Board Meeting
Comprehensive Agenda
April 14, 2016 – 9:00 – Noon
Chateau Louis, Grand Ballroom
11727 Kingsway, Edmonton

1. Call to Order
2. Chair's Opening Remarks

Consent Agenda Items:

Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the meeting Agenda (3), its previous Meeting Minutes (4ab), the updated Policies: A004, F002, F003, G003, G004, G006, G009, G012, G015, G016, G017, G018 (5), and the Revised Committee Terms of References (6).

3. Approval of Agenda
4. Approval of Minutes
   a. February 11, 2016
   b. March 10, 2016
5. Policy Updates
6. Revised Committee Terms of References

7. Mandate; Regional Commissions Feedback

   Board Motion previously referred to Administration:

   1) That Capital Region Board write to the Province asking to list the planning and co-ordination (but not operation) of water under section 12(1)(a) of the current mandate, as recommended by the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee.

   2) That Capital Region Board write to the Province asking to list the planning and co-ordination (but not operation) of wastewater under section 12(1)(a) of the current mandate, as recommended by the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee.

   3) That Capital Region Board write to the Province asking to list the planning and co-ordination (but not operation) of solid waste under section 12(1)(a) of the current mandate, as recommended by the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee.
8. Advocacy & Monitoring Committee
   a. Strategic Plan KPI Report for 2015/16

   **Recommended Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the CRB Strategic Plan 2014–2018 Priorities Measurement Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Report 2015/16, as recommended by the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee.

9. Housing Committee
   a. Regional & Sub-Regional Needs Assessment Reports

   **Recommended Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the Regional and Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessments, as recommended by the Housing Committee.

10. AIHA re: Minister’s Comments

   **Recommended Motion:** That Capital Region Board approve the Chair sending a letter to the Province seeking re-affirmation of its commitment to the CRB Transportation Prioritization List.

11. Growth Plan Update Task Force
   a. Comments from the Chair
   b. Table of Contents for Approval

   **Recommended Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the direction of draft Table of Contents as the basis for preparing the Growth Plan 2.0, as recommended by the Growth Plan Update Task Force.

   c. 30 minute update on the Plan; What’s Changed: Agriculture Policy Area

12. Committee/Task Force Chair Updates

13. Administrative Items
   a. CEO’s Update

14. Adjournment
Minutes of the meeting of the Capital Region Board held at Grand Ballroom, Chateau Louis Conference Centre on Thursday, February 11, 2016

Delegates in Attendance:
Mayor Nolan Crouse – St. Albert/Chair
Mayor Camille Berube – Beaumont
Mayor Randy Boyd – Bon Accord
Mayor Karl Hauch – Bruderheim
Mayor Wally Yachimetz – Calmar
Mayor Don Iveson – Edmonton
Mayor Gale Katchur – Fort Saskatchewan
Councillor Louise Bauder – Gibbons
Reeve Wayne Woldanski – Lamont County
Mayor Greg Krischke – Leduc
Councillor Tanni Doblanko – Leduc County (alternate)
Mayor Carol Tremblay – Legal
Mayor Lisa Holmes – Morinville
Councillor Nicole Boutestein – Morinville (alternate)
Mayor Rod Shaigec – Parkland County
Mayor Mel Smith – Redwater
Mayor Stuart Houston – Spruce Grove
Mayor William Choy – Stony Plain
Mayor Roxanne Carr – Strathcona County
Councillor Susan Evans – Sturgeon County (alternate)
Mayor Barry Rasch – Thorsby
Councillor Art Erickson – Wabamun (alternate)
Mayor Ralph van Assen – Warburg
Monte Krueger – Government of Alberta (alternate)

Absent:
Mayor Stephen Lindop – Devon
Mayor Bill Skinner – Lamont

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

Called to order 9:00 a.m.

2. Chair’s Opening Remarks

- Lamont will be absent and so all votes will be recorded with Lamont in the affirmative.
- Changes to the March Board meeting include:
  - **New Location:** Holiday Inn Express Downtown Edmonton, Penthouse Room
  - **Duration:** 10:00 a.m. – Noon

a. Capital Region Board – Eight Years In Reflection

Presentation by Chair Nolan Crouse

### Consent Agenda Items:

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

**Motion carried unanimously.**

3. Approval of Agenda

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the Agenda of February 11, 2016.

4. Approval of Minutes of December 10, 2015

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

5. Approval of Updated CRB Policies

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve Policies A001, A002, A005, A006, F001, F004, F005, F006, G001, and G002, as recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee subject to the removal of F002 for further work by Administration.

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

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the revised Land Use & Planning Committee Terms of Reference as recommended by the Land Use & Planning Committee.
7. Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan
   This item was removed from the consent agenda by Bon Accord and voted on separately.

8. Joint CRB/CRP Regional Transit Policy Workshop Notes
   Motion: That the Capital Region Board receive the Joint CRB/CRP Regional Transit Policy Workshop Notes for information as recommended by the Transit Committee.

7. Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan

   Moved by Mayor Shaigec. Accepted by Chair.

   Motion:
   1) That the Capital Region Board approve the Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan, as recommended by the Land Use & Planning Committee.
   2) That the Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan be sent to the Province and Alberta Energy Regulator for information.
   3) That the Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan be referred to the Advocacy and Monitoring Committee to pursue the support of the Province in implementation of the Plan’s recommendations and further actions.

   Motion carried unanimously.

9. Results of Membership Review

   a. Town of Lamont

   Moved by Mayor Smith. Accepted by Chair.

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

   Chair Crouse relinquished the Chair position to CRB Vice-Chair Berube.

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

   23 in favour, 1 opposed. Supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the populations. Motion Carried.
b. Town of Redwater

Moved by Mayor Smith. Accepted by Chair.

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

Chair Crouse relinquished the Chair position to CRB Vice-Chair Berube.

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

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

10. Capital Region Board Mandate Review

a. Approval of Mandate with Economic Development Initiative Caveat

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

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

Requested by a member that the recommended motion be split into three individual motions. Accepted by Chair.

Moved by Mayor Krischke. Accepted by Chair.

1) Motion: That Capital Region Board write to the Province, as recommended by the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee, to confirm that we interpret the existing mandate as permissive in areas that the Board may wish to move in over time and in the future.

23 in favour, 1 opposed. Supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the populations. Motion Carried.
Moved by Mayor Krischke. Accepted by Chair.

2) Motion: That Capital Region Board write to the Province, as recommended by the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee, that the CRB ask the Province to list the planning and co-ordination (but not operation) of water, wastewater, and solid waste under section 12(1)(a) of the current mandate.

Mayor Rod Shaigec, Parkland, put forward a friendly amendment to have “co-ordination of planning (but not operation) between the regional water commissions, regional wastewater commissions” reworded in the motion. The friendly amendment was accepted.

Motion: That Capital Region Board write to the Province, as recommended by the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee, that the CRB ask the Province to list the co-ordination of planning (but not operation) between the regional water commissions, regional wastewater commissions as well as solid waste under section 12(1)(a) of the current mandate.

Mayor Roxanne Carr, Strathcona, moved to postpone the motion until the April Board meeting when consultation can be completed with key stakeholders. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the CRB postpone this motion to administration “That Capital Region Board write to the Province, as recommended by the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee, that the CRB ask the Province to list the co-ordination of planning (but not operation) between the regional water commissions, regional wastewater commissions as well as solid waste under section 12(1)(a) of the current mandate;" until the April Board meeting when consultation can be completed with key stakeholders.

Mayor Don Iveson, Edmonton, put forward a friendly amendment to have “refer” replace postpone in the motion. The friendly amendment was accepted.

Motion: That the CRB refer this motion to administration “That Capital Region Board write to the Province, as recommended by the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee, that the CRB ask the Province to list the co-ordination of planning (but not operation) between the regional water commissions, regional wastewater commissions as well as solid waste under section 12(1)(a) of the current mandate;" until the April Board meeting when consultation can be completed with key stakeholders.

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

Notice of Motion, Sturgeon: That the Capital Region Board refers the potential expansion of the CRB’s mandate to include planning and coordination, but not the operation of, water, wastewater, and solid waste to the CRB’s Administration to provide a study on potential roles, cost, models, and implications by September 2016.

3) Motion: Not moved by Mayor Krischke, Leduc, instead the motion will come back to the Capital Region Board for decision at the March 10, 2016 meeting.
11. Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee

a. CRB Chairperson Motion – Non Voting Chair

Moved by Mayor Berube. Accepted by Chair.

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

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

12. Growth Plan Update Task Force

a. Chair Update - provided

b. Revised 2014-2044 Employment Forecast

Moved by Mayor Carr. Accepted by Chair.

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

Mayor William Choy, Stony Plain, put forward a friendly amendment to have “informing” replace “updating” in the motion. The friendly amendment was accepted.

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

Information Request: How are the Employment Forecast numbers being used? Do they affect the REF process?

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

13. Member Motions

a. Sturgeon County – Member Financial Contributions
Mayor Krischke, Leduc, leaves the meeting, no alternate representative takes his place.

Moved by Councillor Evans. Accepted by Chair.

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

Chair Crouse relinquished the Chair position to CRB Vice-Chair Berube.

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

6 in favour, 18 opposed. Not supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the populations. Motion Failed.

14. Board Information Requests Update

15. Committee/Task Force Minutes

Mayor Holmes, Morinville, leaves the meeting, no alternate representative takes her place.

a. Advocacy & Monitoring Committee – draft minutes, update provided
b. Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee – draft minutes and update provided
c. Housing Committee – draft minutes provided
d. Land Use & Planning Committee – draft minutes provided
e. Transit Committee – draft minutes provided
f. Growth Plan Update Task Force – draft minutes provided

16. Administrative Items

a. CEO’s Update
   i. February 5 GPU Engagement Session with a number of Administrations and Planners; significant amount of feedback received and will be provided to the Growth Plan Update Task Force on February 18.
   ii. Economic Development Workshop this afternoon for Mayors, Councillors and CAOs but is an open meeting.
   iii. Collaborate to Compete, June 2, 2016; reminder of earlybird registration deadline of February 25.

b. October – December 2015 Quarterly Report

17. March Board Meeting Plan

Location: Holiday Inn Express Downtown Edmonton, Penthouse Room
Duration: 10:00 a.m. - Noon
18. Adjournment

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

______________________________  ______________________________
CRB Chair, Nolan Crouse         CRB CEO, Malcolm Bruce
Minutes of the meeting of the Capital Region Board held at Penthouse Room, Holiday Inn Express Downtown on Thursday, March 10, 2016

Delegates in Attendance:

Mayor Nolan Crouse – St. Albert/Chair
Mayor Camille Berube – Beaumont
Mayor Randy Boyd – Bon Accord
Councillor Virginia Differenz – Bruderheim (alternate)
Mayor Wally Yachimetz – Calmar
Mayor Stephen Lindop – Devon
Mayor Don Iveson – Edmonton
Councillor Ed Gibbons – Edmonton (alternate)
Mayor Gale Katchur – Fort Saskatchewan
Councillor Louise Bauder – Gibbons
Mayor Bill Skinner – Lamont
Reeve Wayne Woldanski – Lamont County
Mayor Greg Krischke – Leduc
Mayor John Whaley – Leduc County
Mayor Carol Tremblay – Legal
Mayor Lisa Holmes – Morinville
Mayor Rod Shaigec – Parkland County
Mayor Mel Smith – Redwater
Alderman Ed McLean – Spruce Grove (alternate)
Mayor William Choy – Stony Plain
Mayor Roxanne Carr – Strathcona County
Mayor Tom Flynn – Sturgeon County
Mayor Barry Rasch – Thorsby
Mayor Charlene Smylie – Wabamun
Mayor Ralph van Assen – Warburg
Bruce McDonald – Government of Alberta

Absent:

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

March 14, 2016
1. Call to Order

Called to order 10:00 a.m.

2. Chair’s Opening Remarks

Mayor Don Iveson, Edmonton, takes a seat at the table, replacing Councillor Ed Gibbons.

- Condolences to Thorsby on the passing of Councillor Bob Barnett.
- Congratulations to Mayor Greg Krischke, Leduc, for being awarded the Sport Tourism Champion of the Year.
- Welcome back to Mayor Bill Skinner, Lamont.
- Transportation Priorities, Letter from AIHA and comments from the Minister will be added to the CEO Update as item 12b.

3. Approval of Agenda

Moved by Mayor Berube. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the Agenda of March 10, 2016, subject to the inclusion of item 12b - Minister’s position on AIHA.

Motion carried unanimously.

4. Approval of Minutes

It was requested that Administration take the draft minutes back for further refinement and bring them back to the April 14, 2016 meeting for approval.

5. Advocacy & Monitoring Committee

a. Capital Region Growth Plan: Monitoring and Reporting Indicators

Moved by Mayor Krischke. Accepted by Chair.

Mayor Gale Katchur requested the vote be recorded.

Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the Growth Plan: Monitoring and Reporting Indicators report and forward it to the Government of Alberta as recommended by the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee.

23 in favour, 1 opposed. Supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the populations. Motion Carried.
In favour: Beaumont, Gibbons, Legal, Parkland County, Stony Plain, Strathcona County, Spruce Grove, Thorsby, Bon Accord, Bruderheim, Leduc, Lamont County, Wabamun, Devon, Calmar, Redwater, Morinville, St. Albert, Sturgeon County, Edmonton, Warburg, Leduc County, Lamont
Opposed: Fort Saskatchewan

6. Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee

a. Membership Voting Structure

Moved by Mayor Berube. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Capital Region Board support the updated voting structure and request that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Lieutenant Governor in Council take such steps as are required to enact a regulation replacing or amending the Capital Region Board Regulation, ALTA. Reg. 38/2012, to give effect to the new voting structure.

Mayor Tom Flynn, Sturgeon, put forward a friendly amendment to have “subject to the Government of Alberta approval of the Membership Review motions passed at the February 11, 2016 CRB meeting” included at the end of the motion. The friendly amendment was accepted.

Motion: That the Capital Region Board support the updated voting structure and request that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Lieutenant Governor in Council take such steps as are required to enact a regulation replacing or amending the Capital Region Board Regulation, ALTA. Reg. 38/2012, to give effect to the new voting structure, subject to the Government of Alberta approval of the Membership Review motions passed at the February 11, 2016 CRB meeting.

Motion carried unanimously.

b. Business Plan

Moved by Mayor Berube. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the 2016-20 Capital Region Board Business Plan as recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

Motion carried unanimously.

7. CRB Regional Economic Development Initiative

Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the regional economic development model facilitated via the CRB and that administration seek Provincial funding opportunities and report back to the Board in 2016 with an update and implementation timeline.
Or,

That the Capital Region Board approve the regional economic development model, which would be independent of the CRB, for implementation and that administration facilitate the first meeting of self-identified municipalities in 2016.

Requested by a member that the recommended motion be split into two individual motions. Accepted by Chair. Chair declared a short break to present updated motions based on the comments from the members during the Q & A.

**Moved by** Mayor Katchur. **Accepted by** Chair.

1) **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve a regional economic development model facilitated via the CRB and that administration seek Provincial funding opportunities and report back to the Board in 2016.

**Mayor Camille Berube, Beaumont,** put forward a friendly amendment to have “2016” replaced by “in June” in the motion. The friendly amendment was accepted.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve a regional economic development model facilitated via the CRB and that administration seek Provincial funding opportunities and report back to the Board in June.

5 in favour, 19 opposed. Not supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the populations. **Motion Defeated.**

**Moved by** Mayor Carr. **Accepted by** Chair.

2) **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board incubate a formal regional economic development model, which would be independent of the CRB, for further development and that administration seek Provincial support for the next steps, and administration to report on progress in June.

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

8. **Advocacy & Monitoring Committee**

a. **Mandate Review – Economic Development**

**Moved by** Mayor Krischke. **Accepted by** Chair.

**Motion:** That Capital Region Board writes to the Province, as recommended by the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee.
That the CRB recognizes the need for regional economic development and wishes to work further with the Province as the CRB incubates a separate institution.

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

9. **Growth Plan Update Task Force**

   a. **Draft Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Structure to 2044 – Conceptual Map**

   **Moved by** Mayor Carr. **Accepted by** Chair.

   **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the draft Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Structure to 2044 - Conceptual Map direction as the basis for developing the policies for the Growth Plan 2.0, as recommended by the Growth Plan Update Task Force.

   **Motion carried unanimously.**

   b. **Policy Approach and Policy Objectives**

   **Moved by** Mayor Carr. **Accepted by** Chair.

   **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the Growth Plan Update Policy Approach and Policy Objectives and Policy Directions as the basis for developing the policies for the Growth Plan 2.0, as recommended by the Growth Plan Update Task Force.

   **Mayor Bill Skinner, Lamont**, leaves the meeting; no alternate representative takes his place.

   Chair Crouse relinquished the Chair position to CRB Vice-Chair Berube.

   CRB Vice-Chair Berube, returns the Chair position to Chair Crouse.

   **Mayor Tom Flynn, Sturgeon, moved** to amend the motion to “remove Ag Policy related matters”. **Accepted by** Chair.

   **Amendment:** That the Ag Policy related matters be removed from the Growth Plan Update Policy Approach and Policy Objectives and Policy Directions.

   2 in favour, 22 opposed. Not supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the populations. **Motion Failed.**

   **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the Growth Plan Update Policy Approach and Policy Objectives and Policy Directions as the basis for developing the policies for the Growth Plan 2.0, as recommended by the Growth Plan Update Task Force.
19 in favour, 5 opposed. Supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the populations. **Motion Carried.**

Mayor Lisa Holmes, Morinville, leaves the meeting; no alternate representative takes her place.

**10. Board Information Requests Update**

**11. Committee/Task Force Minutes**

Mayor Charlene Smylie, Wabamun, leaves the meeting; no alternate representative takes her place.

Mayor Stephen Lindop, Devon, leaves the meeting; no alternate representative takes his place.

- Advocacy & Monitoring Committee – draft minutes, update provided
- Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee – draft minutes and update provided
- Growth Plan Update Task Force – draft minutes provided

**12. Administrative Items**

- **CEO's Update**
  - Letter received from AIHA regarding indication from the Province that the Transportation Prioritization List may be set aside for new consultations and possibly revisit the second bridge south of the Fort Saskatchewan. The letter will be distributed to members and the matter will be brought back to the Board.
  - Friendly reminder of the “Collaborate to Compete” event, June 2, 2016 in Winnipeg.
  - Request that all Claims be submitted by March 30 for the completion of fiscal year end.

- **Minister’s Position on Transportation**

Chair declared after a request that the Chair of the Alberta’s Industrial Heartland, Councillor Ed Gibbons, City of Edmonton, be invited to speak regarding this matter during the next scheduled Board meeting.

Mayor Gale Katchur, Fort Saskatchewan, leaves the meeting; no alternate representative takes her place.

**13. Adjournment**

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 12:33 p.m.
Capital Region Board Policies

Recommended Motion

That the Capital Region Board approve Policies A004, F002, F003, G003, G004, G006, G009, G012, G015, G016, G017, G018, as amended and recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

Background

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

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

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

Rationale

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

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

The attached policies have been reviewed and were amended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee on February 25, 2016, and recommended to the Board for approval.

Attachments:

1. A004 - Media and Communications
2. F002 - Procurement
3. F003 - Capitalization
4. G003 - Remuneration and Expenses for Board, Committee, and Task Force Members
5. G004 - Board Meeting Minutes
6. G006 - Budgeting
7. G009 - Appointment of Auditor
8. G012 - Committee and Task Force Terms of Reference
9. G015 - Role and Responsibilities of Committee and Task Force Chairs and Vice-Chairs
10. G016 - Member Municipality Representation on Committees and Task Forces
11. G017 - Monitoring and Evaluating Board Performance
12. G018 - GIS Policy
PURPOSE
To establish a strategy and process for communications and media management that may include the utilization of key messages, standard presentations, coordinating media responses and issuing press releases to maximize the Capital Region Board profile.

POLICY
The Capital Region Board will build and maintain a good working relationship with the public, community organizations, governments and the media to ensure that the interests of the Board are advanced. Information provided will be accurate and reflect approved Board policies, the Capital Region Growth Plan, business plans and the Capital Region Board Regulation.- Requests from external organizations and media will be answered in a timely manner.

GUIDELINES
1. The Board will develop and update as required an Advocacy & Communications Strategy for the Capital Region Board. The Strategy will include media relations.

2. The public, external organizations and Capital Region media will be invited to CRB meetings and other meetings as deemed appropriate.

3. The Chief OfficerCEO will approve and distribute media advisories in advance of CRB meetings which will reflect the meeting agenda.

4. The Chair/Interim Chair and Chief OfficerCEO will determine and distribute media releases following CRB meetings if meeting events are deemed to be newsworthy.

5. The Chief OfficerCEO will receive enquiries from external organizations and the media and will answer questions that require factual or administrative information. If questions are of the political nature, then the Chief OfficerCEO will refer the questions to the Chair/Interim Chair and/or the Committee Chairs.

6. The Chair/Interim Chair and the Chief OfficerCEO will meet with external organizations and the Capital Region media as required with the objective of developing relationships and promoting the mandate of the Capital Region Board.

7. Key messages about the activities of the Capital Region Board will be determined each year, or as required, and delivered by the Chair/Interim Chair, Advocacy & Communications Committee members and the Chief OfficerCEO.
8. Speaking engagements are an integral part of the Advocacy & Communications Strategy and presentations will be delivered by the Chair/Interim Chair, members of the CRB and the Chief Officer CEO.

9. All written correspondence to the Premier and Government of Alberta Ministers will be prepared under the signature of the Chair/Interim Chair. In situations in which timelines are short, Chairs of CRB Committees may provide written correspondence under their signatures.

**Revisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 18, 2015</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>Updated wording to reflect new terminology (CEO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose
To establish a strategy and process for communications and media management that may include the utilization of key messages, standard presentations, coordinating media responses and issuing press releases to maximize the Capital Region Board profile.

Policy
The Capital Region Board will build and maintain a good working relationship with the public, community organizations, governments and the media to ensure that the interests of the Board are advanced. Information provided will be accurate and reflect approved Board policies, the Capital Region Growth Plan, business plans and the Capital Region Board Regulation. Requests from external organizations and media will be answered in a timely manner.

Guidelines
1. The Board will develop and update as required an Advocacy & Communications Strategy for the Capital Region Board. The Strategy will include media relations.
2. The public, external organizations and Capital Region media will be invited to CRB meetings and other meetings as deemed appropriate.
3. The CEO will approve and distribute media advisories in advance of CRB meetings which will reflect the meeting agenda.
4. The Chair/Interim Chair and CEO will determine and distribute media releases following CRB meetings if meeting events are deemed to be newsworthy.
5. The CEO will receive enquiries from external organizations and the media and will answer questions that require factual or administrative information. If questions are of the political nature, then the CEO will refer the questions to the Chair/Interim Chair and/or the Committee Chairs.
6. The Chair/Interim Chair and the CEO will meet with external organizations and the Capital Region media as required with the objective of developing relationships and promoting the mandate of the Capital Region Board.
7. Key messages about the activities of the Capital Region Board will be determined each year, or as required, and delivered by the Chair/Interim Chair, Advocacy & Communications Committee members and the CEO.
8. Speaking engagements are an integral part of the Advocacy & Communications Strategy and presentations will be delivered by the Chair/Interim Chair, members of the CRB and the CEO.

9. All written correspondence to the Premier and Government of Alberta Ministers will be prepared under the signature of the Chair/Interim Chair. In situations in which timelines are short, Chairs of CRB Committees may provide written correspondence under their signatures.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18, 2015</td>
<td>Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE
To conduct the purchasing and tendering activities of the Capital Region Board in the most effective, transparent, fair, and efficient manner possible.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

j. Invitation to Tender (ITT) – This format details, very specifically, the what, why, when, where and how the work/project/product will be provided or completed. Providing that all tender terms and conditions have been met the only determining factor for the award, unless stated otherwise, is price. There is no negotiation of price (but could be with the scope of work) with the successful bidder.

Other items of consideration may be past contractor performance with the CRB, reference checks, or whether the contractor has previous experience in the project in which the bid has been made. If these criteria are to be considered in the evaluation process they should be clearly indicated in the tender documents.

Award is made to the best evaluated compliant bidder based on the published evaluation criteria. The criterion provides the CRB with opportunity to exercise its right to reject a proponent if the CRB feels it is not in the best interest of the organization to award a contract to the lowest bidder. If the lowest bidder is not chosen based on one or more of the outlined criteria, it must be documented and approved by the Chief Executive Officer.

k. Request for Information (RFI) – This format is similar to the RFP but less “formal”. The RFI is used to solicit information from potential vendors for any of one or combination of the following:

i. Vendor availability;
ii. Market conditions;
iii. Industry / Technology;
iv. Pricing; or
v. Any other “missing” information.

A RFI should include the basic requirements of any competitive format in terms of closing date and time, contact person, solicitation number, etc. Depending upon the nature of the RFI, the option of process/next steps upon closing can be varied. The issuer can chose to go to RFP or an ITT process or they can choose to negotiate with only one supplier. Whatever the decision, it must be disclosed in the RFI documents.

NOTE: When developing any of the above formats, the use of the words “must” and “shall” should only be used when the requirement is mandatory. Otherwise words like “may” or “should” should be used.

l. Tender Notice – The tender notice is done through paper advertisement (local or otherwise), on the internet or on the Alberta Purchasing Connection website, or any combination of the above. In any instance, the tender notice should include the following information:

i. A brief description of the purpose of the tender;
ii. Where or from whom the tender documents or further information can be obtained;
iii. The conditions for obtaining the tender documents (i.e. if there is a cost for obtaining the tender);
iv. Place where the tenders are to be submitted;

NOTE: it is important to be very specific as where the documents are to be submitted (i.e.: main reception at Capital Region Board, #1405-1100 Bell Tower, 10104 -103 Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0H8);
v. Date and time for submitting tenders should follow the format, May 26, 2010, 14:00:00 hours Mountain Daylight Savings time; and
vi. Time and place of opening (type of bid opening) if applicable (Section 11).

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

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

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

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

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

Examples of an acceptable incompleteness and not acceptable incompleteness:
- Acceptable: A pricing extension is not carried through.
- Not acceptable: Unit price is not completed.

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

11. BID OPENINGS

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

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

c. **Bid openings can be classified as follows:**

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

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

   - Private—In the presence of the Owner only.

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

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

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

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

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

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

12. SOLE SOURCE

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

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

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

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

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

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

Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2015</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>Clarified ‘Opening’ process, adjusted purchase amounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 18, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>GPF amendment to refer 12.b. back to section 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12, 2016</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Clarified, if possible, minimum submissions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
PURPOSE
To conduct the purchasing and tendering activities of the Capital Region Board in the most effective, transparent, fair, and efficient manner possible.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Specifications are general in nature. The selection of the successful supplier is based on the CRB’s appreciation of the proposal and the suppliers ability to complete the project or provide the service. Electronic submissions will be accepted.

If a closing date (and time) is provided for the RFP, submissions after this date (and time) will not be accepted.

j. Invitation to Tender (ITT) – This format details, very specifically, the what, why, when, where and how the work/ project/product will be provided or completed. Providing that all tender terms and conditions have been met the only determining factor for the award, unless stated otherwise, is price. There is no negotiation of price (but could be with the scope of work) with the successful bidder.

Other items of consideration may be past contractor performance with the CRB, reference checks, or whether the contractor has previous experience in the project in which the bid has been made. If these criteria are to be considered in the evaluation process they should be clearly indicated in the tender documents.

Award is made to the best evaluated compliant bidder based on the published evaluation criteria.

k. Request for Information (RFI) – This format is similar to the RFP but less “formal”. The RFI is used to solicit information from potential vendors for any of one or combination of the following:

i. Vendor availability;
ii. Market conditions;
iii. Industry / Technology;
iv. Pricing;
v. Any other “missing” information.

A RFI should include the basic requirements of any competitive format in terms of closing date and time, contact person, solicitation number, etc.

Depending upon the nature of the RFI, the option of process/next steps upon closing can be varied. The issuer can chose to go to RFP or an ITT process or they can choose to negotiate with only one supplier. Whatever the decision, it must be disclosed in the RFI documents.

NOTE: When developing any of the above formats, the use of the words “must” and “shall” should only be used when the requirement is mandatory. Otherwise words like “may” or “should” should be used.

l. Tender Notice –on the Alberta Purchasing Connection website.. In any instance, the tender notice should include the following information:

i. A brief description of the purpose of the tender;
ii. Where or from whom the tender documents or further information can be obtained;
iii. The conditions for obtaining the tender documents (i.e. if there is a cost for obtaining the tender);
iv. Place where the tenders are to be submitted;

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

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

10. RECEIPT OF COMPETITIVE TENDERS, PROPOSALS OR QUOTATIONS
    a. All tenders, proposals and quotations, solicited or unsolicited, must include a closing date and time and compliant with Tender requirems. Time must be indicated as in the following example: 14:00:00 hours Mountain Daylight Savings time, May 26, 2010.

    b. Upon the closing time, all submissions will be “opened”.
    c. Every bid will be reviewed to ensure it is completed in its entirety. Depending on the nature of incompleteness, a bid not completed in its entirety may be either disqualified, with the submission returned to the bidder with an explanation, or accepted.
      Examples of an acceptable incompleteness and not acceptable incompleteness:
      • Acceptable: A pricing extension is not carried through.
      • Not acceptable: Unit price is not completed.
    d. Any submissions that are received after the closing date and time will not be accepted and are to be returned unopened to the originator with a letter explaining why it was returned.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2015</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>Clarified ‘Opening’ process, adjusted purchase amounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 18, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>GPF amendment to refer 12.b. back to section 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12, 2016</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Clarified, if possible, minimum submissions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE
To determine the capitalization of expenditures.

POLICY
The Capital Region Board will capitalize expenditures of a non-recurring nature that cost $2,500 or more and which have an estimated life of more than one year.

GUIDELINES
1. Capital assets are recorded at cost.

2. Purchases will be categorized and amortized as set out below. In the year of acquisition a half amortization will be charged and in the year of disposition a half amortization will be charged.
   a. Furniture and Equipment – declining balance at a 20% rate.
   b. Computer – declining balance at a 30% rate.
   c. Leasehold Improvements – straight line on life of asset.

3. A list of all capital assets and their related amortization will be maintained and reviewed annually by December 31 to assess reasonableness.

4. Assets are removed from the list when disposed or written down to a value of less than $200.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
PURPOSE
To determine the capitalization of expenditures.

POLICY
The Capital Region Board will capitalize expenditures of a non-recurring nature that cost $2,500 or more and which have an estimated life of more than one year.

GUIDELINES
1. Capital assets are recorded at cost.

2. Purchases will be categorized and amortized as set out below. In the year of acquisition a half amortization will be charged and in the year of disposition a half amortization will be charged.
   a. Furniture and Equipment – declining balance at a 20% rate.
   b. Computer – declining balance at a 30% rate.
   c. Leasehold Improvements – straight line on life of asset.

3. A list of all capital assets and their related amortization will be maintained and reviewed annually by May 31 to assess reasonableness.

4. Assets are removed from the list when disposed or written down to a value of less than $200.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
PD G003

REMUNERATION AND EXPENSES FOR BOARD, COMMITTEE, AND TASK FORCE MEMBERS

PURPOSE

To ensure Board, Committee, and Task Force members or their Alternates receive reasonable compensation for their time and expenses.

POLICY

Capital Region Board, Committee, and Task Force Members or their Alternates may be provided with fair and reasonable remuneration and reimbursement for the expenses that they incur while performing their duties. Board, Committee, and Task Force members or their Alternates may decide whether or not to make claims for remuneration and/or expenses.

GUIDELINES

1. PER DIEMS

   Board, Committee, and Task Force members or their Alternates may receive a per diem of $200.00 per day for all formally scheduled Board, Committee, and Task Force meetings. A maximum of $200.00 may be claimed on any day.

   a. Board, Committee, and Task Force members or their Alternates may receive a per diem only while acting in the capacity of a voting member at the Board, Committee, or Task Force meetings.

   b. Members or alternate members of ad hoc CRB Committees are not eligible to receive per diems, unless otherwise agreed to by the CEO.

   b.c. Mileage for ad hoc meetings may be claimed in accordance with Part 2.

2. TRAVEL

   a. Board, Committee, and Task Force members or their Alternates (while acting in the capacity of a voting member) travelling to and from Board, Committee, and Task Force meetings of the CRB may receive a travel allowance on a per kilometer basis equivalent to the Government of Alberta rate.

   b. Reimbursement of parking costs for attendance at Board, Committee, and Task Force meetings of the CRB will be provided with the submission of paid receipts.

   c. Board, Committee, and Task Force members or their Alternates acting on behalf of the CRB and with prior CEO approval may claim travel expenses. Travel expenses include: cost of air travel at economy rates, vehicle travel allowance on a per kilometer basis equivalent to the Government of Alberta rate, hotel, meals, parking, and taxi fares. Reimbursement for air travel, hotel, meals, parking, and taxi fare costs will require the submission of paid receipts.

   d. Employees and contractors of member municipalities will not be reimbursed for travel expenses under any circumstances.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 5 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Clarity regarding ad-hoc meetings added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Clarity regarding mileage for ad-hoc meetings, as per GPF’s request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE

To ensure Board, Committee, and Task Force members or their Alternates receive reasonable remuneration for their time and expenses.

POLICY

Capital Region Board, Committee, and Task Force Members or their Alternates may be provided with fair and reasonable remuneration and reimbursement for the expenses that they incur while performing their duties. Board, Committee, and Task Force members or their Alternates may decide whether or not to make claims for remuneration and/or expenses.

GUIDELINES

1. PER DIEMS

   Board, Committee, and Task Force members or their Alternates may receive a per diem of $200.00 per day for all formally scheduled Board, Committee, and Task Force meetings. A maximum of $200.00 may be claimed on any day.

   a. Board, Committee, and Task Force members or their Alternates may receive a per diem only while acting in the capacity of a voting member at the Board, Committee, or Task Force meetings.
   b. Members or alternate members of ad hoc CRB Committees are not eligible to receive per diems, unless otherwise agreed to by the CEO.
   c. Mileage for ad hoc meetings may be claimed in accordance with Part 2

2. TRAVEL

   a. Board, Committee, and Task Force members or their Alternates (while acting in the capacity of a voting member) travelling to and from Board, Committee, and Task Force meetings of the CRB may receive a travel allowance on a per kilometer basis equivalent to the Government of Alberta rate.
   b. Reimbursement of parking costs for attendance at Board, Committee, and Task Force meetings of the CRB will be provided with the submission of paid receipts.
   c. Board, Committee, and Task Force members or their Alternates acting on behalf of the CRB and with CEO approval may claim travel expenses. Travel expenses include: cost of air travel at economy rates, vehicle travel allowance on a per kilometer basis equivalent to the Government of Alberta rate, hotel, meals, parking, and taxi fares. Reimbursement for air travel, hotel, meals, parking, and taxi fare costs will require the submission of paid receipts.
   d. Employees and contractors of member municipalities will not be reimbursed for travel expenses under any circumstances.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Clarity regarding ad-hoc meetings added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Clarity regarding mileage for ad-hoc meetings, as per GPF’s request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE
To outline the approach to the taking of minutes and identify the purpose of audio recordings of Capital Region Board meetings.

POLICY
Minutes will be recorded for the public sessions at all Board meetings to capture topics discussed, motions and required actions. Approved minutes will serve as the Record of Decisions of the Board.

Public sessions at the Board meetings will be audio recorded to assist in the preparation of the written minutes. Audio recordings in and of themselves are not the official record of the Capital Region Board meetings and are therefore not available to the public at any time.

GUIDELINES
1. Administration is responsible to prepare the minutes by recording topics discussed with brief comments, as appropriate, along with any motions and decisions made and the required actions.
2. If a Board Member is replaced by an Alternate Member at the Board table or vice versa, the minutes will indicate the same as well as the time that the replacement occurred.
3. Draft minutes are submitted to Board members for review with approval taking place at the next meeting. Meeting minutes are draft only, until approved by the Board. Meeting minutes are posted on the Capital Region Board website.
4. Board members, designated Board alternates, and Municipal Chief Administrative Officers (or their designate) will be provided with access to listen to full recordings of any meeting at the Capital Region Board office.
5. All meeting minutes and audio recordings will be retained at the Capital Region Board office.

______________________________
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE

To outline the approach to the taking of minutes and identify the purpose of audio recordings of Capital Region Board meetings.

POLICY

Minutes will be recorded for the public sessions at all Board meetings to capture topics discussed, motions and required actions. Approved minutes will serve as the Record of Decisions of the Board.

Public sessions at the Board meetings will be audio recorded to assist in the preparation of the written minutes. Audio recordings in and of themselves are not the official record of the Capital Region Board meetings and are therefore not available to the public at any time.

GUIDELINES

1. Administration is responsible to prepare the minutes by recording topics discussed with brief comments, as appropriate, along with any motions and decisions made and the required actions.

2. If a Board Member is replaced by an Alternate Member at the Board table or vice versa, the minutes will indicate the same as well as the time that the replacement occurred.

3. Draft minutes are submitted to Board members for review with approval taking place at the next meeting. Meeting minutes are draft only, until approved by the Board. Meeting minutes are posted on the Capital Region Board website.

4. Board members, designated Board alternates, and Municipal Chief Administrative Officers (or their designate) will be provided with access to listen to full recordings of any meeting at the Capital Region Board office.

5. All meeting minutes and audio recordings will be retained at the Capital Region Board office.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
PURPOSE

To ensure that the Capital Region Board maintains a strong financial planning position.

POLICY

The Capital Region Board will approve a business plan and budget for each fiscal year.

GUIDELINES

1. The Chief Executive Officer will prepare the four year business and budget for approval by the Capital Region Board Members prior to December 31 of each year.

2. The Business Plan includes the activities proposed to be undertaken during the year and a summary of the financial and human resources required to carry them out.

3. The operating budget must include the estimated amount of each of the following expenditures and transfers:
   a. the amount needed to enable the CRB to provide its services;
   b. the amount needed to pay its debt obligations in respect of borrowings made to acquire, construct, remove or improve capital property;
   c. if necessary, the amount needed to provide for a depreciation or depletion allowance, or both, for any public utility it is authorized to provide;
   d. the amount to be transferred to or from reserves;
   e. the amount to be transferred to the capital budget; and
   f. the amount needed to cover any deficiency as required under Section 9.

4. The operating budget must include the estimated amount of the following sources of revenue and transfers:
   a. fees for services provided;
   b. grants;
   c. transfers from or to the Capital Region Board’s accumulated surplus funds or reserves; and
   d. any other source of revenue.

5. The capital budget must include the following:
   a. an estimate of the amount needed to acquire, construct, remove or improve capital property;
   b. the anticipated sources and estimated amounts of money to pay the costs referred to in clause (a) above; and
   c. an estimate of the amount to be transferred from the operating budget.
6. By September 15 of each year, the Chief Executive Officer will obtain input from each of the CRB committees and the Project Managers with regards to initiatives to be considered for inclusion in the Business Plan. Initiatives, that have a financial commitment for municipalities, will be communicated to these municipalities as soon as possible.

7. The drafts of the business plan and the budgets will be presented by the Chief Executive Officer to the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee no later than October 15/November 30.

8. The Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee will recommend the business plans and budgets for board approval no later than December 31.

9. If the total revenues and transfers of the Capital Region Board over a four year period are less than the total expenditures and transfers of the Capital Region Board for the same period, the operating budget for the Capital Region Board for the year following the four year period must include an expenditure to cover the deficiency.

---

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8, 2016</td>
<td>Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE
To ensure that the Capital Region Board maintains a strong financial planning position.

POLICY
The Capital Region Board will approve a business plan and budget for each fiscal year.

GUIDELINES
1. The Chief Executive Officer will prepare the four year business and budget for approval by the Capital Region Board Members prior to December 31 of each year.

2. The Business Plan includes the activities proposed to be undertaken during the year and a summary of the financial and human resources required to carry them out.

3. The operating budget must include the estimated amount of each of the following expenditures and transfers:
   a. the amount needed to enable the CRB to provide its services;
   b. the amount needed to pay its debt obligations in respect of borrowings made to acquire, construct, remove or improve capital property;
   c. if necessary, the amount needed to provide for a depreciation or depletion allowance, or both, for any public utility it is authorized to provide;
   d. the amount to be transferred to or from reserves;
   e. the amount to be transferred to the capital budget; and
   f. the amount needed to cover any deficiency as required under Section 9.

4. The operating budget must include the estimated amount of the following sources of revenue and transfers:
   a. fees for services provided;
   b. grants;
   c. transfers from or to the Capital Region Board’s accumulated surplus funds or reserves; and
   d. any other source of revenue.

5. The capital budget must include the following:
   a. an estimate of the amount needed to acquire, construct, remove or improve capital property;
   b. the anticipated sources and estimated amounts of money to pay the costs referred to in clause (a) above; and
   c. an estimate of the amount to be transferred from the operating budget.
6. By September 15 of each year, the Chief Executive Officer will obtain input from each of the CRB committees and the Project Managers with regard to initiatives to be considered for inclusion in the Business Plan. Initiatives, that have a financial commitment for municipalities, will be communicated to these municipalities as soon as possible.

7. The drafts of the budgets will be presented by the Chief Executive Officer to the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee no later than November 30.

8. The Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee will recommend the budgets for board approval no later than December 31.

9. If the total revenues and transfers of the Capital Region Board over a four year period are less than the total expenditures and transfers of the Capital Region Board for the same period, the operating budget for the Capital Region Board for the year following the four year period must include an expenditure to cover the deficiency.

---

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE

To provide a process for the selection and appointment of an auditor.

POLICY

The Capital Region Board shall appoint an auditor.

GUIDELINES

1. If the appointment of an auditor is to expire on December 31, the Chief Executive Officer, as per the purchasing policy, prior to October 31, will recommend the name of an auditor to the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee for approval and recommendation to the Capital Region Board.

2. The Capital Region Board shall appoint an auditor, to a maximum four year term, prior to December 31 of the year that the previous appointment is to expire.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
PURPOSE

To provide a process for the selection and appointment of an auditor.

POLICY

The Capital Region Board shall appoint an auditor.

GUIDELINES

1. If the appointment of an auditor is to expire on December 31, the Chief Executive Officer, as per the purchasing policy, prior to October 31, will recommend the name of an auditor to the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee for approval and recommendation to the Capital Region Board.

2. The Capital Region Board shall appoint an auditor, to a maximum four year term, prior to December 31 of the year that the previous appointment is to expire.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
COMMITTEE AND TASK FORCE TERMS OF REFERENCE

PURPOSE

To establish common terms of reference for committees and task forces.

POLICY

This policy provides the common terms of reference that Board committees and task forces shall apply in carrying out their specific mandates.

GUIDELINES

All committees and task force terms will be established with its own specific description, mandate and deliverables. However, unless deemed otherwise by the Board, all committees and task forces will share the following common terms:

1. AUTHORITY
   a. All meeting groups established by the Board are considered advisory bodies to the Board and therefore must, by a passed motion, provide recommendation(s) to the Board for decision.
   b. Task forces that have been established under the guidance of a specific committee are expected to seek counsel and support for any motions by their sponsoring committee before proceeding to the Board for decision.

2. AMENDMENTS TO THE TERMS OF REFERENCE
   At any time, a committee may consider changes to its Terms of Reference and recommend the proposed changes to the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee, through to the Board for review and approval.

3. MEMBERSHIP AND MEMBERSHIP TERMS
   Member Municipality Representation on committees and task forces shall be established by approved Terms of Reference for each committee or task force.

4. APPOINTMENT AND TERM OF THE CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR
   Upon establishing a committee or task force, the committee or task force membership will appoint the Chair for each committee and task force. For committees, at the end of a two year period, once the membership has been reset, the committee may choose to elect its Chair and Vice-Chair.

5. EX-OFFICIO
   a. The Board Chair will be considered non-voting ex-officio in all meeting groups with the exception of the Board and Performance-Advocacy Monitoring and Monitoring Committee.
6. DECISION MAKING
   a. Decisions, recommendations, and actions determined by each committee/task force will be driven by the desired outcome to do what is in the best interests of the Capital Region. Only elected officials that are designated as voting members of a committee or task force, or their designated alternate, may vote. Each member will have one vote.
   b. All motions must be moved by a voting member. Motions require a simple majority of members in attendance to pass a motion (50 percent plus one).

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

8. DISPUTE RESOLUTION
   The committee and task force Chairs are 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 applicable standing committee or Board for discussion and resolution.

9. SUPPORT/RESOURCES
   Committees and task forces will be supported by the Chief Executive Officer, Capital Region Board staff and consultant resources, and others as determined by its mandate and the Board’s approved business plan and budget. The Chief Executive Officer may establish an administrative working or advisory group as deemed necessary to support a committee or task force project.

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

11. STATUS OF MEETINGS
    a. Committee and task force 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. Committees and task forces may invite individuals from the province, industry, the general public or other Board, committee, task force members to participate in specific agenda items. Matters emerging and voted on from committees and task forces will become a matter of public record.
    b. 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.
    c. All members (elected and administrative) attending the in camera session shall respect the confidentiality of the in camera items.

12. REPORTING
Committees and task forces are expected to provide the Board, through established communication channels and schedules, sage advice, descriptions and recommendations to resolve existing issues, status and progress as it relates to its mandate and expected deliverables.

a. All CRB meeting agendas, minutes, reports, briefings and supporting documentation will be provided in an electronic format.
b. In general, CRB meeting agendas and pre-read materials, where available, will be provided at least one week in advance of a scheduled meeting.
c. All committees and task forces will include their meeting minutes with the next Board meeting agenda package.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 16, 2015</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>Provision regarding chair positions being occupied by municipally appointed Board Member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8, 2016</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>Clarify CAO ability to vote, typos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 2016</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>Removal of provision regarding chair positions being occupied by municipally appointed Board Member, as per GPF’s request.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
PURPOSE

To establish common terms of reference for committees and task forces.

POLICY

This policy provides the common terms of reference that Board committees and task forces shall apply in carrying out their specific mandates.

GUIDELINES

All committees and task force terms will be established with its own specific description, mandate and deliverables. Unless deemed otherwise by the Board, all committees and task forces will share the following common terms:

1. AUTHORITY
   a. All meeting groups established by the Board are considered advisory bodies to the Board and therefore must, by a passed motion, provide recommendation(s) to the Board for decision.
   b. Task forces that have been established under the guidance of a specific committee are expected to seek counsel and support for any motions by their sponsoring committee before proceeding to the Board for decision.

2. AMENDMENTS TO THE TERMS OF REFERENCE
   At any time, a committee may consider changes to its Terms of Reference and recommend the proposed changes to the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee, through to the Board for review and approval.

3. MEMBERSHIP AND MEMBERSHIP TERMS
   Member Municipality Representation on committees and task forces shall be established by approved Terms of Reference for each committee or task force.

4. APPOINTMENT AND TERM OF THE CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR
   Upon establishing a committee or task force, the committee or task force membership will appoint the Chair for each committee and task force. For committees, at the end of a two year period, once the membership has been reset, the committee may choose to elect its Chair and Vice-Chair.

5. EX-OFFICIO
   a. The Board Chair will be considered non-voting ex-officio in all meeting groups with the exception of the Board and Advocacy and Monitoring Committee.
b. The CRB CEO will be considered non-voting in all meetings.

6. DECISION MAKING
   a. Decisions, recommendations, and actions determined by each committee/task force will be driven by
      the desired outcome to do what is in the best interest of the Capital Region. Only elected officials that
      are designated as voting members of a committee or task force, or their designated alternate, may
      vote. Each member will have one vote.
   b. All motions must be moved by a voting member. Motions require a simple majority of members in
      attendance to pass a motion (50 percent plus one).

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

8. DISPUTE RESOLUTION
   The committee and task force Chairs are 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 applicable standing committee or Board for discussion and resolution.

9. SUPPORT/RESOURCES
   Committees and task forces will be supported by the Chief Executive Officer, Capital Region Board staff
   and consultant resources, and others as determined by its mandate and the Board’s approved business
   plan and budget. The Chief Executive Officer may establish an administrative working or advisory group as
   deemed necessary to support a committee or task force project.

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

11. STATUS OF MEETINGS
   a. Committee and task force 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. Committees and task forces may invite individuals from the province, industry,
      the general public or other Board, committee, task force members to participate in specific agenda
      items. Matters emerging and voted on from committees and task forces will become a matter of
      public record.
   b. 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.
   c. All members (elected and administrative) attending the in camera session shall respect the
      confidentiality of the in camera items.
12. REPORTING

Committees and task forces are expected to provide the Board, through established communication channels and schedules, advice, descriptions and recommendations to resolve existing issues, status and progress as it relates to its mandate and expected deliverables.

a. All CRB meeting agendas, minutes, reports, briefings and supporting documentation will be provided in an electronic format.
b. In general, CRB meeting agendas and pre-read materials, where available, will be provided at least one week in advance of a scheduled meeting.
c. All committees and task forces will include their meeting minutes with the next Board meeting agenda package.

---

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 16, 2015</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provision regarding chair positions being occupied by municipally appointed Board Member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8, 2016</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarify CAO ability to vote, typos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 2016</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td></td>
<td>Removal of provision regarding chair positions being occupied by municipally appointed Board Member, as per GPFs request.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE
This policy clarifies the role and responsibilities of committee and task force chairs and vice-chairs.

POLICY
The role of committee and task force chairs and vice-chairs are to oversee the efforts of the committee or task force enabling progress in its mandate through effective planning, member collaboration, productive meetings, and reporting.

GUIDELINES
1. MEETING PROCEDURES
   The Chair is responsible for:
   a. Having a working knowledge of the CRB Regulation & other provincial obligations, Growth Plan, Board policies, and Board business and strategic plans; and
   b. Applying Policy G005, Meeting Procedures and Policy G013, Committee and Task Force Meeting Procedures.

2. AGENDA SETTING
   With the assistance of the CEO and the assigned CRB Project Manager, the Chair is responsible for setting each meeting agenda, reviewing and approving the agenda package, and ensuring that the agenda and work undertaken by the committee/task force remains consistent to its mandate as set by the Board.
   
   In setting the agenda, the Chair is responsible for assessing the timing and expected outcomes of the agenda and determining if a meeting should be rescheduled or cancelled.

   As a general rule, the Chair will work with CRB administration to finalize and issue the meeting agenda and supporting documentation to its members one week prior to each scheduled meeting.

3. REPORTING
   The Chair is responsible for ensuring that the committee/task force reporting is timely, consistent and transparent to the Board and its members. In doing so, the following tasks are included:
   a) Ensuring that meeting minutes are reviewed and included in the next scheduled Board meeting package;
   b) Ensuring committee/task force deliverables are reviewed and issued to the Board one week prior of a scheduled meeting; and
   c) Providing verbal updates to the Board as requested.
4. **VICE-CHAIR**

In instances where the Chair rescinds his/her role during a meeting (refer to Policy G005) or at any other time, the Vice-Chair is authorized to perform the responsibilities and have the authority of the Chair.

---

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PURPOSE

This policy clarifies the role and responsibilities of committee and task force chairs and vice-chairs.

POLICY

The role of committee and task force chairs and vice-chairs are to oversee the efforts of the committee or task force enabling progress in its mandate through effective planning, member collaboration, productive meetings, and reporting.

GUIDELINES

1. MEETING PROCEDURES

   The Chair is responsible for:
   a. Having a working knowledge of the CRB Regulation & other provincial obligations, Growth Plan, Board policies, and Board business and strategic plans; and
   b. Applying Policy G005, Meeting Procedures and Policy G013, Committee and Task Force Meeting Procedures.

2. AGENDA SETTING

   With the assistance of the CEO and the assigned CRB Project Manager, the Chair is responsible for setting each meeting agenda, reviewing and approving the agenda package, and ensuring that the agenda and work undertaken by the committee/task force remains consistent to its mandate as set by the Board.

   In setting the agenda, the Chair is responsible for assessing the timing and expected outcomes of the agenda and determining if a meeting should be rescheduled or cancelled.

   As a general rule, the Chair will work with CRB administration to finalize and issue the meeting agenda and supporting documentation to its members one week prior to each scheduled meeting.

3. REPORTING

   The Chair is responsible for ensuring that the committee/task force reporting is timely, consistent and transparent to the Board and its members. In doing so, the following tasks are included:
   a) Ensuring that meeting minutes are reviewed and included in the next scheduled Board meeting package;
   b) Ensuring committee/task force deliverables are reviewed and issued to the Board one week prior of a scheduled meeting; and
   c) Providing verbal updates to the Board as required.
4. **VICE-CHAIR**

In instances where the Chair rescinds his/her role during a meeting (refer to Policy G005) or at any other time, the Vice-Chair is authorized to perform the responsibilities and have the authority of the Chair.

---

**Nolan Crouse, Board Chair**

### Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 8, 2016</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>Typo, updated 3(C) to required vs. requested.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMBER MUNICIPALITY REPRESENTATION ON COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

PURPOSE

To determine municipal membership, Chairs and Vice-Chairs for each of the Board’s committees and task forces.

POLICY

In carrying out its mandate, the Board benefits from the use of committee and project-focused task forces to support implementation and further development of the Growth Plan and to provide informed advice and recommendations to the Board as part of its corporate responsibilities.

GUIDELINES

At a regularly scheduled or special meeting of the Board, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Board Chair will administer the selection processes, with the assistance of the Chief Executive Officer (CEO).

Part A - Standing Committee Municipal Membership Selection

For each standing committee, municipal membership will be determined by approved Terms of Reference for each committee and Policy G012 Committee and Task Force Terms of Reference.

1. Board members from each municipality type (cities, towns, counties, and villages, or defined sub region as with the Housing Committee) will form separate groups. Within each group, each municipality will have an opportunity to identify their preference and interest in participating in one or more of the standing committees.

2. In the circumstance where there are no municipal candidates for a particular type of municipality grouping determined for a specific committee, then no vote will occur and that seat will remain vacant until the next membership selection process takes place.

3. Once municipal candidates for each committee have been determined, then the Board Chair and/or CEO will facilitate a silent secret ballot if necessary for each committee:
   a. Each member will have one vote for each committee.
   b. The municipality with the most votes for a specific committee will be deemed the representative.
   c. For committees that allow for more than one representative position, then the municipality with the second and, if applicable, third highest votes will be deemed the representative(s).
   d. In cases where there is a tie (same number of votes) then a “run off” process will be used to determine the municipal representatives for that committee:
      i. A tie of two (2) or more members with the most votes will result in either:
         I. For cases where the number of tied candidates equal the positions available, then all are to be deemed successfully elected; or
II. For cases where there are more tied candidates than positions available, then a second ballot may be conducted or the names of these candidates will be drawn until all vacant positions have been filled.

Part B - Task Force Municipal Membership Selection

For each task force established by the Board, municipal membership will be determined by approved Terms of Reference for each, and Policy G012 Committee and Task Force Terms of Reference. As task forces are designed to be focused on a particular outcome through the completion of a specific project, the selection process may not occur at the same time as the selection process for the standing committees but rather at a time that meets the requirements of the project.

In considering municipal representation for membership positions, the Board will consider those municipalities that can add expertise and value to the quality and outcome for a specific project and/or may be more impacted by the project outcomes than other municipalities. As a result, ensuring representation from each municipality type (city, town, county, and village) may not be the best use of Board and member resources. Member municipality representation is limited to a maximum of one representative for each Task Force but may, at the will of the Board, participate in multiple task forces if it is deemed to be in the best interest of the task forces.

Municipal membership will remain consistent for the term of the project unless otherwise determined by the Board.

1. For those projects that are deemed by the Board to require a task force, the Board will seek a recommendation from the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee as to the optimal task force membership including funding requirements. In situations where all municipalities can contribute equally and are impacted equally, then the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee will consider the recommendation of one member from each municipality type (city, town, county and village) plus one.

2. For task force positions that will consist of specific municipality type(s), the same voting process outlined in Part A of this policy will be facilitated by either the Board Chair or CEO.

3. For task force positions that will be determined based on specific criteria (expertise, impact, etc.), then those municipalities who wish to be considered for the task force will be asked to identify themselves for Board consideration and vote.

4. The CEO will facilitate a silent-secret ballot for each task force:
   a. Each Board member will have one vote
   b. The top five candidates with the most votes will be deemed to be on the task force
   c. In cases where there is a tie (same number of votes) then a “run off” process will be used to determine the municipal representatives for the task force:
   d. A tie of two or more members with the most votes will result in either:
      i. For cases where the number of tied candidates equal the positions available, then all are to be deemed successfully elected; or
      ii. For cases where there are more tied candidates than positions available, then a second ballot may be conducted or the names of these candidates will be drawn until all vacant positions have been filled.
Part C - Selection of Chairs and Vice-Chairs for Committee and Task Forces

Each committee and task force will be led by a Chair and supported by a Vice-Chair. These positions are appointed to a specific person who has already been deemed a member of the committee or task force in question. For continuing committee and task force, Chairs and Vice-Chairs will be reviewed and refreshed every two (2) years: after each municipal election and at the two (2) year point into the four (4) year term.

1. Following each municipal election and after the determination of municipal membership representatives for a committee and/or task force, the committee or task force memberships will appoint their Chair and Vice-Chair.
2. At the mid-term point of two (2) years and after the membership has been reviewed and updated, the membership may elect both the Chair and Vice-Chair to serve the remaining two years of the term unless the Board agrees to extend the term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
PURPOSE

To determine municipal membership, Chairs and Vice-Chairs for each of the Board’s committees and task forces.

POLICY

In carrying out its mandate, the Board benefits from the use of committee and project-focused task forces to support implementation and further development of the Growth Plan and to provide informed advice and recommendations to the Board as part of its corporate responsibilities.

GUIDELINES

At a regularly scheduled or special meeting of the Board, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) will administer the selection processes.

Part A - Standing Committee Municipal Membership Selection

For each standing committee, municipal membership will be determined by approved Terms of Reference for each committee and Policy G012 Committee and Task Force Terms of Reference.

1. Board members from each municipality type (cities, towns, counties, and villages, or defined sub region as with the Housing Committee) will form separate groups. Within each group, each municipality will have an opportunity to identify their preference and interest in participating in one or more of the standing committees.

2. In the circumstance where there are no municipal candidates for a particular type of municipality grouping determined for a specific committee, then no vote will occur and that seat will remain vacant until the next membership selection process takes place.

3. Once municipal candidates for each committee have been determined, then the CEO will facilitate a secret ballot if necessary for each committee:
   a. Each member will have one vote for each committee.
   b. The municipality with the most votes for a specific committee will be deemed the representative.
   c. For committees that allow for more than one representative position, then the municipality with the second and, if applicable, third highest votes will be deemed the representative(s).
   d. In cases where there is a tie (same number of votes) then a “run off” process will be used to determine the municipal representatives for that committee:
      i. A tie of two (2) or more members with the most votes will result in either:
         I. For cases where the number of tied candidates equal the positions available, then all are to be deemed successfully elected; or
II. For cases where there are more tied candidates than positions available, then a second ballot may be conducted or the names of these candidates will be drawn until all vacant positions have been filled.

Part B - Task Force Municipal Membership Selection

For each task force established by the Board, municipal membership will be determined by approved Terms of Reference for each task force and Policy G012 Committee and Task Force Terms of Reference. As task forces are designed to be focused on a particular outcome through the completion of a specific project, the selection process may not occur at the same time as the selection process for the standing committees but rather at a time that meets the requirements of the project.

In considering municipal representation for membership positions, the Board will consider those municipalities that can add expertise and value to the quality and outcome for a specific project and/or may be more impacted by the project outcomes than other municipalities. As a result, ensuring representation from each municipality type (city, town, county, and village) may not be the best use of Board and member resources. Member municipality representation is limited to a maximum of one representative for each Task Force but may, at the will of the Board, participate in multiple task forces if it is deemed to be in the best interest of the task forces.

Municipal membership will remain consistent for the term of the project unless otherwise determined by the Board.

1. For those projects that are deemed by the Board to require a task force, the Board will seek a recommendation from the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee as to the optimal task force membership including funding requirements. In situations where all municipalities can contribute equally and are impacted equally, then the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee will consider the recommendation of one member from each municipality type (city, town, county and village) plus one.

2. For task force positions that will consist of specific municipality type(s), the same voting process outlined in Part A of this policy will be facilitated by either the Board Chair or CEO.

3. For task force positions that will be determined based on specific criteria (expertise, impact, etc.), then those municipalities who wish to be considered for the task force will be asked to identify themselves for Board consideration and vote.

4. The CEO will facilitate a secret ballot for each task force:
   a. Each Board member will have one vote
   b. The top five candidates with the most votes will be deemed to be on the task force
   c. In cases where there is a tie (same number of votes) then a “run off” process will be used to determine the municipal representatives for the task force:
      i. For cases where the number of tied candidates equal the positions available, then all are to be deemed successfully elected; or
      ii. For cases where there are more tied candidates than positions available, then a second ballot may be conducted or the names of these candidates will be drawn until all vacant positions have been filled.
Part C - Selection of Chairs and Vice-Chairs for Committee and Task Forces

Each committee and task force will be led by a Chair and supported by a Vice-Chair. These positions are appointed to a specific person who has already been deemed a member of the committee or task force in question. For continuing committee and task force, Chairs and Vice-Chairs will be reviewed and refreshed every two (2) years: after each municipal election and at the two (2) year point into the four (4) year term.

1. Following each municipal election and after the determination of municipal membership representatives for a committee and/or task force, the committee or task force memberships will appoint their Chair and Vice-Chair.

2. At the mid-term point of two (2) years and after the membership has been reviewed and updated, the membership may elect both the Chair and Vice-Chair to serve the remaining two years of the term unless the Board agrees to extend the term.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

<table>
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<th>Revisions</th>
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<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 18, 2015</td>
<td>Revised</td>
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</tr>
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<td>February 8, 2016</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>Removed Board Chair from administering the selection process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE

This policy provides the basis of the Board’s monitoring and evaluation framework.

POLICY

The Board is expected to establish a clear sense of direction and monitor and evaluate its performance on a regular basis. In doing so, the Board can be proactive in addressing any shortfalls or unexpected results as well as recognize the progress it has made.

GUIDELINES

The Board will commit to the development and implementation of a monitoring and reporting framework to measure the Board’s performance and success in achieving its goals and targets as set out in the CRB Growth Plan and its strategic and business plans.

1. STRATEGIC AND BUSINESS PLANNING
   The Board will develop a strategic plan that mirrors the length of the municipal election term and a rolling four year business plan that is updated annually. Refer to Policy G006 Budgeting for further reference to the business plan.

2. SCOPE
   The Board will develop and maintain a monitoring and evaluation program that addresses, at minimum, the Board’s:
   a. Compliance to the Regulation, Board-approved policies and any legal constraints placed on the CRB by the Province of Alberta;
   b. Effectiveness of the Board’s performance against reasonable or available standards; and
   c. Oversight of the monitoring and evaluation of the Board’s performance activities.

3. PERFORMANCE-ADVOCACY AND MONITORING COMMITTEE
   To further develop this framework and to ensure due attention, the Board has established an Advocacy and Monitoring - Performance Monitoring Committee under its oversight with the mandate to:
   a. Monitor and report on the Board’s progress as set out in its approved business, strategic and Growth plans;
   b. Identify risks and issues that may be inhibiting the Board’s progress and propose solutions;
   c. Identify emerging issues and opportunities to the Board; and
   d. Identify where changes are needed or enhancements can be applied to further reinforce the progress of the Board’s collective efforts; and
d.e. Monitor KPIs and report regularly to the Board.
## Revisions

<table>
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Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
PURPOSE

This policy provides the basis of the Board’s monitoring and evaluation framework.

POLICY

The Board is expected to establish a clear sense of direction and monitor and evaluate its performance on a regular basis. In doing so, the Board can be proactive in addressing any shortfalls or unexpected results as well as recognize the progress it has made.

GUIDELINES

The Board will commit to the development and implementation of a monitoring and reporting framework to measure the Board’s performance and success in achieving its goals and targets as set out in the CRB Growth Plan and its strategic and business plans.

1. STRATEGIC AND BUSINESS PLANNING
   The Board will develop a strategic plan that mirrors the length of the municipal election term and a rolling four year business plan that is updated annually. Refer to Policy G006 Budgeting for further reference to the business plan.

2. SCOPE
   The Board will develop and maintain a monitoring and evaluation program that addresses, at minimum, the Board’s:
   a. Compliance to the Regulation, Board-approved policies and any legal constraints placed on the CRB by the Province of Alberta;
   b. Effectiveness of the Board’s performance against reasonable or available standards; and
   c. Oversight of the monitoring and evaluation of the Board’s performance activities.

3. ADVOCACY AND MONITORING COMMITTEE
   To further develop this framework and to ensure due attention, the Board has established an Advocacy and Monitoring Committee under its oversight with the mandate to:
   a. Monitor and report on the Board’s progress as set out in its approved business, strategic and Growth plans;
   b. Identify risks and issues that may be inhibiting the Board’s progress and propose solutions;
   c. Identify emerging issues and opportunities to the Board;
   d. Identify where changes are needed or enhancements can be applied to further reinforce the progress of the Board’s collective efforts; and
   e. Monitor KPIs and report regularly to the Board.
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PURPOSE

To define the role of the Capital Region Geographic Information Services (CRGIS).

POLICY

The Capital Region Board (CRB) shall develop and maintain a shared regional Geographic Information System, and related services, that provides equitable access to members and promotes informed regional decision-making as directed in Appendix 4: CRGIS Strategy and Implementation Plan of the Growing Forward Capital Region Growth Plan.

GUIDELINES

1. CRGIS encompasses both a Geographic Information System (GIS) and related services that the CRB provides to member municipalities.

2. CRGIS shall act as a centralized hub of regional spatial data and provide complementary services to member GIS systems and services. CRGIS is not intended to replace existing or future GIS systems or services provided by members to their communities.

3. CRGIS will focus on the collection, assembly and maintenance of regional data and information used in spatial analytics and data visualization that support regional decision-making and initiatives by the CRB. Where resources permit, CRGIS will also provide related GIS support services to members, such as GIS education and capacity development services, advisory and consultation services, analysis and mapping, etc.

4. CRGIS shall facilitate access, sharing and analysis of regional datasets to member municipalities and the public where appropriate.

5. The CRB shall ensure that delivery of CRGIS is cost effective and balances the needs of individual municipal members with the needs of the CRB, as a whole.

6. The CRB shall ensure that the CRGIS can be readily accessed while also ensuring that appropriate security is in place to protect information when necessary.

7. Member municipalities shall respond to all CRB administration or member municipality requests for data related to the CRGIS Strategy and Implementation Plan and/or Capital Region Growth Plan.

8. Original data creators/owners will retain complete ownership and authority over their data.

9. The CRB shall develop and maintain processes and guidelines for data submissions and updates from data owners as well as ad hoc data request procedures.
10. CRB believes in shall adopt an open data structure where appropriate and only share licensed or restricted data with the full consent of the data owner.

10.11. CRGIS shall support Capital Region Board regional initiatives.

PRINCIPLES

This policy will be realized through the guiding principles defined in the CRGIS Strategy and Implementation Plan:

1. Autonomy – All municipal members will respect the self determinations of other municipalities and their control over land use planning and data within the context of the regional plan.

2. Collaboration – All municipal members will work together to support the planning efforts of the region including free sharing of relevant non-confidential data sets.

3. Equity – All municipal members will be treated in a way that is equitable, consistent and congruent and to ensure the benefits of CRGIS are available to all municipal members.

4. Flexibility – All municipal members will be expected to identify options that work best for themselves while also fitting in with the needs of the region including data standards and technology platforms.

5. Mutuality – Working together in the region will be the key to achieving a consistent level of data quality and data access to any of the member municipalities.

6. Sustainability – All municipal members will seek decisions which encourage sustainable data acquisition and maintenance practices.

7. Transparency – The results of decision making processes in relation to spatial data and technology platforms that relate to the regional plan will be transparent to the stakeholders.

8. Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
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To define the role of the Capital Region Geographic Information Services (CRGIS).

POLICY
The Capital Region Board (CRB) shall develop and maintain a shared regional Geographic Information System, and related services, that provides equitable access to members and promotes informed regional decision-making as directed in Appendix 4: CRGIS Strategy and Implementation Plan of the Growing Forward Capital Region Growth Plan.

GUIDELINES
1. CRGIS encompasses both a Geographic Information System (GIS) and related services that the CRB provides to member municipalities.

2. CRGIS shall act as a centralized hub of regional spatial data and provide complementary services to member GIS systems and services. CRGIS is not intended to replace existing or future GIS systems or services provided by members to their communities.

3. CRGIS will focus on the collection, assembly and maintenance of regional data and information used in spatial analytics and data visualization that support regional decision-making and initiatives by the CRB. Where resources permit, CRGIS will also provide related GIS support to members, such as GIS education and capacity development, advisory and consultation services, analysis and mapping, etc.

4. CRGIS shall facilitate access, sharing and analysis of regional datasets to member municipalities and the public where appropriate.

5. The CRB shall ensure that delivery of CRGIS is cost effective and balances the needs of individual municipal members with the needs of the CRB, as a whole.

6. The CRB shall ensure that the CRGIS can be readily accessed while also ensuring that appropriate security is in place to protect information when necessary.

7. Member municipalities shall respond to all CRB administration or member municipality requests for data related to the CRGIS Strategy and Implementation Plan and/or Capital Region Growth Plan.

8. Original data creators/owners will retain complete ownership and authority over their data.

9. The CRB shall develop and maintain processes and guidelines for data submissions and updates from data owners as well as ad hoc data request procedures.

10. CRB believes in an open data structure where appropriate and only share licensed or restricted data with the full consent of the data owner.
11. CRGIS shall support Capital Region Board regional initiatives.

PRINCIPLES

This policy will be realized through the guiding principles defined in the CRGIS Strategy and Implementation Plan:

1. Autonomy – All municipal members will respect the self determinations of other municipalities and their control over land use planning and data within the context of the regional plan.

2. Collaboration – All municipal members will work together to support the planning efforts of the region including free sharing of relevant non-confidential data sets.

3. Equity – All municipal members will be treated in a way that is equitable, consistent and congruent and to ensure the benefits of CRGIS are available to all municipal members.

4. Flexibility – All municipal members will be expected to identify options that work best for themselves while also fitting in with the needs of the region including data standards and technology platforms.

5. Mutuality – Working together in the region will be the key to achieving a consistent level of data quality and data access to any of the member municipalities.

6. Sustainability – All municipal members will seek decisions which encourage sustainable data acquisition and maintenance practices.

7. Transparency – The results of decision making processes in relation to spatial data and technology platforms that relate to the regional plan will be transparent to the stakeholders.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Revised Terms of Reference

Recommended Motion

*That the Capital Region Board approve the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee Terms of Reference as amended and recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.*

And

*That the Capital Region Board approve the Transit Committee Terms of Reference as amended and recommended by the Transit Committee.*

Background Governance, Priorities and Finance Committee

- On May 8, 2014, the Capital Region Board approved the Governance, Priorities and Finance Committee Terms of Reference (TOR).

- The approved 2016 meeting schedule impacts the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee TOR by not conforming to the meet-times specified in the TOR. The TOR has been updated to accommodate and reflect the adjusted meeting schedule.

- Included a line regarding committee specific budget items.

- On February 25, 2016 The Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee recommended the TOR to the CRB for approval.

Background Transit Committee

- On October 9, 2014, the Capital Region Board approved the Transit Committee Terms of Reference (TOR).

- On January 28, 2016, the Transit Committee reviewed its Terms of Reference. It was noted by CRB Administration that the Leadership section of the TOR lacked the biennial review of the chair and vice chair of the committee, a requirement found in all other committees of the Board. The Committee requested CRB Administration add a clause to the TOR to be consistent with the other committees.

- On March 24, 2016 The Transit Committee recommended the TOR to the CRB for approval.

Attachments:

1. Revised Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee Terms of Reference
2. Revised Transit Committee Terms of Reference
GOVERNANCE, PRIORITIES & FINANCE COMMITTEE
TERMS OF REFERENCE
REVISED BY BOARD MAY 8, 2014 APRIL 14, 2016

BACKGROUND
This committee provides the best collective and strategic advice to the Board in matters pertaining to Board governance, Board priorities, and Board finances. In doing so, the committee would be expected to consult with Board members and leverage expertise from administration to provide the Board with timely advice related to the Board’s strategic agenda and the need for, and mandate of, proposed task forces.

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

Business and Budget Planning
- On an annual basis, recommend a rolling four year business plan and budget for the committee and its task forces for consideration in the Board’s annual business plan update
- Facilitate processes to develop a four year strategic plan, establish annual regional priorities, and develop the rolling four year business plan and budget
- Recommend a four year rolling business plan and budget to the Board based on the Board’s strategic plan and input received from its members and standing committees
- Recommend the establishment of task forces to the Board as deemed necessary to fulfill the Board’s business plan

Monitoring and Audit
- Monitor and review the annual audit, and report to the Board regarding financial performance on a regular basis
- Facilitate the development of the Annual Report and other reporting requirements of the legislative/regulatory framework
- Meet with the Auditor independent of the administration at minimum on an annual basis

Policy Advice
- Recommend new/revised policies that will guide the CRB
- Assess current policies on a regular basis
- Recommend that the Board establish specific task forces that enable the CRB to get its business done, based in part on the advice received from the other standing committees
- 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 and task force meeting procedures as deemed necessary and timely
- Support committees/task forces in fulfilling their mandates

Succession Planning
- Advice relative to the timing and process of selection of the Board Chair and Chief Executive Officer
MEMBERSHIP
This committee will consist of 10 members: Edmonton, two Cities, three Counties, three Towns and one Village as determined by the Board or as approved by the Board. Membership will be reviewed by the Board every two years.

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

At the end of a two year period, once if the committee membership has been reviewed by the Board, the committee will also review and select its Chair and Vice-Chair.

SUPPORT/RESOURCES
The CEO will support this committee drawing upon CRB administration as required.

The committees is supported by the Chief Executive Officer, Capital Region Board administration and consultant resources, and others as determined by its mandate and the Board’s approved business plan and budget. The Chief Executive Officer may establish an administrative working or advisory group as deemed necessary to support a committee project.

MEETING FREQUENCY
This committee shall meet bi-monthly six times per year or at the call of the Chair as warranted.

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

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

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

DECISION-MAKING
Decisions, recommendations and actions determined by this committee will be driven by the desired outcome to do what is in the best interest of the Capital Region. Only elected officials that are designated as voting members of the committee, or their designated alternate, may vote. Each member will have one vote.
All motions must be moved by a voting member. Motions require a majority of members in attendance to pass (50 percent plus one).

**QUORUM**

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

**DISPUTE RESOLUTION**

The committee Chair(s) 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 applicable standing committee or Board for discussion and resolution.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

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

**STATUS OF MEETINGS**

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

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

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

**REPORTING**

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

**MEETING AGENDAS AND MINUTES**

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

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

The committee will include its meeting minutes with the next Board meeting agenda package.
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 9, 2016</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Clarified meeting frequency,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 2016</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Fixed typos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BACKGROUND

This committee provides the best collective and strategic advice to the Board in matters pertaining to Board governance, Board priorities, and Board finances. In doing so, the committee would be expected to consult with Board members and leverage expertise from administration to provide the Board with timely advice related to the Board’s strategic agenda and the need for, and mandate of, proposed task forces.

MANDATE

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

Business and Budget Planning

- On an annual basis, recommend a rolling four year business plan and budget for the committee and its task forces for consideration in the Board’s annual business plan update
- Facilitate processes to develop a four year strategic plan, establish annual regional priorities, and develop the rolling four year business plan and budget
- Recommend a four year rolling business plan and budget to the Board based on the Board’s strategic plan and input received from its members and standing committees
- Recommend the establishment of task forces to the Board as deemed necessary to fulfill the Board’s business plan

Monitoring and Audit

- Monitor and review the annual audit, and report to the Board regarding financial performance on a regular basis
- Facilitate the development of the Annual Report and other reporting requirements of the legislative/regulatory framework
- Meet with the Auditor independent of the administration at minimum on an annual basis

Policy Advice

- Recommend new/revised policies that will guide the CRB
- Assess current policies on a regular basis
- Recommend that the Board establish specific task forces that enable the CRB to get its business done, based in part on the advice received from the other standing committees
- 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 and task force meeting procedures as deemed necessary and timely
- Support committees/task forces in fulfilling their mandates

Succession Planning

- Advice relative to the timing and process of selection of the Board Chair and Chief Executive Officer
MEMBERSHIP
This committee will consist of 10 members: Edmonton, two Cities, three Counties, three Towns and one Village as determined by the Board or as approved by the Board. Membership will be reviewed by the Board every two years.

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

At the end of a two year period, if the committee membership has been reviewed by the Board, the committee will also review and select its Chair and Vice-Chair.

SUPPORT/RESOURCES
The CEO will support this committee drawing upon CRB administration as required.

The committees is supported by the Chief Executive Officer, Capital Region Board administration and consultant resources, and others as determined by its mandate and the Board’s approved business plan and budget. The Chief Executive Officer may establish an administrative working or advisory group as deemed necessary to support a committee project.

MEETING FREQUENCY
This committee shall be scheduled to meet six times per year or at the call of the Chair as warranted.

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

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

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

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

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

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

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

The committee Chairs 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 applicable standing committee or Board for discussion and resolution.

COMMUNICATIONS

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

STATUS OF MEETINGS

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

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

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

REPORTING

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

MEETING AGendas AND MINutes

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

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

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

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
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BACKGROUND

This committee provides leadership and strategic oversight of regional transit projects to support the implementation of the Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan.

MANDATE

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

- To provide strategic advice about the future direction of Intermunicipal transit service that will enable the CRB to achieve its economic, social and environmental objectives, advocating for transit as a convenient and competitive mode of transportation.
- To provide leadership in the planning and implementation of Intermunicipal transit service to support the mobility needs of residents and visitors to the Region.
- To ensure the region’s transit plans are integrated with the Land Use and Transportation Infrastructure Plans for the region.
- To ensure transit plans are incorporated into regional highway plans to allow for alternate modes of transportation for the efficient movement of people throughout the region.
- To ensure policies are developed to support Transit Oriented Development in the region.
- To provide strategic oversight for the implementation and delivery of regional intermunicipal transit services through various studies, projects, policy frameworks and measurement tools that support effective management of public transit, including special transit services for persons with disabilities.

MEMBERSHIP

Membership for this committee requires the participation and expertise of the existing transit operators in the region and those who currently contract with the existing operators. It will consist of seven members: Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, City of Leduc, St. Albert, Spruce Grove, Strathcona County and Sturgeon County. Membership will be reviewed by the Board, every two years.

LEADERSHIP

At its first meeting, the committee will select its Chair and Vice-Chair from amongst its membership. If there is a change in the committee’s membership, the committee should review and select its Chair and Vice-Chair. At the end of a two year period, once the committee membership has been reviewed by the Board, the committee will also review and select its Chair and Vice-Chair.

SUPPORT/RESOURCES

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

**MEETING FREQUENCY**

It is proposed that this committee meet bi-monthly or at the call of the Chair as warranted.

**AUTHORITY**

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

**EX-OFFICIO**

The Board Chair will be considered non-voting ex-officio member of this committee.

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

**DECISION-MAKING**

Decisions, recommendations and actions determined by the committee will be driven by the desired outcome to do what is in the best interest of the Capital Region. Only elected officials that are designated as voting members of the committee, or their designated alternate, may vote. Each member will have one vote. All motions must be moved by a voting member. Motions require a majority of members in attendance to pass (50 percent plus one).

The approved Governance Model for Transit requires a majority vote (four of seven) including unanimous support of the three transit operators (Edmonton, St. Albert, and Strathcona County) on matters pertaining to conventional transit.

**QUORUM**

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

**DISPUTE RESOLUTION**

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

**COMMUNICATIONS**

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

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

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

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

REPORTING

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

MEETING AGENDAS AND MINUTES

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

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

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

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
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BACKGROUND

This committee provides leadership and strategic oversight of regional transit projects to support the implementation of the Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan.

MANDATE

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

- To provide strategic advice about the future direction of Intermunicipal transit service that will enable the CRB to achieve its economic, social and environmental objectives, advocating for transit as a convenient and competitive mode of transportation.
- To provide leadership in the planning and implementation of Intermunicipal transit service to support the mobility needs of residents and visitors to the Region.
- To ensure the region’s transit plans are integrated with the Land Use and Transportation Infrastructure Plans for the region.
- To ensure transit plans are incorporated into regional highway plans to allow for alternate modes of transportation for the efficient movement of people throughout the region.
- To ensure policies are developed to support Transit Oriented Development in the region.
- To provide strategic oversight for the implementation and delivery of regional intermunicipal transit services through various studies, projects, policy frameworks and measurement tools that support effective management of public transit, including special transit services for persons with disabilities.

MEMBERSHIP

Membership for this committee requires the participation and expertise of the existing transit operators in the region and those who currently contract with the existing operators. It will consist of seven members: Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, City of Leduc, St. Albert, Spruce Grove, Strathcona County and Sturgeon County. Membership will be reviewed by the Board, every two years.

LEADERSHIP

At its first meeting, the committee will select its Chair and Vice-Chair from amongst its membership. If there is a change in the committee’s membership, the committee should review and select its Chair and Vice-Chair. At the end of a two year period, once the committee membership has been reviewed by the Board, the committee will also review and select its Chair and Vice-Chair.
SUPPORT/RESOURCES

The CEO will support this committee, drawing upon CRB administration as required.

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

MEETING FREQUENCY

It is proposed that this committee meet bi-monthly or at the call of the Chair as warranted.

AUTHORITY

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

EX-OFFICIO

The Board Chair will be considered non-voting ex-officio member of this committee.

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

DECISION-MAKING

Decisions, recommendations and actions determined by the committee will be driven by the desired outcome to do what is in the best interest of the Capital Region. Only elected officials that are designated as voting members of the committee, or their designated alternate, may vote. Each member will have one vote. All motions must be moved by a voting member. Motions require a majority of members in attendance to pass (50 percent plus one).

The approved Governance Model for Transit requires a majority vote (four of seven) including unanimous support of the three transit operators (Edmonton, St. Albert, and Strathcona County) on matters pertaining to conventional transit.

QUORUM

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

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

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

COMMUNICATIONS

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

**STATUS OF MEETINGS**

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

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

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

**REPORTING**

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

**MEETING AGENDAS AND MINUTES**

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

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

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

---

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
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Board Mandate Discussion Results & Decision - Commissions

Board Motion previously referred to Administration:

1) That Capital Region Board write to the Province asking to list the planning and co-ordination (but not operation) of water under section 12(1)(a) of the current mandate, as recommended by the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee.

2) That Capital Region Board write to the Province asking to list the planning and co-ordination (but not operation) of wastewater under section 12(1)(a) of the current mandate, as recommended by the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee.

3) That Capital Region Board write to the Province asking to list the planning and co-ordination (but not operation) of solid waste under section 12(1)(a) of the current mandate, as recommended by the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee.

Feedback Summary

- The Water and Wastewater commissions that offered responses generally believe they have delivery corridors mapped for the length of the Growth Plan. They feel there is enough current and future planning to accommodate the forecasted growth and thus some are willing to share information. Most do not see a role for the Capital Region Board.
- One solid waste commission responded – it indicated there was merit in looking at solid waste solutions regionally.

Rationale

At the February 11, 2016 Board meeting the following motion was brought forward to the Board by the Advocacy and Monitoring Committee.

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

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

At the Board meeting:

- part one of the motion passed
- part two of the motion was tabled until April, allowing CRB administration to consult with regional commissions – see Follow-up report, below
part three come back before the Board at the March Board meeting. An alternate motion was put forward and passed. The alternate motion is as follows.

3) That the CRB recognizes the need for regional economic development and wishes to work further with the Province as the CRB incubates a separate institution.

Follow-up Part 2: Consultation with Commissions

Letters were sent to each water, wastewater, and solid waste commission on which Capital Region Board member municipalities sit as representatives. Responses varied and are summarized in the attached spreadsheet.

Although the Town of Devon, Village of Thorsby, and Village of Warburg are not currently part of a Water Services Commission, the question was also put to them in the event that they may join a commission in the future.

Background

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

- November 12, 2015 - The Board passed the following motion:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Assumptions

- Any new mandate area for CRB will come with new provincial funding. The areas CRB has chosen to discuss are:
  - Mandate to plan for water
  - Mandate to plan for wastewater
  - Mandate to plan for solid waste

Attachments:

1) Summary of Feedback collected.

Correspondence from:

2) Capital Region Board to commissions requesting feedback (sample)
3) Alberta Capital Region Wastewater Commission
4) Capital Region Northeast Water Services Commission
5) Capital Region Parkland Water Commission
6) EPCOR Water Canada
7) Roseridge Waste Management Services Commission
There is little value to have the CRB involved in the planning of our wastewater system. The CRPWSC is currently undertaking the detailed design of the twinning project that will service its members for the next 30 to 40 years. Although the detailed design is not yet completed, the twinning alignment will largely remain within current utility corridors. The long term planning is therefore complete near the scope of the CRGP2.0 planning horizon of 50 years.

In conclusion, the CRNWSC has no problem in providing the CRB with their master plan later this year which, in essence, will validate the Commission's existing Right of way will be required to be constructed over the next 25 years. If there is a requirement for increasing capacity for any specific community it would be the Commission's preference to utilize the existing Right of way to the extent of possibly expanding the water supply system. In saying this, we do not currently see the need of adding any additional Right of way for corridor expansion for water within the Capital Region. If there is a need for increasing capacity for any specific community it would be the Commission's preference to utilize the existing Right of way to the extent of possibly expanding the water supply system. In saying this, we do not currently see the need of adding any additional Right of way for corridor expansion for water within the Capital Region.

Our sewer network for all intents and purposes is fixed until another municipality in the CRB approaches the Commission to become a member. Out trunk sewers are secured by rights-of-way and easements and any future expansion will occur within those rights-of-ways.

In planning our wastewater system we not only take into consideration input from members but we also reference the CRB's Growth Plan to ensure we provide adequate service into the future.

We make decisions always considering the value that ratepayers receive for their user fees and for their property tax dollars.

Identifying the importance of strategically selecting landfill locations, and reducing the number of sites required if at all feasible.

We believe there should be considerations to support planning solid waste infrastructure around population growth on a regional level including landfilling. It is the CRNWSC belief that we work cooperatively with EPCOR Water on strengthening the existing water supply line within the City of Edmonton boundaries such that no new water supply lines will be required to be constructed over the next 25 years. If there is a requirement for increasing capacity for any specific community it would be the Commission's preference to utilize the existing Right of way to the extent of possibly expanding the water supply system. In saying this, we do not currently see the need of adding any additional Right of way for corridor expansion for water within the Capital Region.

Identifying the importance of strategically selecting landfill locations, and reducing the number of sites required if at all feasible.

We believe there should be considerations to support planning solid waste infrastructure around population growth on a regional level including landfilling. It is the CRNWSC belief that we work cooperatively with EPCOR Water on strengthening the existing water supply line within the City of Edmonton boundaries such that no new water supply lines will be required to be constructed over the next 25 years. If there is a requirement for increasing capacity for any specific community it would be the Commission's preference to utilize the existing Right of way to the extent of possibly expanding the water supply system. In saying this, we do not currently see the need of adding any additional Right of way for corridor expansion for water within the Capital Region.

In conclusion, the CRNWSC has no problem in providing the CRB with their master plan later this year which, in essence, will validate the Commission's existing Right of way will be required to be constructed over the next 25 years. If there is a requirement for increasing capacity for any specific community it would be the Commission's preference to utilize the existing Right of way to the extent of possibly expanding the water supply system. In saying this, we do not currently see the need of adding any additional Right of way for corridor expansion for water within the Capital Region. If there is a need for increasing capacity for any specific community it would be the Commission's preference to utilize the existing Right of way to the extent of possibly expanding the water supply system. In saying this, we do not currently see the need of adding any additional Right of way for corridor expansion for water within the Capital Region.

In conclusion, the CRNWSC has no problem in providing the CRB with their master plan later this year which, in essence, will validate the Commission's existing Right of way will be required to be constructed over the next 25 years. If there is a requirement for increasing capacity for any specific community it would be the Commission's preference to utilize the existing Right of way to the extent of possibly expanding the water supply system. In saying this, we do not currently see the need of adding any additional Right of way for corridor expansion for water within the Capital Region. If there is a requirement for increasing capacity for any specific community it would be the Commission's preference to utilize the existing Right of way to the extent of possibly expanding the water supply system. In saying this, we do not currently see the need of adding any additional Right of way for corridor expansion for water within the Capital Region.

In conclusion, the CRNWSC has no problem in providing the CRB with their master plan later this year which, in essence, will validate the Commission's existing Right of way will be required to be constructed over the next 25 years. If there is a requirement for increasing capacity for any specific community it would be the Commission's preference to utilize the existing Right of way to the extent of possibly expanding the water supply system. In saying this, we do not currently see the need of adding any additional Right of way for corridor expansion for water within the Capital Region.

The CFPSWSC is currently undertaking the detailed design of the twinning project that will service its members for the next 60 to 40 years. Although the detailed design in not yet completed, the twinning alignment will largely remain within current utility corridors. The long term planning is therefore complete near the scope of the CRGP2.0 planning horizon of 50 years.

In conclusion, the CRNWSC has no problem in providing the CRB with their master plan later this year which, in essence, will validate the Commission's existing Right of way will be required to be constructed over the next 25 years. If there is a requirement for increasing capacity for any specific community it would be the Commission's preference to utilize the existing Right of way to the extent of possibly expanding the water supply system. In saying this, we do not currently see the need of adding any additional Right of way for corridor expansion for water within the Capital Region. If there is a requirement for increasing capacity for any specific community it would be the Commission's preference to utilize the existing Right of way to the extent of possibly expanding the water supply system. In saying this, we do not currently see the need of adding any additional Right of way for corridor expansion for water within the Capital Region.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village of Warburg</th>
<th>Village of Warburg</th>
<th>6-Mar-2016</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPCOR</td>
<td>EPCOR</td>
<td>4-Mar-2015</td>
<td>22-Mar-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historically, EPCOR (then part of the City of Edmonton) has taken direction from "The Edmonton Regional Utility Study" completed in 1978 by the Provincial Government. This study set out the growth options and extensions of the water, wastewater and solid waste management systems for the Regional population of 1 million. A large portion of the infrastructure that has been built over the last 40 years is in alignment with the plans defined at that time. This plan provided certainty for the developers and the communities as to how and where infrastructure could be extended.

The Regional system for water infrastructure resulted in many communities (a map is attached) being served by two large water plants in the City of Edmonton. Under this approach, the region's need for water have been met in a cost effective manner while ensuring water of the highest quality. Centralized plants also reduce the capital requirements for each individual community allowing them to utilize their borrowing capacity for other activities.

The development of a new comprehensive Capital Region Utility study that will serve a population base of over 2 million will provide a framework for orderly development for the future and EPCOR supports this initiative fully.
March 4, 2016

Dear Commission Administrator;

The purpose of this letter is to seek your input into a current discussion about the planning function of the Capital Region Board (CRB) through the Board’s growth plan. Specifically, we are seeking your thoughts regarding the possibility of the CRB potentially incorporating regional level coordination of planning of water, wastewater corridors and solid waste into an update of the growth plan that is now underway.

One of the key outcomes for the Board is to facilitate Regional level planning amongst the 24 member municipalities. This is being achieved through a framework Capital Region Growth Plan (CRGP) that was first published under provincial legislative authority in 2009. Within CRB Regulation it indicates that the CRBP may wish to consider utility corridors under the plan.

Currently the Capital Region Growth Plan:

- Provides an integrated and strategic approach to planning for future growth in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region;
- Identifies the overall development patterns and key future infrastructure investments that would best complement existing infrastructure, services and land uses in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region, and would also maximize benefits to the Region; and,
- Coordinates decisions in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region to sustain economic growth and ensure strong communities and a healthy environment.

In the initial CRGP, energy corridors were the primary focus due to the pressing need for a regional planning perspective for pipelines. However, there is an opportunity to explore other areas from that regional planning context now as we are in the process of updating our Mandate and the CRGP. A key driver of this update is population growth; forecasts out to 2044 indicate another million people moving to the region. That will bring the total population to roughly 2.2 million people.

To this end, at the February 11, 2016 Board meeting the Capital Region Board passed the following motion, note bold highlight:

That the CRB refer this motion to administration “That the CRB ask the Province to list the coordination of planning (but not operation) between the regional water commissions, regional wastewater commissions as well as solid waste under section 12(1)(a) of the current mandate;” until the April Board meeting when consultation can be completed with key stakeholders.
The Board seeks the benefit of your experience in the operation and success of regional commissions, along with any thoughts, concerns, or insight you may have into the CRB incorporating the regional planning of water and wastewater corridors, and solid waste into its Capital Region Growth Plan, now or in future. **We ask that you provide us with a response by March 21, 2016.**

Should you have any questions, please contact me directly at mb Bruce@capitalregionboard.ab.ca or 780-638-6002. On behalf of the CRB, I appreciate your support in this endeavour.

Sincerely,

Malcolm Bruce, Chief Executive Officer
Capital Region Board

Cc. Commissions within the Capital Region Board Boundaries
22 March 2016

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

Dear Malcolm,

Thank you for your letter of March 4, 2016 asking for the Alberta Capital Region Wastewater Commission’s input on the CRB’s mandate as it relates to the coordination of planning of regional water, wastewater and solid waste management services.

From the ACRWC’s perspective, there is limited value to have the CRB involved in the planning of our wastewater system. In addition to a number of limitations that would preclude the CRB’s involvement, there are already sufficient planning mechanisms in place to ensure we provide effective wastewater transmission and treatment in the region beyond the 2044 planning horizon of the Capital Region Growth Plan.

Firstly, the ACRWC’s regulation (Alberta Regulation 129/1985) requires us to provide service as required to our member municipalities. No other agency can influence that part of our mandate. However, in planning our wastewater system we not only take into consideration input from members but we also reference the CRB’s growth plan to ensure we provide adequate service into the future.

Secondly, the wastewater systems in our region are integrated. The ACRWC is party to a Regional Wastewater Exchange Agreement with the City of Edmonton. This agreement obligates both the ACRWC and City of Edmonton to provide service as required to each other to meet the needs of growth in our respective service areas. The agreement also sets out a requirement for joint planning and the ACRWC and City of Edmonton are about to embark on an integrated planning study.

Finally, our sewer network for all intents and purposes is fixed until another municipality in the CRB approaches the Commission to become a member. Our trunk sewers are secured by rights-of-way and easements and any future expansion will occur within those rights-of-ways. From that aspect then, there is no benefit for the CRB to coordinate our corridor requirements.

The ACRWC is committed to sharing our plans and would see benefit in better information sharing at a regional level. As we develop our GIS system, the CRB has been very helpful to ensure that our two systems are integrated.
If you have any questions or would like to discuss any of the above, please call me at (780) 416-9962.

Regards,

Mike Darbyshire, P.Eng.
General Manager

c.c. Brian Latte, City of Edmonton Utility Services
Mr. Malcolm Bruce,
Chief Executive Officer
Capital Region Board
#1100 Bell Tower, 10104 103 Avenue
Edmonton, AB  T5J 0H8

Subject:   Capital Region Board’s Land Use Planning Inquiry with Regional Water and Wastewater Commissions

This is a follow up to your email dated March 10, 2016 seeking input from Capital Region Northeast Water Services Commission (CRNWSC) on a current discussion at the Capital Region Board (CRB). If the CRNWSC understands this inquiry correctly, the CRB is simply investigating the potential of requesting the Alberta Government to include the Planning of Water & Wastewater Corridors within the CRB’s mandate.

To put this request into perspective, the CRNWSC purchases it’s water from EPCOR Water (City of Edmonton owned Utility), the Commission then re-transmits this water to meet the growth requirement of all its member municipalities:

- Town of Gibbons
- Town of Bon Accord
- Town of Red Water
- City of Fort Saskatchewan
- Strathcona County
- Sturgeon County

The CRNWSC also provides water to three other water commissions that are far beyond the CRB mandate:

1. Hwy 28/63 Regional Water Services Commission:
   - County of Thorhild
   - County of Smoky Lake
   - Town of Smoky Lake
   - Villages of Vilna
   - Village of Waskatenau
   - Customers in County of St. Paul – Ashmont & Lottie Lake

2. John S. Batiuk Regional Water Commission:
   - Town of Bruderhiem
   - Town of Lamont
3. Alberta Central East Corporation
   - County of Minburn
   - County of Two Hills
   - County of Vermillion River
   - Town of Two Hills
   - Town of Vermillion
   - Villages Dewberry
   - Village of Innisfree
   - Village of Kitscoty
   - Village of Mannville
   - Village of Marwayne
   - Village of Myrnam
   - Village of Paradise Valley
   - Village of Willington

Please note that over the last decade the expansion of water supply has been driven by the Province under their “Water for Life Strategy”. This strategy has effectively taken water treated by EPCOR Water to Municipalities that far reaches outside the CRB mandate.

The Province’s regionalization of water is generally following a master plan where the transmission of water is within the respective water sheds of the Province. The planning within the North Saskatchewan’s River water shed is for all intents and purposes complete as further expansion would have to cross water shed boundaries which require Ministerial approval from the Province. As a Commission we do not see that happening in this jurisdictional area. The Commission(s) sees their role as transmitting safe and potable water to all their member and customers.

From a land management perspective the Commission has Right of ways (corridor) containing the water supply lines from EPCOR and Strathcona County. It is the CRNWSC belief that we work cooperatively with EPCOR Water on strengthening the existing water supply line within the City of Edmonton boundaries such that no new water supply lines will be required to be constructed over the next 25 years. We do however have the CRNWSC Engineer currently undertaking a master plan update for the Commission such that we can address capital requirements for growth going forward for the next 25 years.

If there is a requirement for increasing capacity for any specific community it would be the Commission’s preference to utilize the existing Right of ways to the extent of possibly twinning the water supply system. In saying this, we do not currently see the need of adding any additional Right of way for corridor expansion for water
within the Capital Region. Once this Master Plan is complete the CRNWSC would have no difficulty in providing a copy of this report to the CRB to demonstrate the current planning is prudent to meet the growth requirements. This Master Plan is scheduled to be completed in 2016.

Please note that the Water Commission’s mandate is not to control or impede any one Communities growth, but instead meet the growth requirements of the Community. As noted the majority of water being re-transmitted goes to municipalities outside of the CRB membership.

In addition, water conservation, the municipality’s fees and charges reflecting the cost of regionalization of water and increased densities have reduced the per capita consumption significantly to the point where the existing water supply lines are meeting population projections far beyond what was initially planned.

In conclusion, the CRNWSC has no problem in providing the CRB with their master plan later this year which, in essence, will validate the Commission’s existing Right of way will not require expansion to meet growth (2044). Please note that a water master plan is only as good as the information provided by the member municipalities, a land use plan will drive the utility servicing (water only being one of the services).

Sincerely,

Lyle Clarke
CRNWSC Manager
March 24, 2016

Mr. Malcolm Bruce, MSM  
Chief Executive Officer  
Capital Region Board  
#1100 Bell Tower, 10104 – 103 Avenue  
Edmonton, Alberta  T5J 0H8

Dear Mr. Bruce:

Re: Capital Region Board Role in Regional Planning of Water Utility Commissions

Thank you for your letter dated March 4, 2016, emailed to the Capital Region Parkland Water Services Commission (CRPWSC) seeking input about the planning function of the Capital Region Board (CRB) through the Capital Region Growth Plan 2.0 (CRGP2.0) update. I have reviewed the request with the CRPWSC Board and offer the following response:

The CRPWSC was formed in 1984 and currently operates with three member municipalities - Parkland County, the Town of Stony Plain, and the City of Spruce Grove. The CRPWSC is also in the process of adding the West Inter Lake District (WILD) Commission as a new customer sometime in 2016. Each member municipality is represented by two members at the board table. The mandate of the CRPWSC is to provide potable water service for its members and to maintain water supply for future growth requirements.

Currently, capital region water commissions are supplied with water through EPCOR and the commissions are member of the Regional Water Customers Group (RWCG). The RWCG member commissions, including the CRPWSC, services upwards of 70 municipalities in the region; a much larger area than currently contemplated within the CRGP2.0. The RWCG works closely with EPCOR and represents the member commissions to reflect the growth related water demands through five year, annual projections.

The CRPWSC is currently undertaking the detailed design of a twinning project that will service its members for the next 30 to 40 years. Although the detailed design is not yet completed (the design is anticipated to be completed in 2016), the twinning alignment will largely remain within current utility corridors. The long term planning is therefore complete nearing the scope of the CRGP2.0 planning horizon of 50 years.
The CRPWSC has also been contacted by ISL Engineering and Land Services Ltd. on behalf of the CRB to provide information relative to existing/future locations of water pipeline infrastructure. This information has been provided as requested.

The CRPWSC Board applauds the steps that the CRB is taking to ensure a complete CRGP2.0 update; however, we believe that the CRB role should remain as information gathering as opposed to one of planning of regional commissions. The information that is being gathered by the CRB should serve the CRGP2.0 well.

The CRPWSC Board thanks the CRB for the request for input and wishes the CRB success in the large undertaking of the CRGP2.0. Should you have any additional questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Corey Levasseur, CET, CLGM
Commission Manager
Capital Region Parkland Water Services Commission (CRPWSC)
March 22, 2016

Malcolm Bruce, Chief Executive Officer  
Capital Region Board  
#1100 Bell Tower, 10104 – 103 Avenue  
Edmonton AB  T5J 0H8  
mbruce@capitalregionboard.ab.ca

Dear Mr. Bruce,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input into the proposed expansion of the planning mandate for the Capital Region Board to include increased regional coordination of water, wastewater and solid waste management.

As an owner and operators of water and wastewater treatment facilities and provider of water distribution within the City of Edmonton, EPCOR has been an active participant for many years in the planning of the Regional Water and Wastewater systems. In particular, we have been working directly with the individual communities and water commissions where we provide wholesale water and wastewater services.

Historically, EPCOR (then part of the City of Edmonton) has taken direction from “The Edmonton Regional Utility Study” completed in 1978 by the Provincial Government. This study set out the growth options and extensions of the water, wastewater and solid waste management systems for the Regional population of 1 million. A large portion of the infrastructure that has been built over the last 40 years is in alignment with the plans defined at that time. This plan provided certainty for the developers and the communities as to how and where infrastructure could be extended.

The Regional system for water infrastructure resulted in many communities (a map is attached) being served by two large water plants in the City of Edmonton. Under this approach, the region’s need for water have been met in a cost effective manner while ensuring water of the highest quality. Centralized plants also reduce the capital requirements for each individual community allowing them to utilize their borrowing capacity for other activities.

The development of a new comprehensive Capital Region Utility study that will serve a population base of over 2 million will provide a framework for orderly development for the future and EPCOR supports this initiative fully.

Key principles that should be considered in development of this study include:

- Conservation is best served when utility rates reflect the full cost of providing utility services
- The increased utilization of reuse water in the region should also be considered as an opportunity to reduce the amount of raw water diverted. (EPCOR’s experience with Industrial wastewater reuse in the Edmonton region and municipal water reuse in our US operations can be of particular benefit to the planning process.)
• Assets should be owned and operated by the utility/municipality in whose service area they fall. There should be a mechanism to facilitate the orderly transfer of assets when service area boundaries change through amalgamation for example.

• In Regional planning a full cost analysis of the options should be considered as the various planning scenarios are developed. This can include assessing the costs of new pipelines to support increased sewage flows around the City of Edmonton, or directing additional flows from the Region into the Gold Bar plant and expanding plant capacities reducing overall pipe size requirements.

• Regional growth plans will need to consider Government of Alberta led initiatives such as the Capital Region/Industrial Heartland Water Management Framework (CRIH-WMF) and the North Saskatchewan Regional Plan (NSRP) under the Land Use Framework. Under the CRIH-WMF, Alberta Environment and Parks is developing an Effluent Management Program that will involve setting loading limits for wastewater dischargers in the CRIH stretch of the North Saskatchewan River. These limits will be derived based on a cumulative effect assessment of impact on the river and will embed the concept of no net degradation. In the face of regional population growth, these limits will drive the need for innovative approaches in wastewater management and treatment in the region. Closely related to this is the developing NSRP that will include a Surface Water Quality Management Framework for the entire North Saskatchewan River basin within Alberta that will dictate land use decisions. EPCOR has been engaged in both initiatives.

If you require any additional information, EPCOR would be willing to assist as required. I can be reached at (780)-441-7145 or jelford@epcor.com.

Sincerely,

John Elford
Senior Vice President EPCOR Water Canada

cc: Guy Bridgeman
Senior Vice President and CFO
March 8, 2016

To: Mr. Malcolm Bruce  
Chef Executive Officer  
Capital Region Board

Re: Solid Waste Consideration in CRB Growth Plan

Dear Mr. Malcolm Bruce

Please accept this response to your request for input on amending the CRB Growth Plan to include planning around MSW (Municipal Solid Waste). I do believe there should be considerations to support planning solid waste infrastructure around population growth on a regional level. Landfilling technology has increased dramatically over the last 30 years, supporting initiatives like ARMA (Alberta Recycling Management Authority) and RCA (Recycle council of Alberta). There are new ways of treating MSW by source separation, composting and recycling to eliminate the need for more air space thus eliminating the need of a larger footprint to bury our province’s wastes. Land usage in the Capital region is becoming a very sought after commodity for various uses up to and including landfilling.

As you know the Edmonton area has to haul wastes outside of city limits as the capacity for landfilling has reached ultimate air space requirements. The city has produced leading edge technology around waste to fuel management, but at a high cost and demand for labor. These costs go back to the ratepayers of the municipalities, and are increasing year over year. “Waste has wheels” was one of the first concepts I learned when I started in this industry 4 years ago. I have heard countless times that ‘Nobody wants a landfill in their back yard, identifying the importance of strategically selecting landfill locations, and reducing the number of sites required if at all feasible. As a Waste Management Services Commission, we make decisions always considering the value that ratepayers receive for their user fees and for their property tax dollars.

I believe that regionally planning solid waste management to accommodate potential growth to 2.2 million in the Capital Region is a necessity. Currently, there are technologies available that can reduce our carbon footprint, lower labor costs and eliminate the need to landfill most MSW material. The ultimate goal of most waste management commissions is to divert waste, minimize environmental
impacts, all while keeping taxes acceptable for ratepayers. If regional cooperation through the CRB will aid all member municipalities in accomplishing these objectives, than the inclusion of regional solid waste in the CRBGP would be a good approach through the existing Commission and Authorities.

I hope this is enough information to help guide the board in their decision making process. If you have any other questions or concerns please do not hesitate to contact myself.

Yours truly,

Gerard Duffy  
Manager, Waste Management Officer  
Roseridge Waste Management Services Commission  
C. 780-803-8343  
O. 780-939-5678  
gduffy@sturgeoncounty.ca
CRB Strategic Plan KPI Report for 2015/16

Recommended Motion

That the Capital Region Board approve the CRB Strategic Plan 2014-2018 Priorities Measurement Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Report 2015/16, as recommended by the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee.

Background:

- The Capital Region Board (CRB) approved a Strategic Plan for 2014-2018 in June 2014
- Four Strategic Priorities were identified: Regional Vision, Collaborative Culture, Regional Growth Plan and Global Competitiveness
- Key measurement of Strategic Plan priorities against Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) is to be reported annually to highlight and assess the Board’s progress

Highlights in 2015/16:

- Most progress has been made on Priority #4 Global Competitiveness:
  - Draft Economic Development Initiative Report to Board in June
  - Board motion to pursue regional economic development independent of the CRB
  - CRGIS website launch in June
  - CRB Website Audit and Redevelopment project will better incorporate GIS tools and a Site Selector
- Other examples of progress as a result of collaboration and advocacy
  - 15 REFs out of 15 REFs approved (2015)
  - 1 REF out of 2 REFs approved (2016)(one in process)
  - GPU extension to October 2016
  - GPU Policy approach, objectives, and direction approved along with a conceptual map
  - Regional and Sub-Regional Housing Needs going to the Board for approval
  - Regional GreenTRIP priorities accepted and implemented
  - ReEnvision Housing Symposium
  - Road Shows and CEO regional tours (2)
  - Formation of a Cross-Ministerial team as GPU moves toward completion
  - 2015 Transportation Prioritization List approved

Attachment:

1. CRB Strategic Plan 2014-2018 Priorities Key Performance Measurement Report 2015/16
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priorities</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Key Results</th>
<th>2015 Status</th>
<th>2016 Status</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 - REGIONAL VISION</strong></td>
<td>The Board develops a strong, long-term vision for the whole region based on the desires and dreams of the region’s municipalities and citizens.</td>
<td>KR 1.1: Regional stakeholders and citizens are engaged, and they develop a long term vision for the whole region. KR 1.2: The Board adopts its long term Regional Vision.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Separate and distinct from the Growth Plan - Recommended to be addressed after the GPU is completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 - COLLABORATIVE CULTURE (The How)</strong></td>
<td>The Board’s activity promotes a collaborative culture among members. CRB focuses its efforts on high level issues that impact the region.</td>
<td>KR 2.1: The Board understands the distinctive characteristics and needs of rural and urban members. KR 2.2: CRB improves collaboration and governance practices through education, best practice research, educational speakers and workshops. KR 2.3: CRB members agree on priority high level issues for the region and are validated on a regular basis. KR 2.4: CRB actively pursues partnerships and collaboration with specific regional stakeholder organizations.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Key Result 2.1 - 15 REF out of 15 REFs approved (2015) - 1 REF out of 2 REFs approved (2016) (one in process) - CEO toured region twice in 2015, visiting each participating municipality to engage with CAOs and Mayors on a number of topics (KR 2.1, 2.4) - Board Chair and CEO toured Municipalities eligible for Membership Review (KR 2.1, 2.4) - Membership review and voting structure review concluded with a follow up request going to the Province - Board approved Energy Corridors Master Plan - Housing Symposium a success (sellout)(KR 2.1, 2.4) - Board approved Transportation Priorities - Regional and Sub-Regional housing needs going to the Board for approval Key Result 2.2 - Mandate discussion to be completed in April 2016 - Participating members contributed financially - Budget approved - Business Plan approved - Policies being reviewed with completion of Policy review to be complete in 2016 - Committee Terms of Reference updated and approved - Committee structure reviewed and resulted in new</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3 - REGIONAL GROWTH PLAN (The What)

The Board develops and implements a high level, long term growth plan for the region, which is approved by the Government of Alberta.

| Key Result 3.1 | A high level growth plan is prepared and adopted by the CRB.  
KR 3.2: The GoA reviews and approves the Regional Growth Plan.  
KR 3.3: A process for approving and incorporating the Capital Region Growth Plan into GoA policy environments is developed, negotiated with Government of Alberta and approved by Capital Region Board.  
KR 3.4: Municipal members ensure |  
|---|---|---|---|

- Key Result 2.3  
  - GreenTRIP Funding  
  - Provincial matching funding (KR 2.3, 2.4)  
  - Provincial mandate funding  
  - New policies approved, such as Policy G019 regarding Board membership  
  - Approved Transportation Prioritization List submitted to the Province  

- Key Result 2.4  
  - CEO update occurs monthly to all member CAOs  
  - Collaboration with CRP  
  - Growth Plan outreach expanded to include U of A City Region Studies Centre, and First Nations and Metis communities  
  - GPU Advocacy beginning  
  - Advocacy occurred regarding transit (GreenTRIP), housing, funding CRB projects, Growth Plan  
  - Outreach occurred to new government (political and administrative)  
  - Developing Advocacy Strategy and Plan  

- Committee structure: Two task forces becoming committees

**Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Report 2015/16**

April 14, 2016
### 4 - GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS (The Why)

The Board understands the global situation and positioning of the region and the strategic opportunities to compete globally.

**Key Result 4.1:** Independent Regional Economic Development approved by the Board. To be incubated by the CRB (KR 4.1, 4.2)
- Incubation Process in development to come back to the Board in June
- One on one meeting took place with self identified municipalities, sub-regional economic development agencies, regional economic development officers (via GEEDT)
- Economic Development Strategy and Framework developed.
- Discussion on Board mandate tied to global competitiveness and economic development (KR 4.1, 4.2)

**Key Result 4.2**
- GIS launched in June 2015
- Additional GIS layers being added

**Key Result 4.5**
- Work to begin on a site selector (KR 4.5)

| that municipal and sub-regional plans conform to the Regional Growth Plan. 
| KR 3.5: Outcomes of the Regional Growth Plan are measured, monitored and reported. | Plan indicators and will be used to inform the next iteration of indicators 
| **Key Result 3.2** - Discussions with GOA Cross Ministerial committee in process (KR 3.2, 2.4) - Scheduled Oct. 2016 approval with Nov. 2016 delivery to the Province (KR 3.2, 3.3) |

---

**Legend:**
- Colours – Green significant progress; Yellow a work in progress; red either yet to be initiated or just started
- Arrows – Up progressing according to plan; side ways no progress started
Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessments

Recommended Motion

That the Capital Region Board approve the Regional and Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessments, as recommended by the Housing Committee.

Background

The Capital Region Growth Plan: Appendix 5 Housing Plan provides direction to develop a 10-year regional housing plan based on sub-regional planning that is responsive to housing need.

The development of a “Sub-Regional Planning Process” was an approved Housing Committee initiative in the CRB 2012-2014 Business Plan.

In 2013, an Environmental Scan was carried out that described the roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders currently involved with the provision of non-market housing, and suggested how those roles might evolve as an enhanced approach to planning for non-market housing is implemented. The findings and recommendations of the Environmental Scan confirmed that provincial funding and regional planning priorities should be guided by sub-regional planning efforts – which, in turn, would benefit from the use of standardized planning and assessment tools.

In 2014, the Sub-Regional Needs Assessment Framework and pilot reports were received for information by the Capital Region Board.

The December 2014 Capital Region Board meeting approved the 2015/19 Business plan including the Housing Committee initiative “Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessment” under “A” Priority Projects.

In September 2015, the new 2011 Core Housing Need data was acquired.

On October 29, 2015 the Housing Advisory Working Group met to start the process for completing the remaining four sub-regional needs assessments.

Project process and updates were presented at the November 2015 and January 2016 Housing Committee meetings by Gordon and Associates.

From December to March meetings/correspondence with each sub-region were held to build and inform the assessments.

At the March 7, 2016 Housing Advisory Working Group meeting there was consensus to recommend the Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessments be approved, through the Housing Committee, by the Capital Region Board.

On March 24, 2016 the Housing Committee recommended the Capital Region Board approve the Regional and Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessments. Administration acknowledged minor
discrepancies and the Committee requested the Regional Housing Needs Assessment be included in
the Capital Region Board agenda package with the Sub-Regional Needs Assessments attached.

Rationale
An important step toward addressing the housing needs of our region is determining the extent of the
need. The needs assessments established through the approved framework allowed for consistent
and comparable studies. These housing needs assessment reports are more focused than the pilot
assessments. Needs assessment studies are the foundation of planning, and will feed into a
standardized sub-regional plan (to be developed).

A two day Workshop will be designed to review the needs assessments (need, demand, and supply of
all types of accommodation; core housing need; demographics and target markets). The Workshop
format will be built with the Housing Advisory Working Group and focus forward to inform the next
phase of work to build the Sub-Regional Housing Plan Model and discuss policy and program options
and alternatives that sub-regions might consider in seeking to respond to the assessed level of need
and housing requirements. The Workshop will be held after CRB Board approval of the Housing Need
Assessments.

Attachments:

1. Capital Region Board Housing Needs Assessment
2. Edmonton Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment
3. Lamont Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment
4. Parkland Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment
5. Sturgeon Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment
6. Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment Addendum
7. Leduc Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment Addendum
The Capital Region Board Housing Needs Assessment summarizes housing need and demand to inform planning for housing options within the Capital Region. Six detailed Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessments support this document.

Capital Region Housing Needs Assessment Summary

Headwater Group with Focus Consulting and Gordon & Associates
This Capital Region Board Housing Needs Assessment Summary provides a high-level overview of the current and anticipated housing market to inform current and future housing needs in the Capital Region. The Capital Region Board (CRB) developed the Housing Assessment Tool (HAT) used in this assessment as an important first step in providing an analysis of the current housing situation, recent trends and future needs in each of its six housing sub-regions. These Needs Assessments will inform and support the creation of future integrated regional housing plans within the Capital Region.

**Household Core Need Analysis:**
- There are currently 30,720 renter households estimated to be in core housing need.
- The primary core housing need challenge across the region is affordability, especially among renters, who are five times as likely as owners to be in core need.
- Lone-parent families and seniors who rent have the highest incidence and number of households in need of Non-Market Housing.
- There are 30,163 Non-Market Housing units in the Capital Region.
- On average, 49% of households in core need are served by the Non-Market housing portfolio. Only Edmonton (50%) and Lamont (73%) have service levels above the region average. Sturgeon and Parkland have the lowest percent of households in need (43%) served by the existing Non-Market housing portfolio.
Future housing demand is growing at an average annual rate of 12,791 units: 1,593 of those units are for households in core need, 1,892 units are for households requiring Market Affordable housing, and 9,306 units are households requiring pure market housing.

Households with maintainers 65+ years of age are increasing as a share of the total need and those below 65 years of age are decreasing over the coming six years.

**Projected Growth in Need and Demand, 2015-21**

- **Non-Market**: Households who spend >30% of income on housing
  - 1,593 (12%)
- **Market Affordable**: Housing affordable to households below CRB median income
  - 1,892 (15%)
- **Pure Market**: Housing affordable to households above median income
  - 9,306 (73%)

**Housing Stock Considerations**:
- The predominant form of housing supply is detached single-family homes, which meet the requirements of families with children.
- The growing population of single person and senior households require smaller, more appropriate form of rental housing such as apartments and other options.
- The limited supply of smaller apartment options, especially in the suburban sub-regions, can lead to high rents.
- Lack of smaller apartment options will lead to young singles, as well as some seniors, moving from their current community.
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## Affordable Housing Program
The Province of Alberta’s Affordable Housing Program provides one-time capital grants for the construction/acquisition of rental housing units. Grant recipients are required to provide rents that are at least 10% below market. Units are targeted at households with incomes at or below HILs. There are no operating subsidies for these units.

## Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC)
CMHC is Canada’s national housing agency. Established as a government-owned corporation in 1946 to address Canada’s post-war housing shortage, the agency has grown into a major national institution. CMHC is Canada’s premier provider of mortgage loan insurance, mortgage-backed securities, housing policy and programs, and housing research.

## Capital Region
The Capital Region includes lands lying within the boundaries of the participating municipalities: Beaumont, Bon Accord, Bruderheim, Calmar, Devon, Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, Gibbons, Lamont, Lamont County, Leduc, Leduc County, Legal, Morinville, Sturgeon County, Redwater, St. Albert, Spruce Grove, Stony Plain, Strathcona County, Sturgeon County, Thorsby, Wabamun, and Warburg.

## Capital Region Board
The Capital Region Board was established in 2008, under Capital Region Board Regulation 38/2012, of the Municipal Government Act. The Capital Region Board is a non-profit corporation comprised of 24 member municipalities from within the Region.

## Co-Operative Housing (Co-Op)
Co-op housing is collectively owned and managed by its members who live in the housing. Co-op members actively participate in decision-making and share the work involved in managing the building and housing community.

## Community Amenities
Community amenities are capital facilities or improvements needed to service a growing population or to create a more complete community such as leisure centres, police buildings, cultural centres, libraries, parks, and playgrounds. Some definitions also include the natural amenities of rivers, lakes, and walking trails. Other definitions include access to commercial amenities such as shopping centres, medical facilities, and restaurants.

## Community Housing Program
The Province of Alberta’s Community Housing Program provides subsidized rental housing to low-income households who cannot afford private sector accommodation. Applicants whose income falls below CNITS are eligible to apply. Management and tenant selection is delegated to the local housing operators (usually a Management Body). Applicants are given priority based on need, as determined by income, assets, and current housing condition. A tenant’s rent, which includes heat, water and sewer expenses, is based on 30 percent of a household’s adjusted income. The tenant is
responsible for electricity, telephone and cable television, as well as any additional services they may request (such as parking). Operating deficits are cost-shared with Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. One of the orders of government owns the units.

**Core Housing Need**
This is a concept developed in the 1980’s to define housing need and involves a two-step assessment. First, does a household experience any one or combination of housing problems covering suitability (crowding), adequacy (building condition) or affordability (paying greater than 30% for shelter)? Second, is their income below a defined income threshold that varies by market/city and by household size?

**CMA**
Census Metropolitan Area.

**CNITS (Core Need Income Thresholds)**
Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation establish local income limits each year. Households with annual incomes equal to or less than the HIL are said to have insufficient income to afford the on-going costs of suitable and adequate rental units in their area. Incomes below this level may be eligible for various rental subsidy programs.

**Condominium (Condo)**
This is a form of tenure that creates title and ownership rights in virtual three dimensions, as opposed to land title. The term refers to a legal ownership structure and should not be confused with built form. For example, an apartment that is owned may be a condominium, but an apartment may also be rented.

**Diversification of Housing Types**
This is a range of housing types, including single-family dwellings, duplex, townhome, condominium and apartment types, mixed throughout neighborhoods to serve a broad range of residents of varied age and income.

**EREB**
The Edmonton Real Estate Board is an Association of realtors and provides data and statistics on home sales and prices in the Edmonton area.

**Garage Suites**
A garage suite is a self-contained dwelling located above a rear attached garage which is accessory to a single detached dwelling. It must have an entrance separate from the vehicle entrance, either from the interior or exterior of the structure, and include cooking facilities, a bathroom and bedroom(s).

**Habitat for Humanity Homes**
Housing units are built with voluntary labour, using cash and material donations. When completed the units are sold to qualifying, working, low and moderate income households. The household is provided an interest free mortgage and the mortgage is amortized to 25% of the household’s
income. When the recipient household decides to sell the unit, it is sold back to Habitat for Humanity and another qualifying household receives a place to live.

**HAT**
Housing Assessment Tool. The HAT is the tool developed for the Capital Region to assess housing need across all Sub-Regions.

**HICO**
Housing In Canada Online. A CMHC interactive data file providing historic data and core need estimates for a wide geography of cities and census areas.

**HIL**
Housing Income Limits (new label for former CNITs, as above).

**Home Program**
Through education, financial assistance and one-on-one counselling, the HOME Program helps low income people become homeowners. Education sessions are available to anyone interested in owning a home. Participants do not have to be first time buyers or low-income buyers. Low-income buyers (below CNITS) who have completed education sessions can apply for down payment assistance.

**Household**
Refers to a person or a group of persons (other than foreign residents) who occupy the same dwelling and do not have a usual place of residence elsewhere in Canada. It may consist of a family group (census family) with or without other persons, of two or more families sharing a dwelling, of a group of unrelated persons, or of one person living alone. When age is cross-tabulated with households, this uses the reported age of the household maintainer.

**Housing Allowance**
This is housing assistance to help households manage high shelter cost burden and is distinct from the Rent Supplement. Payments are made to the household, not to the property owner, and the Housing Allowance is therefore portable. A Housing Allowance may be structured to pay a fixed monthly allowance or can pay based on the RGI-market rent difference.

**Housing Continuum**
This is a conceptual framework used to describe a range of housing options from homeless supports to independent market rate housing.

**Incidence of Need**
The frequency (or incidence) of need refers to the tendency that a particular household will experience housing need. For example, if 60 lone-parent households out of 100 lone-parent households experience affordability problems, the incidence (or chance) of need among lone-parents is 60%. In the assessment, incidence refers to affordability need only.
Inclusive Communities
Inclusive communities have a variety of housing, commerce, recreational, institutional, social, and public amenities within their boundary. Inclusive communities provide a physical and social environment where residents can live, learn, work, and play without having to travel beyond the community boundary.

Infill Development
Development or redevelopment in existing developed areas includes building on vacant or underutilized lands, or re-development of a developed site to a higher density.

Intensification
This is the development of a property, site or area at a higher density than currently exists. For example, this includes redevelopment (including the reuse of Brownfield sites), development of vacant and/or underutilized lots, the conversion or expansion of existing buildings, and infill development, and may include Greenfield sites with development densities higher than historical norms.

Major Repairs Needed
This includes dwellings needing major repairs such as defective plumbing, electrical wiring, and structural repairs to walls, floors, or ceilings.

Market Housing
Market Housing is defined as housing supplied by the private market, without direct government subsidies. Under Market Housing, one sub category, Market Affordable Housing, has been further delineated:

  Market Affordable Housing
  Market Affordable Housing is defined as rental or ownership housing that is modest in form and specification and is capable of being produced for moderate income households without upfront or on-going direct government subsidies (such as through regulatory relaxations, efficient design, or tax incentives). This applies to households earning moderate incomes between 100% and 150% of median income.

  Pure Market is used to further delineate housing that is affordable to those with incomes greater than median income

Minor Repairs Needed
This includes dwellings needing minor repairs such as missing or loose floor tiles, bricks, or shingles and defective steps, railing, or siding.

Mixed-Income Development
This is a type of development that includes families at various income levels. Mixed-income developments are intended to promote de-concentration of poverty and give lower-income households access to improved amenities.
Mixed-Use Development
This development mixes compatible residential, commercial, institutional and recreational land uses. The development may exist within an area of land, and/or within buildings, in order to increase density, reduce development footprint through intensification of land use, and to improve public accessibility to the range of mixed land uses.

Multi-family Housing
A building constructed for residential purposes for use by two or more families, such as duplexes, townhomes, and row house developments, multistory, and high-rise apartments.

NHS
National Household Survey (the replacement for the Statistics Canada long form census), administered in May 2011.

Non-Market Housing
Non-Market Housing is defined as housing that is operated and funded, or created, through direct government subsidies. It includes categories of housing based on the associated services needed by the clients. Non-Market Housing is further segmented into the categories of Affordable Housing and Subsidized Housing:

**Affordable Housing** is rental or ownership housing that generally does not require on-going (operating) subsidies. It is both affordable and targeted for long-term occupancy to households with incomes between 100% and 80% of the median renter income for their household size.

**Social Housing** is rental housing that requires on-going operating subsidies to make it affordable on a long-term basis to households with incomes between 80% and 65% or less of the median renter income for their household size.

Other Non-profit
These are non-profit organizations providing rental housing at rents below market rates who do not receive housing subsidies from government.

Provincial Private Non-profit Program
This program provides monthly subsidies to non-profit organizations to cover operating deficits, including a reserve allocation and the mortgage principal and interest payment based on eligible capital costs. Individuals who currently occupy a crowded or inadequate dwelling would be eligible for housing in these units owned by private non-profit groups. The operating deficits are cost-shared with Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Rents are based on 30 percent of a household’s adjusted income.

---

1 “Non-Market Housing” also includes “Emergency Shelters”, “Transitional Housing” and “Supportive Housing”, and requires deeper capital and operating subsidies provided under government programs to enable affordability to households with considerably lower incomes or no incomes at all.
RGI
Rent Geared to Income.

Rent Supplement Program
A subsidy is provided to reduce the market rent for a household with income below CNITS. There is a variety of rent supplement programs, some providing subsidies directly to the property owner, others directly to the tenant. The subsidy can be a fixed rate or based on the income of the household. Typically, these subsidies are funded by the province and administered by a management body.

Rural and Native Housing Program
This provincial program funds the construction of a small number of housing units throughout Alberta. Management bodies typically rent out the units in the same manner as the Community Housing Program defined above.

Secondary Suites
A secondary suite is a separate and subordinate dwelling unit contained within a detached dwelling. A secondary suite must have a separate entrance from the entrance to the principal dwelling and include a cooking facility, bathroom and bedroom(s) that are separate from those of the principal dwelling.

Seniors Self-Contained Program
The Alberta Government provides apartment style accommodation to low and moderate income seniors who are functionally independent with or without assistance from existing community services. Rent, which includes water, heat and sewer expenses, is based on 30% of a household’s adjusted income. The Province owns most of the apartments funded under this program and any operating deficits are fully funded by the Alberta Government. Household income must be below the CNITs to qualify for the program.

Emergency Shelters
These are temporary places for people to live until housing that is more permanent is found. An emergency shelter supports people fleeing a specific situation, such as natural or man-made disasters, domestic violence or sexual abuse. Emergency shelters sometimes facilitate support groups, and provide meals.

Special Needs Housing
Special needs housing are dwellings that have been modified with special features to help people live independently in the community. For example, a unit may be adapted for wheelchair access.

Supportive Housing
Supportive housing offers support services onsite to assist tenants to live independently. For example, some providers will offer support for youth or people with substance abuse problems.
Support Services
Housing support services help people live independently in the community, regardless of their tenure. They support people who want to stay in their own home. A wide range of people with particular needs can receive housing support services, including homeless people, refugees, women escaping domestic violence, people with a chronic illness, people with a physical impairment or learning disability, seniors, ex-offenders, people with drug and alcohol related problems, and others who need support. They may use these services when their accommodation is temporary (for example, in a crisis) or when they are being re-housed.

A wide range of supported accommodation models exist and some examples include:
- Sheltered housing with 30 or 40 self-contained units of accommodation with on-site support
- Communal facilities and call systems
- Homeless hostels
- Group homes where people share accommodation supported by residential or visiting housing support workers
- Individual scattered or clustered dwellings with floating (flexible) support
- Wet houses for people with substance misuse problems

Supported Housing
Rental Housing for less than median income households for whom outreach services are accessed from an off-site source (e.g. homecare, aids to daily living, etc.).

Supportive Living Lodge
Supportive living settings are operated under the Alberta Housing Act (usually by a Management Body) and are designed to provide room and board for seniors who are functionally independent with or without the assistance of community-based services.
Acknowledgements

The consultants would like to thank the following people for their contribution to the Capital Region Housing Needs Assessment:

- Loretta Bertol, Alberta Seniors
- Kelly Wagar, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation
- Stephanie Chai, Capital Region Board
- Greg Dewling, Capital Region Housing Corporation
- Daryl Kreuzer, City of Edmonton
- Barb Bigelow, City of Fort Saskatchewan
- Cory Labrecque, City of Leduc
- Alfred Nicholai, Habitat for Humanity
- Lory Scott, City of St. Albert
- Raymond Swonek, Greater Edmonton Foundation
- Lynn Olenek, Heartland Foundation
- Giri Puligandla, Homeward Trust Edmonton
- Nancy Laing, Leduc Foundation
- Lori-Anne St. Arnault, Meridian Foundation
- Pamela Steppan, Strathcona County
- Marnie Lee, Strathcona County
- Dennis Magnusson, Sturgeon Foundation

The Capital Region Board Needs Assessments acknowledges the significant amount of work that has been, and continues to be, done with respect to homelessness. The current work being completed on homelessness is intended to complement the regional and sub-regional needs assessments.
1.0 Introduction

The Capital Region Housing Needs Assessment identifies housing need and demand to support planning for a diverse range of housing options within the Capital Region. Needs Assessments have been completed for six sub-regions: the Edmonton, Lamont, Leduc, Parkland, Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan and Sturgeon Sub-Regions.

The purpose of the Needs Assessment is to:
- Inform the Capital Region Board of existing and projected Non-Market Housing need and Market Affordable Housing supply, need and demand conditions, and trends;
- Support an integrated planning approach to meet the housing need and demand through a sufficient supply and balanced mix of dwelling types across the housing continuum in each sub-region; and
- Inform sub-regional housing plans that are part of the Capital Region Board Regional Housing Plan (Figure 1).

The Housing Needs Assessments are not intended to assess community amenities and support services. Amenities and services required by households in need will be addressed as part of the sub-regional housing plans.

Figure 1: Capital Region Board (CRB) Regional Housing Development Process Diagram

1. CRB Regional Direction (Every 5 yrs)
2. Sub-Regional Needs Assessment (Every 5 yrs)
3. Sub-Regional Housing Plans (Every 5 yrs)
4. Sub-Regional Deliver and Monitor (Annually)
5. Report, Evaluate and Adjust (CRB and Sub-Regions Annually)
1.0 Introduction (continued)

The focus of the region-wide assessment is to examine both how the market is, or is not, meeting housing requirements. The assessments identify core need and Non-Market housing stock across the region to enable a comparison of the state of housing need across the region for program and policy decision-making.

The Capital Region Housing Needs Assessment follows the nine-step approach outlined in the Capital Region Board Housing Needs Assessment Framework. The Framework includes a Housing Assessment Tool that extrapolates key data to assess the current housing situation, recent trends, and future patterns of development across the region.

Report Structure

This Needs Assessment Report provides key data in four main sections:
- Housing Market Overview – Housing stock, prices and household characteristics;
- Households in Need – Core housing need estimates;
- Future Housing Market – Housing, rental market continuum, housing need and demand 2015 – 2021;
- Gap Analysis – Existing and future housing need gaps, Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing.

Data sources include Canada Census, mainly the National Household Survey (NHS) for 2011 and the Long Form Census for previous years, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC), and Edmonton Real Estate Board.
2.0 Housing Market Overview

The Housing Market Overview focuses on trends in market supply and demand across the region. How well the market functions directly impacts the residual role of the Non-Market sector. A thorough understanding of the local housing market and conditions is fundamental to develop effective policy and program responses for Non-Market need. Indicators used in this section will form the baseline to measure the effectiveness of future housing plans.
2.1 Housing Stock Characteristics: Current State (2011)

Description

Housing stock characteristics include dwelling type, tenure, age and condition of supply. This establishes the context for housing options and trends.

Findings

- The region contains more than 450,000 housing options for residents, 72% of which reside in Edmonton (see T1, below).
- Just over half (51%) of the housing stock in Edmonton is single-family detached (SFD) housing compared to 78% in the rest of region.
- 33% of the housing stock in Edmonton is made up of apartments compared to 8-9% for the other sub-regions.

Assessment

- The housing stock outside of Edmonton is dominated by single detached dwellings, which skews tenure mix toward ownership. The rural areas within these sub-regions, where SFDs and moveable dwellings are the normal house type, influence the high proportion of SFDs.
- In the sub-regions surrounding Edmonton, a small rental sector and few apartments provide limited options for smaller and lower income households. Many rentals are SFDs and mobiles in smaller sub-regions, which generally provide more housing than required, resulting in higher rental rates.

T1: Capital Region Housing Stock Dwelling Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th>Lamont</th>
<th>Leduc</th>
<th>Strath/FtS</th>
<th>Sturgeon</th>
<th>Parkland</th>
<th>Region %</th>
<th>Region #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>265,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>37,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>118,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>324,760</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>22,455</td>
<td>40,460</td>
<td>34,970</td>
<td>26,640</td>
<td>451,915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.1 Housing Stock Characteristics: Current State (2011)

**Description**
Housing stock characteristics include dwelling type, tenure, age, and condition of supply. This establishes the context for housing options and trends.

**Findings**
- Only 65% of Edmonton’s dwellings are owner occupied, compared to over 80% in the remaining five sub-regions.
- On average, major repairs are needed on 9% of regional housing stock. The percentage is slightly higher in Edmonton and significantly higher in Lamont.

**Assessment**
- Edmonton and Lamont have a higher than average proportion of dwellings in need of major repair, suggesting older stock and opportunities for redevelopment.

---

**F1: Household Ownership Rate (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th>Lamont</th>
<th>Leduc</th>
<th>Strath/FtSask</th>
<th>Sturgeon</th>
<th>Parkland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F2: Major Repairs Needed - All Housing Stock**

- Edmonton: 7%
- Lamont: 12%
- Leduc: 6%
- Strath/FtSask: 4%
- Sturgeon: 5%
- Parkland: 5%

**Description**

Housing supply is assessed by examining trends in residential construction activity, including built form (type) and intended tenure at time of construction of new starts.

**Findings**

- Housing starts dipped during the 2008 recession and have been increasing ever since.
- Apartment starts are growing as semi-detached and SFD starts have stabilised.
- Most housing construction has been targeted to owners. There has been limited construction aimed at the rental market, especially in 2009 and 2010.
- Rental construction (apartments) has recently increased, particularly in Edmonton. Edmonton also experienced most of the rental starts over the past five or six years that were not stimulated by an Affordable Housing grant.

**Assessment**

- The shift toward more multiple starts (semi, row, and apartment) over the decade is an encouraging sign of a more diversified housing market. Although these multiple starts do not satisfy housing need and demand, they show that supply is responding to demand.
2.3 Household Characteristics: Type and Size (2011)

**Description**

Type and size of household characteristics are assessed to help identify the size and type of housing needed across the region.

**Findings**

- Couples and two-parent families are the prevalent type of household and account for more than 66% of households in the five sub-regions and 48% in Edmonton.
- Non-family households represent 36% of total households in Edmonton compared to 20% in the region.
- Most non-family households are single person households; this group accounts for a larger proportion in Edmonton compared to the region.
- 29% of Edmonton households are single person while the other sub-regions have 17-19% single person households.

**Assessment**

- Edmonton has substantially different household types and size than the other five sub-regions. Edmonton has fewer families and more small households. Lamont, Leduc and Strathcona have larger household sizes.
- Edmonton has a greater proportion of one-person households (29%) compared to the other sub-regions (17-19%), which is partly a result of fewer small housing options in the sub-regions.
2.4 Household Characteristics: Age of Household Maintainer (2011)

Description
Age of the household maintainer identifies both the availability of housing for different age groups and the overall demographics of the region.

Findings
- First time buyers are typically those aged under 39. This age cohort represents 36% of household maintainers in Edmonton and 28% of household maintainers in the remaining five sub-regions.
- 31% of household maintainers in Edmonton and 35% of household maintainers in the remaining five sub-regions are 40-54 years of age.
- 17% of household maintainers in Edmonton and 18% of household maintainers in the remaining five sub-regions are over 65 years of age.

Assessment
- Edmonton has a younger overall age of household maintainer, a factor likely related to urban lifestyle and housing availability.
- Edmonton also has a higher proportion of young renter household maintainers compared to the other five sub-regions.
- There is a higher proportion of older renters in the other five sub-regions.
2.5 Household Income Profile (2011)

Description
Household income provides a base indicator to determine affordability. Median household income is used to determine a household’s ability to find housing in their community at an affordable price.

Findings
- As is the case everywhere, owners have much higher incomes than renters.
- Incomes for both owners and renters in Edmonton and Lamont tend to be lower than the median income in the region.
- Higher household incomes in Sturgeon and Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan Sub-Regions are reflected in the following:
  - More two-earner, older, established households;
  - Fewer renters, which on average have much lower household incomes, than the region;
  - Higher ownership rate.
- Sturgeon and Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan households are wealthier than households in other sub-regions. The high median income in both these sub-regions is influenced by a large proportion of households (more than 50%) earning more than $100,000 (compared to 33% for Edmonton).
- More than 40% of households in Edmonton earn less than $60,000 per year.

Assessment
- The high median incomes are partly a reflection of the high percentage of owners, who have higher incomes than renter households do.
- Higher renter incomes may reflect demand for large sized rental homes among families.
3.0 Households in Need

Determining need and demand for Non-Market Housing and Market Affordable Housing is one of several reasons for undertaking a housing needs assessment. Comparing the distribution of the households in Non-Market Housing need and Market Affordable Housing demand across the region will point to current and future gaps. Consistent and reliable data is required to develop integrated plans to address housing imbalances in the sub-regions and region. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) has developed a Core Housing Need measure, which uses a two-step process to identify the number and incidence of households in need of housing:

- Does a household experience any one of or a combination of problems based on three standard measures of suitability (number of bedrooms compared to household composition), condition (need for major repair) and affordability (paying greater than 30% of income for housing)?
- Is the household’s gross income below a specified threshold (which is calculated separately for each Census Metropolitan Area [CMA] and for each household size, such as one person or two-person households)?

Another approach is to examine households experiencing severe shelter cost burdens. This is represented by housing costs in excess of 50% of income from the 2011 National Households Survey (NHS). This measure of acute need is used alongside core need (which uses 30% of income) as a way to help understand which households face a significant housing cost challenge.

As mentioned in the discussion on the housing continuum, the homeless are included in the Non-Market Housing category. Although the homeless are not included in the core need data, they are an important aspect of need in all of the sub-regions, most significantly in Edmonton. Edmonton, the only Sub-Region to have undertaken a homeless count to date, found 2,252 homeless people in 2012, about 8.3% of core housing need. Work to research the problem of homelessness is ongoing in many of the other sub-regions.

---

2 Core Housing Need estimates are derived from the Canada Census every five years, which does not count the homeless.
### 3.1 Core Housing Need Estimates (2011)

#### Description
Core housing need is estimated using magnitude (number of households) and incidence or tendency to be in need. The CMHC data provides insight into the characteristics (tenure, age and family type) of households in need.

#### Findings
- Affordability is consistently the most significant problem. (Core need totals in F11 exceed 100% due to some households experiencing two or three of the problems.)
- After affordability, the next largest problem is condition (suitability), which reflects need for major repairs. This is especially notable in Lamont, which has an older housing stock.
- Crowding is not a significant issue, although is slightly higher in Edmonton than the other sub-regions.
- In absolute counts, a significant number of owners (17,755) are found to be in core need. This represents quite a small proportion (6%) of all owners. Owners have an asset in their property that provides financial security not available to renters.
- Renters, by contrast, have no property asset and, across all the sub-regions, experience a much higher incidence of need.
- Renters total 30,720 households across the region and experience core housing need at about five times (26%) the rate of homeowners (6%) in Edmonton.

#### Assessment
- Renter households have a much higher incidence and severity of need than owner households.
- Actions to address core need should focus on the affordability of renter households, which experience far more severe challenges than owners do.
3.1 Core Housing Need Estimates (Renters)

**Description**
Renters have a high incidence of core need. The charts focus on renter households to identify those in greatest need.

**Findings**
- Core housing need is most prevalent among lone-parent families and non-family households.
- While lone-parents total a small number of households, many of them are in need: this ranges from a high of 49% of lone-parent families in Edmonton to 37% in Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan.
- One-quarter to one-third of non-family households are in core need and is most prominent in Sturgeon. 6,785 couple families (17% of all couple families) are in need in Edmonton.
- Share of need varies by age cohort. In Lamont, where total numbers are quite small, the incidence of need for the 30-44 year cohorts is 41%. The incidence of need for the same age cohorts in Edmonton is 34%.
- In other sub-regions, the age cohort with the highest incidence of need tends to be seniors 65 years of age and over. The need ranges from 34% in Sturgeon to 39% in Parkland and 40% in Leduc.

**Assessment**
- The greatest need is among lone-parents and senior renter households. In part, this need reflects low household incomes. Also, lone-parents require larger, and therefore higher-priced, homes to accommodate children.
- Non-elderly singles also require a significant number of Non-Market Housing units to meet their needs.
- The low number and cost of small sized rental units in the market results in limited options for singles and small households of all ages.
3.2 Acute Need

Description

The 2011 National Household Survey (NHS) identifies households who pay more than 50% of their income for housing and are experiencing acute housing needs*.

Findings

- Of all household types, single non-families experience the highest incidence of acute need at 22% in Edmonton and Lamont, and just below 20% in the region.
- Lone-parent families have the second highest incidence of acute need at 20% in Edmonton and between 15% and 17% in the other five sub-regions.
- Acute affordability is less significant for lone-parents in absolute count, but as a proportion of all lone-parents, they rank high. 17% of lone-parents pay over 50% for housing and are in acute need.
- As in core need, acute need is significant among renters.

Assessment

- 50,765 households are in acute need across the region. 41,124 (more than 80%) households in acute need are in Edmonton.
- Singles and lone-parent families are the largest household type in need.

* Almost 5% of all households (8.5% of renters) in the region pay over 100% of their income for housing. This is a statistical anomaly caused, in part, by change in household composition or status in prior years. It occurs because NHS collects shelter cost in April 2011, but income data is for the prior year (2010). While included here, this data should be treated with caution.
3.3 Non-Market Housing Portfolio

Description
The type of units in the Non-Market Housing Portfolio and relative level of access to those units by different household types is an important component of determining the priority for addressing current households in need.

T2: Region Non-Market Housing Portfolio Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF HOUSING/PROGRAM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Singles</th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Emergency Shelters</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transitional Accommodation</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Permanent Supportive Housing (Lodge)*</td>
<td>4,119</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supported Housing – Semi-independent</td>
<td>4,911</td>
<td>2,818</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-Profit Housing</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Community Housing</td>
<td>4,614</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>4,292</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Seniors’ Self-Contained Housing</td>
<td>3,778</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rent Supplements</td>
<td>1,563</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Affordable Housing</td>
<td>4,926</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>1,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Co-op Housing</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Secondary Suites</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Other (Specify)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30,163</td>
<td>9,905</td>
<td>10,357</td>
<td>9,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARE OF REGION PORTFOLIO</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment
- The region’s 30,163 Non-Market Housing units are evenly distributed between singles (33%), families (34%) and seniors (33%).

* There is a wide range of supportive living facilities designed to serve health and related accommodation and nutritional needs. SL2 (Lodge level accommodation) is included in the Non-Market Housing portfolio, but the SL-3 (Assisted Living), SL-4 (Enhanced Assisted Living), SL-4d (Dementia Care) and Continuing Care accommodation are not included mainly because they are health (not income) related and must qualify through Alberta Health Services for entry. Also, the majority of beds/units are not subsidized at any given point in time and should not be included in the Non-Market housing portfolio.
3.3 Non-Market Housing Portfolio (continued)

Description
The Non-Market Housing portfolio is assessed to determine the share of Non-Market Housing provided across the sub-regions.

Findings
- Edmonton has 89% of the region’s Non-Market Housing portfolio with 26,869 units.
- Leduc, Sturgeon, and Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan Sub-Regions have a relatively diversified portfolio with 2.6%, 2.5%, and 3.1% of the region’s units, respectively.

Assessment
- Other than Edmonton, there is a limited diversity of Non-Market Housing programs in the sub-regions.
- Of all the sub-regions, Edmonton has the greatest number of Non-Market Housing programs and facilities.

T3: Sub-Region Non-Market Housing Portfolio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF HOUSING/PROGRAM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th>Lamont</th>
<th>Leduc</th>
<th>Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan</th>
<th>Sturgeon</th>
<th>Parkland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelters</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Accommodation</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Supportive Housing (Lodge)</td>
<td>4,119</td>
<td>3,289</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported (homeless) Housing</td>
<td>4,911</td>
<td>4,845</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Profit Housing</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Housing</td>
<td>4,614</td>
<td>4,569</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors’ Self-Contained Housing</td>
<td>3,778</td>
<td>3,136</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Supplements</td>
<td>1,563</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>4,926</td>
<td>4,336</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-op Housing</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Suites</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30,163</td>
<td>26,869</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARE OF TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.3 Non-Market Housing Portfolio (continued)

**Description**

The relative service level* is assessed to show the proportion of households in need that are being serviced by the availability of Non-Market housing.

**Findings**
- Edmonton provides Non-Market Housing service to 50% (26,869) of households in core need (53,889).
- Sturgeon and Parkland provide a lower level of Non-Market Housing service compared to other sub-regions. Both provide Non-Market Housing service to 43% of households in core need.

**Assessment**
- Non-Market Housing Initiatives need to bring the service levels by household type more in line with the share of core housing need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th>Leduc</th>
<th>Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan</th>
<th>Sturgeon</th>
<th>Parkland</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NMH Portfolio (1)</td>
<td>26,869</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>30,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs in Core Need</td>
<td>27,020</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>30,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (2)</td>
<td>53,889</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>60,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Level (1/2)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Service Level (SL) refers to the proportion of households in need that are served by the existing Non-Market Housing portfolio. The SL is calculated for the main household types and is useful for establishing priorities and ensuring a balanced portfolio.

** While totals may not add up exactly due to rounding, there is no material change to the service level percentages. **
4.0 Future Housing Market

How housing requirements and needs change over time draws on population and household projections for the region. The method used to generate the projections includes historic fertility, mortality and household formation rates within each sub-region. Population projections include the number of households by age cohort from the growth.

Total household growth under the low and high estimate for the region was examined to assess the implications for future growth in housing requirements. It revealed that, across the region, household growth over the next seven years (2015-2021) is anticipated to average between 10,200 and 12,800 households per year.

The high projection is used in this assessment to estimate the housing requirements resulting from population and employment growth sorted by Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing need and demand. This future need assessment assumes that each sub-region continues to maintain its current share of the region’s population and households. It also assumes that the 2011 incidence of core housing need remains constant.

| T5: Projected Annual Growth in Housing Requirements - Low and High Scenarios³ |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| **LOW GROWTH SCENARIO** |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |                |
| New Housing Requirements | 10,743 | 10,599 | 10,205 | 10,040 | 9,973 | 9,911 | 9,985 | **10,208** |
| **HIGH GROWTH SCENARIO** |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |                |
| New Housing Requirements | 13,116 | 13,093 | 12,747 | 12,622 | 12,660 | 12,598 | 12,699 | **12,791** |

Note: Projecting long-term population and household growth cannot predict economic downturns and the impact on the number of households in need.

³ The population projections used here do not include the adjustment made from the Capital Region Board Growth Plan Update with 2014 municipal census results as this needs assessment requires detailed projections by age and year to project annual housing requirements. The adjustment made for the Growth Plan Update included the total population in 2014 and 2044 only.
4.1 Future Non-Market Housing Needs

Description

The annual growth in housing requirement and need over the next six years is forecast to assist future housing plans. The growth in core need draws on an allocation of overall growth from the regions’ high growth projection, using the incidence of core need by age cohort from 2011. This estimates what proportion of the total household growth (12,971) will be in core need.

Findings

- The number of households in core housing need is projected to grow on average by almost 1,600 annually over the next six years. During the same time period, growth by age cohort varies considerably, as evidenced below:
  - The 15 - 24 age cohort will decrease slightly, on average, by 21 households every year;
  - The 25-44 age cohort will increase by 584 households every year;
  - The 65-74 age cohort will increase on average by 575 households every year;
  - The 75 and over age cohort will increase by 165 households every year.

Assessment

- Over the next six years, the 65 and over age cohort will rapidly grow as a share of the total. In 2015, this cohort will account for 36% of the growth in core need. By 2021, this cohort will account for 56% of the growth in core need.
- Affordable housing units, such as bachelor and one-bedroom units, will be required to meet the needs of this older age cohort.
4.2 Future Market Housing Requirements

Description
Future Market Affordable Housing requirements are calculated using the overall share of households with incomes above the eligible range for Non-Market housing but below median income and thus less able to access ownership. These requirements should be compared to earlier data of the form and type of new homes being constructed.

Findings
- On average, 1,892 new Market Affordable Housing units are required annually to accommodate future growth. A breakdown of the annual housing requirements by age are:
  - 15-24 will decline until 2019 with minimal growth thereafter;
  - 25-44 will increase, on average by 749 households (40% of the growth);
  - 45-64 will increase by 485 households (26% of the growth);
  - 65-74 will increase by 531 households (28% of the growth);
  - 75+ will increase by 152 households (8% of the growth).
- Over the next six years, the 65 and over age cohort will grow more quickly, expanding from 27% to 36% of the total Market Affordable demand, and adding 856 households in 2021.

Assessment
- The decline in the 15-24 age cohort and slow growth of the 25-44 age cohort will influence housing requirements and require a shift in the type of homes developed by the construction industry. Growth in non-family and smaller households will require appropriately sized units with a variety of built form and tenure choices.
- With the large growth of the 65+ cohorts, there is a need to examine the changing housing preferences and needs of an aging population. Again, small sized housing units for seniors and more rental options will be needed.
- These trends are important in terms of built forms; families tend to have 3+ people and non-families are mostly one and some two-person households.
5.0 Gap Analysis

This section summarizes the gaps and potential implications for the Capital Region in view of the overall housing continuum. The data and information from the needs assessment is the foundation for assisting decision making across the region.
5.1 Non-Market Housing Gaps

Description

Non-Market Housing gaps include both an existing backlog in core need and future growth of households in core need. The prioritization of these gaps, based on age and household type, should form the basis for allocating any funding for new Non-Market Housing. This analysis considers only renters, for whom need is high.

Findings

- Renter Households with the highest incidence of need are:
  - Lone-parent renters, 15-29 years of age (66%);
  - Lone-parent renters, 30-44 years of age (54%);
  - Non-family renters, 65 years of age and over (57%).

- Renter Households with the highest number in unmet need are:
  - Lone-parent families, 30-44 years of age (3,840);
  - Non-family households, 45-64 years of age (5,475);
  - Non-family households, 65 years of age and over (5,015).

- Lone-parent families and seniors rank high in terms of numbers and incidence of need, now and into the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T8: Renters in Core Need by Household Type and Age, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone-Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment

- Over the next six years, 37% of the growth in need will be from household maintainers between 30-44 years of age and 36% will come from households between 65-74 years of age. 10% of growth in need will come from households 75 years of age and over.

- All other age cohorts will continue to grow (except the 15-24 age cohort), but will decrease their share of need related to growth.

F17: Renters in Need by Household Type and Age of Maintainer
5.2 Market Housing Gaps

Description
Market Housing gaps include both the existing and future gaps in the supply and need/demand mismatch related to household incomes and housing costs in the region. Understanding existing and future gaps in the housing market is important for developing policy and program responses to address both Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing requirements.

Findings
- The 2011 data indicates a surplus of Market Affordable Housing (based on rent and price). However, these surplus units are occupied by lower income households and should be labeled as a mismatch.
- Separating out renter households reveals there is still a surplus, but it is much smaller. Again, these surplus units are occupied by lower income renter households and should be labeled as a mismatch.
- There is a projected need to add 12,791 homes each year. At least 1,892 of these homes should be modest in form and price to target moderate income households, including newly forming families, singles and seniors seeking to downsize.

Assessment
- The distribution of dwelling units in the Capital Region is skewed in both size and price in favour of larger, higher rent/priced homes.
- There are surpluses, both for singles and families, in the Market Affordable range. However, this is due in part to the absence of lower rent/priced options; lower income households are occupying housing and paying more than 30% of their income.
- The region’s housing stock has likely changed since the 2011 data used in this assessment, with a few years of growth followed by a recent downturn. This needs to be considered in any housing planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of New Households (Annual Average)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 – 29</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 44</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 64</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 74</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T9: Market Affordable Housing, 2015-21
5.3 Summary

Non-Market Housing Gaps
- 30,720 households are in core housing need in the region. These households are distributed among couple families, lone-parent families and single (non-elderly) person households. Of those households in core need, seniors represent 19%, couples 21%, lone-parents 24% and singles 36%.
- To compare to the Non-Market portfolio, 30,163 Non-Market Housing units are fairly evenly distributed between singles (33%), families (34%) and seniors (33%).
- Non-Market Housing needs for seniors will continue to grow as a share of the total need. All other age groups will decline as a share of the total. Future need will continue to be most acute among lone-parent renter households who will require large sized family units.
- The existing Non-Market Housing Portfolio is evenly split between family and non-family households.
- Priority, in the short term, should be given to non-seniors and lone-parents’ housing to address the backlog of need.

Market Affordable Housing Gaps
- The current supply of housing units is sufficient, with a theoretical surplus of more than 30,000 units. If owners are removed, the surplus is less than 11,000 rental units in this rent range. However, the surplus is theoretical because households from the other income ranges occupy many of these dwellings.
- There is a requirement for about 1,900 units of Market Affordable Housing for families, in particular for three and four-bedroom units.

Pure Market Housing Gaps
- The main gaps in Pure Market Housing are the lack of multi-family housing and traditional rental housing in the sub-regions outside of Edmonton. These gaps result in higher housing costs compared to a more diversified and balanced housing stock of structure types and tenures.

### T10: Annual Growth in Housing Need and Demand, 2015-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Requirements</td>
<td>13,116</td>
<td>13,093</td>
<td>12,747</td>
<td>12,622</td>
<td>12,660</td>
<td>12,598</td>
<td>12,699</td>
<td>12,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Market (Need)</td>
<td>1,561</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>1,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Affordable</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>1,868</td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>1,879</td>
<td>1,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Market</td>
<td>9,615</td>
<td>9,586</td>
<td>9,306</td>
<td>9,188</td>
<td>9,172</td>
<td>9,102</td>
<td>9,169</td>
<td>9,306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### T11: Projected Annual Growth in Need and Demand by Sub-Region, 2015-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Region</th>
<th>Existing Needs</th>
<th>Annual Need and Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household Growth</td>
<td>Non-Market Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>27,020</td>
<td>9,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region*</td>
<td>30,720</td>
<td>12,791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals may not add up due to rounding.
6.0 Where To From Here

- Both existing unmet needs and future housing need and demand are used in the development of public policy and planning for Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing across the Capital Region. The development of long-range plans and land use policies can ensure the housing market is balanced and functioning in an inclusive manner, and that it supports initiatives to improve housing affordability, specifically Market Affordable Housing.

- The next step in implementing the Capital Region Board Housing Plan is development of a Regional Planning Framework that would incorporate both Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing and build upon the results of the need assessment.

- The result will be a Regional Housing Plan with a 5-10 year timeframe that (1) incorporates changing trends and gaps in the existing supply of housing with future housing need and demand, and (2) directs the supply of Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing throughout the Capital Region.
The Edmonton Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment identifies housing need and demand to support planning for a diverse range of housing options within the Capital Region. This document is one of six assessments for each Housing Sub-Region.

Edmonton Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment

Headwater Group with Focus Consulting and Gordon & Associates

Draft Updated on April 4, 2016
The Edmonton Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment provides a comprehensive overview of the housing market and demographics in Edmonton, in order to assess the current and future housing needs in the Sub-Region. The Capital Region Board (CRB) developed the Housing Assessment Tool (HAT) used in this assessment as an important first step in providing an overview of the current housing situation, recent trends and future needs in each of its six housing Sub-Regions, toward the creation of an integrated regional housing plan.

**Household Core Need Analysis:**
- There are currently 27,020 renter households estimated to be in core need.
- In this analysis, core need is aligned with Non-Market housing; while 27,020 are in core need, the current stock of Non-Market options coincidently also totals almost 27,000 units, so it is necessary to double the stock to fully address the backlog of need.
- Lone parent families and non-elderly singles who rent have the highest incidence and number of households in need of Non-Market Housing.
- As the population and number of households grow, so will need. Total households are estimated to grow by 10,300. Of this growth 13% (1,293) are likely to be in core need. A further 1,428 will be moderate income and require homes in the mid-range of rent and prices, so a market response to this demand is needed.

**Existing Core Need by Household Type, 2011**
- **Singles:** 38%
- **Families:** 46%
- **Seniors:** 16%

**Projected Growth in Need and Demand, 2015-21**
- **Non-Market:** 1,293 (13%)
- **Market Affordable:** 1,428 (14%)
- **Pure Market:** 6,471 (74%)

27,020 of CRB Renter Households currently in Core Need, spending >30% of income on housing

Pure Market = Housing affordable to households above median income

Non-Market = Households in core housing

Market Affordable = Housing affordable to households below median income
Estimated future core need housing requirements

- The total core need, and thus requirements for Non-Market Housing, is expected to grow by 1,300 households per year.
- Initially most of this growth will come from non-elderly households, especially those aged 25-44. Many of these will be lone parents and singles, so smaller lower cost units are required.
- Over the next six years, growth in need shifts to those over 65 years of age.
- These two household types both require lower rent options and smaller (one-bed) apartments.

Housing Stock Considerations:

- The predominant forms of housing supply and new housing starts across the Region are detached single-family homes, which meet the requirements of families with children. In Edmonton there is a more diverse mix of dwelling types than in the remainder of the Region.
- 59% of recent starts in Edmonton have been in multi-unit form, which responds well to the growing requirements of smaller households.
- The critical issue is the rent/price of new starts, which are generally above price levels affordable to either households in core need or to households in the affordable market range.
- Planning policy and incentives could be used to encourage a market response that more fully meets emerging housing requirements in terms of built form and rent/price.
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1.0 Introduction

Note: In this report, Edmonton means the “Edmonton Housing Sub-Region” which in this case is the City of Edmonton.

The Edmonton Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment identifies housing need and demand to support planning for a diverse range of housing options within the Capital Region. Needs Assessments are also available for the Lamont, Leduc, Parkland, Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan, and Sturgeon Housing Sub-Regions (see Diagram 1).

The purpose of the Needs Assessment is to:
- Inform the Capital Region Board of existing and projected Non-Market Housing need and Market Affordable Housing supply, need and demand conditions, and trends in each Sub-Region;
- Lead to a coordinated planning approach to meet housing need and demand through a sufficient supply and balanced mix of dwelling types across the housing continuum in each Sub-Region.

The Needs Assessments are not intended to identify and assess the availability and gaps in community amenities and support services. Amenities and services required by households in need will be identified and coordinated during the planning and delivery of Non-Market Housing.

The Needs Assessments for all six housing Sub-Regions are to inform Sub-Regional Housing Plans that are part of the Capital Region Board Regional Housing Planning process (see Diagram 2).
1.0 Introduction (continued)

The Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessment follows the nine-step approach outlined in the Capital Region Board Housing Needs Assessment Framework\(^1\). The Framework includes a Housing Assessment Tool (HAT) that extrapolates core data to assess the current housing situation, recent trends and future patterns of development across the Region.

**Report Structure**

This Needs Assessment Report provides core data in four main sections:

- Housing Market Overview – Housing stock, prices and household characteristics;
- Households in Need – Core housing need estimates;
- Future Housing Market – Housing, rental market continuum, housing need and demand 2015-2021;
- Gap Analysis – Existing and future housing need gaps, Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing.

In the sub-regional assessments, a comparison is made between the Sub-Region and the aggregate regional total. The Edmonton Sub-Region carries a large weighting in the aggregate regional total, so such comparisons are less useful. Most comparisons have been omitted from this assessment, however where retained, the comparison is against the entire Region, including the City of Edmonton (i.e. it is not a comparison of Edmonton versus the rest of the Region).

**Appendices**

Appendix A: Data Sources* and Limitations
Appendix B: The Housing Continuum Demand and Supply Mismatch – Methodology and Assumptions
Appendix C: Glossary and Acronyms

* Figures 14, 15, and 17 use CMHC data and Figure 16 uses Edmonton Real Estate Board data. All other Figures use data from the Canada Census, mainly the National Household Survey (NHS) for 2011 and the Long Form Census for previous years.

\(^1\) Capital Region Board (2014) Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessment Framework
2.0 Housing Market Overview

The Housing Market Overview describes the status of the housing market in the Edmonton Sub-Region and contrasts it against the Capital Region in four main areas:

- Housing Stock Characteristics;
- Population and Household Characteristics;
- Household Income Profile;
- House Prices and Rental Rates.

Many of the variables used in this section will form the baseline from which future progress will be measured. A thorough understanding of the local housing market and conditions is fundamental to develop effective policy and program responses.
2.1 Housing Stock Characteristics: Current State (2011)

Description
Housing stock characteristics include dwelling type, tenure, age and condition of supply. This establishes the context for housing options and trends.

Findings
- Edmonton has 70% of the population and 72% of all households for the Region (2011).
- There is a wider mix and blend of dwelling forms, compared to other Sub-Regions.
- 51% of all dwellings are detached homes and 65% are owned, compared to over 80% in all of the other Sub-Regions.
- A large share (31%) of dwellings are apartments.
- There are almost 325,000 dwellings and just over 114,000 (35%) of these are rented (mainly in apartment buildings).
- Single detached homes are predominantly owner occupied (90%); apartments are predominantly rented (although more recent additions are frequently condominiums).
- Edmonton has a slightly older housing stock than the Region; 53% of the dwellings were constructed before 1980 compared to 49% for the Region. Recent starts (as reflected in the NHS census) have lagged, with only 21% of the dwellings constructed since 2000 compared to 24% for the Region.
- Edmonton’s housing is in a reasonable state of repair. Overall, 7% require major repair.
- This includes 6% of owner occupied stock and 9% of rental units, most of which are in this Sub-Region.

Assessment
- There is a reasonable balance between high-density multi-unit housing and low-density mainly detached homes. In Edmonton, 35% of the population are renters.
- 41% of dwellings are multi-unit (apartment and row). Many of these are rentals.
- From a built form perspective, the stock (supply) reasonably approximates demand. As discussed later, there is a mismatch in tenure and pricing, relative to what people can afford.

**Description**

Housing supply is assessed by examining trends in new construction, including built form (type) and intended tenure at time of construction of new starts.

**Findings**

- Housing starts in Edmonton (and elsewhere) fell noticeably during the global financial crisis of 2008-09, but thereafter gained considerable momentum, reaching a peak in 2015 (despite declining oil prices beginning in late 2014).
- Edmonton has been increasing its share of housing starts. Since 2006, it has accounted for, on average, 71% of all starts in the Region. In 2014 and 2015, this rose to more than 75%.
- Dwelling starts in Edmonton are more diverse than other Sub-Regions. Multi-unit construction has underpinned this expansion.
- Many apartments target the ownership market as condominiums. Most starts have been targeted to buyers. Apart from 2012 and 2015, there has been minimal volume of rental construction.
- Some rental construction may have been due, in part, to increased activity from federal and provincial affordable housing subsidy programs.

**Assessment**

- In recent years, new construction has favoured multi-unit products. This helps to create a broader range of options (form and price) for a broader range of demand.
- While the rental starts in 2012 and 2015 are encouraging, rental options for lower income households are still limited. 35% of households are renters, but over the past decade, only 11% of new starts have been intended for rental use.
2.3 Household Characteristics: Type and Size (2011)

**Description**
Two household characteristics are assessed: type and size of households.

**Findings**
- 64% of the household types in Edmonton are families compared to 80% in the Region.
- 36% of household types are non-family and singles compared to 20% for the Region.
- Among families, 9% of household types are lone parents compared to 7% for the Region.
- 29% of the non-family households are single person households compared to 17% in the rest the Region.
- 7% are households of two or more unrelated persons sharing accommodation compared to 3% in the rest the Region.
- 29% of households consist of one person.

**Assessment**
- The high proportion of single and other non-family households reflects the larger range of options and rentals available in Edmonton compared to other Sub-Regions.
- With one and two person households making up 62% of all households, and this increasing as families age and children leave home, there is likely to be demand for more small sized homes. Recent starts suggest the industry is responding to the shifting demand, however, it will take some years to catch up with demand. New apartments are not being built in affordable price ranges and will not meet the demand and need from lower income households.
- 9% of families have 5+ persons; an undersupply of large sized units, especially at affordable rents, exists in the rental sector.
2.4 Household Characteristics: Age of Household Maintainer (2011)

Description

Two characteristics of household maintainers are assessed: age and tenure, including percent of households in each age cohort that are owners.

Findings

- Young households under 25 years of age comprise a very small proportion of the population and most are renters.
- First time buyers are typically those aged 25 to 39. In Edmonton, 54% of households in this age cohort have purchased a home, a much lower percentage than the overall ownership rate of 65% in the Region.
- A high proportion of households over 45 years of age own homes. The same age-cohort ownership rates are lower for the Region.
- The proportion of household maintainers 55-64 and 65 years old and over are similar to that of the Region.
- The largest cohorts are those aged 25-39 and 40-54 years of age.

Assessment

- Edmonton has a significant percentage of households aged 25-39 and 40-54. Many within these two age cohorts are renters. Some rent as a lifestyle choice (greater mobility) while others rent because they cannot afford to buy.
- Adding options for entry-level purchase could help these households transition to ownership and would free up rental units. Incentives to increase development of rental units would also be beneficial.
- A low proportion of renters over 55 years of age may reflect the option for such households to move to an apartment form but continue to own (i.e. condominiums).
2.5 Household Characteristics: Tenure by Household Type (2011)

**Description**
The ratio of household types by tenure is partly determined by the makeup of the housing stock. There are 114,000 renters in Edmonton. They occupy 35% of the housing stock. This chart focuses only on this subset of households.

**Findings**
- 54% of renter households are non-families compared to 52% in the Region.
- 41% of non-family households are single persons. 13% are made up of two or more unrelated people compared to 12% for the Region.
- Families, particularly two parent families, have a slightly higher representation than in the Region.
- Other family, including multi families and families with boarders, account for 6% of renter households.

**Assessment**
- Edmonton has a higher proportion of families that rent than the other Sub-Regions.
- Non-family households, particularly singles, represent the majority of renter households and reflect the availability of one and two bed units in the apartment rental stock.
2.6 Household Income Profile (2011)

Description
Household income provides a base indicator to determine affordability. Median household income is used to determine a household’s ability to find housing in their community at an affordable price.

Findings
- Incomes for both owners and renters in Edmonton tend to be lower than the median income in the other Sub-Regions.
- Owners tend to have much higher incomes than renters. In Edmonton, renter incomes are about 50% of owner incomes.
- Lower household incomes in Edmonton are reflected in the following:
  - Fewer two-earner, older, established households than the Region;
  - More renters, which on average have much lower household incomes than the Region.
- Edmonton has a smaller proportion of high-income households compared to the Region. It also has more low-income households (especially singles) than the Region.
- Households with income between $20,000—$60,000 make up 30% of all households.
- Edmonton has a disproportionate share of very low-income households. It accommodates 71% of households in the Region, but 83% of those earning under $20,000 in income.

Assessment
- Lower incomes reflect the larger number of renters and smaller, single person, single earner households.
- A higher number and proportion of lower income renters indicates a need for low rent affordable options and assistance.
- Edmonton has a large number of both low income and high income households.
2.7 House Prices (Current)

Description
Current house prices reveal the cost to purchase a house in Edmonton based on recent data from the Edmonton Real Estate Board augmented by 2011 NHS data.

Findings
- Detached house sale prices average $395,400, which is not significantly different from the Region median at 402,000 (2014).
- Condominiums provide a relatively affordable alternative to detached homes, with a median price equal to 58% of SFDs.
- NHS data (2011), which reflects the owners’ assessment of their home value, suggests more homes are in the lower price ranges than the rest of the Sub-Regions. This reflects an older and more diverse stock including lower pricing of condominiums, which are less prevalent in the Sub-Regions surrounding Edmonton.
- NHS data (occupant-assessed price) shows a higher proportion of homes under $400,000 and a lower proportion above $400,000 compared to the Region.
- Edmonton has a smaller percent of homes (16%) priced above $500,000 compared to the Region (19%).

Assessment
- The larger availability of condominium apartments and townhomes in Edmonton helps to create a broader and lower price range of options for buyers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Type</th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th>Region*</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>$395,400</td>
<td>$402,000</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/Row</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>$332,000</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condo</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>$233,000</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Region includes City of Edmonton
2.8 Rental Rates (Current)

Description
The CMHC rental survey, which covers only purpose-built structures of 3+ units, does not reflect rented SFDs and other informal types of rentals. These are captured in the Distribution of Rents (F13).

Findings
- CMHC-surveyed rents are similar to the Region average. Bachelor rental rates are significantly higher than the Region, while one and three-bedroom rental rates are only a little higher, and two-bedrooms are lower.
- NHS data (2011) shows the average rent was lower in Edmonton than the Region.
- There are few rental units available below $600 per month and only a limited number between $600-800 per month. The Edmonton Sub-Region does have a larger proportion in the mid-market $600-1200 per month range.
- However, 77% of rental units are above $800 per month and are skewed toward the higher end of the range.

Assessment
- Edmonton has a large rental stock, including both conventional apartments (CMHC surveys structures with 3+units) and units in the secondary market (suites in homes, rented homes and investor owned condominiums). However, there are a limited number of lower rent, affordable units.
- The lack of options in rent ranges below $800 per month creates significant affordability challenges for lower income households, including singles, seniors and lone parents.

T3: Average Apartment Rental Rates, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Apartment Rental Rates</th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>$844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-bedroom</td>
<td>$1,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-bedroom</td>
<td>$1,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ bedroom</td>
<td>$1,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average</td>
<td>$1,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F13: Distribution of Rents, 2011

Monthly Rent Ranges ($)

- <400
- 400-600
- 600-800
- 800-1000
- 1000-1200
- 1200-1500
- 1500-2000
- 2000+
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2.9 House Prices (Trends)

Description
Trends in house prices and rental rates reveal the changing costs to live in Edmonton and provide an indicator of cost barriers for different household types. This assessment draws on both CMHC new price data as well as MLS data from the Edmonton Real Estate Board.

Findings
- Up until 2014, prices for new homes have tracked the Region median. Prices were relatively stable between 2010 and 2014 but trended up in 2014, prior to the fall in oil prices and associated impact on the Alberta economy.
- The first quartile new home price is above $350,000, a high price for entry-level buyers.
- The CMHC new home survey tracks SFDs and semi-detached. MLS sales provide a full range of sales types.
- Resale home prices, as reflected in the MLS median (which also includes condominium and row) have followed a moderate path. Prices for SFDs fell in 2007-09. Thereafter, detached homes recommenced an increasing trend, while condominium prices increased only modestly. Since 2009, prices have changed as follows:
  - Single-family 2%
  - Semi-detached 3%
  - Condo/apartment -9%

Assessment
- New house prices command a premium over existing dwellings.
- Resale house prices are more affordable, influenced by smaller, higher density options, including row and apartment condominiums.
- Lower priced housing options, such as condominiums and other higher density accommodation, help to meet the demand from smaller households and first time homebuyers.
2.10 Rental Rates (Trends)

Description
Trends in rental rates detail the overall changes in rent levels and include a comparison of existing versus newly constructed rental units (CMHC surveyed purpose built structures of 3+ units).

Findings
- Apartment rents have increased from an average of $745 per month in 2006 to $1,126 per month in 2014. This is an increase of 6% per year, well above inflation.
- As presented earlier in Figure 4, new rental construction has been low, especially prior to 2009. A comparison of rents for units built after 2000 to rents for older stock (which dominate the average) shows that new units tend to have rents that are more expensive.
- Rents for units built after 2012 are 25% above the average rents for units built prior to 2000. In 2014, the average rent for units built prior to 2000 was $1,098 per month compared to $1,386 per month for new units.
- Condominiums have become a significant source of new rental units, but tend to rent at high levels.

Assessment
- After 2009, strong in-migration to Edmonton and subsequently low vacancy rates have helped to stimulate some construction of rental units. However, the new rental units, except when supported by subsidy programs, are not affordable to moderate income households.
2.10 Rental Rates (continued)

Description
Examining trends in rental distribution can provide insight into how the housing market responds to need and demand. These charts show both the rent distribution for three census periods and how rent distribution has changed over that period.

Findings
- Edmonton has a stock of 114,000 rental units, including those surveyed by CMHC (the formal “purpose built” stock) and those in the secondary market (suites in homes, rented homes and investor owned condominiums).
- The secondary market is a significant part of the rental system. Purpose built rental starts totalled 733 between 2006 and 2011, however, the census universe increased by 2,800, so 2,000 of these were in informal stock.
- After 2001, the distribution of rent shifted from predominantly lower rent ranges (blue columns) to predominantly higher rent units (green columns).
- Between 2001 and 2011, the number of units with rents below $600 per month declined by 45,000. A further 16,000 units with rents between $600 and $800 per month were lost.
- In 2011, only 26,000 units, representing 23% of the rental stock, had rents under $800 per month.

Assessment
- More renters experience affordability challenges because of the erosion of lower rent units.
- Promoting new rental development is important, but it is also critical to monitor erosion of the existing affordable low rent stock.
- More affordable options are required to replace the affordable units lost and to encourage and enable lower income families, single people and seniors to live in Edmonton.
2.11 The Housing Continuum

The concept of a housing continuum is widely adopted across Canadian municipalities to help identify where gaps exist between need and demand versus supply. It locates housing need and requirements against a continuum of options. These range from subsidized or Non-Market housing through moderate rent/priced market options, called Market Affordable, to full market priced options both in the rental and ownership sector.

The following terms are used to reflect this range throughout the remainder of this report:

A. **Non-Market** describes households with incomes below those required to access social housing. This translates to 35% of median household income for singles and 50% of median income for families. This includes the homeless who require support services that are either provided in-house or delivered separately via community support services agencies.

B. **Market Affordable** describes the income group accessing modest to mid rent/priced homes. They have incomes above those required to be eligible for social housing ("A" above), but below those needed to have wide market choice (as defined by "C" below).

C. **Pure (or Full) Market** housing is that which starts at the regional entry-level home prices (median condominium for singles and first quartile detached home for family). Converting these into incomes (income required to buy at entry-level price, as defined) results in a benchmark pegged at 50% of median family income for singles and 80% of median income for families. Households with incomes above these thresholds are deemed able to rent/buy at market prices.

Using these income thresholds, households are allocated into one of the three income demand categories and dwelling units are similarly sorted into one of three categories, based on rents and prices derived at 30% of the related income thresholds. See Appendix B for method and details.

(Source: 2009 Capital Region Housing Plan)

### Description

- **Non-Market Housing**
  - 15-20% of households whose housing needs are not met by the market
  - Housing operated, funded or created by government funding and is comprised of different categories of housing based on the associated services included and the level of public funding achieved
  - Requires direct capital and/or operating subsidies to enable rents or ownership costs to be provided for short or long term occupancy by lower income and/or special needs households

- **Subsidized Housing**
  - Receives direct subsidies enabling rents to be provided on a geared to income basis for a range of low-income and/or special needs households
  - 65-80% Below Median Income

- **Affordable Housing**
  - 80-100% Below Median Income

- **Market Housing**
  - 80-85% of households whose housing need and demand is sufficiently met by the private market
  - Rental and Ownership housing provided by the Private Sector

- **Market Affordable**
  - Household income can exceed median income. Minimum rent or ownership changes calculated through private financing based on cost effective construction
  - 100-150% Above Median Income (Moderate Income Level)

---
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2.12 Housing Availability and Requirements by Income Band

Availability of rental units (blue bars) compared to households of a specific income range (red bars) in the housing continuum identifies rental unit mismatches in Edmonton (green bar). The maximum income benchmarks, associated maximum affordable rents, and house prices used to quantify this continuum are presented in detail in Appendix B.

Findings and Assessment

- There is a shortage of 6,115 rental units affordable to households with incomes in the Non-Market category of the continuum (singles with income below $29,750; families below $42,500). The shortage is more acute for singles (Appendix B). Without sufficient lower priced options, these households have to live in units in the more expensive Market Affordable category (approximately $1,000 per month), and have to pay in excess of 30% of their income.
- The single-person households earn less than $29,750 and require housing, such as bachelor and one-bedroom apartments, that cost less than $744 per month. Currently, there are limited numbers of this type of housing.
- The shortage of 4,788 Pure Market rental units is theoretical because these higher income households can and do live in lower rent Market Affordable Housing surplus rental units.
2.13 Rental Rates and Household Income Balance

Description
An indicator of the number of rental units required by rental price range can be determined by comparing the rental units in each rent range (units available) to renter incomes, using 30% of income as an affordability measure to convert their income into a rent range (units required, based on income). Based on this assessment, the net mismatch in each rent range (Figure 22) shows the shortages and surpluses by rent range.

Findings
- There are an insufficient number of units with rents below $750 per month. Most units have rents in the mid-range of $750 to $1,500 per month. These are expensive for many low-income households who consequently pay more than 30% of their income for housing.
- The net rental market mismatch shows a shortage of 15,000 units with rents under $500 per month.

Assessment
- Many lower income renters must rent housing in the $500 per month or higher ranges and pay in excess of 30%, and for some over 50%, of their income for housing.
- The shortage (23,250) of high rent units ($2000 and over) is theoretical (see Section 2.12). Higher income households can and do live in units with lower rents.
2.14 Rental Market Supply and Affordability

Description
The comparison of actual units in the stock (2011) against the number required, based on income and affordability at 30% of income, can be further examined by separating family and non-family (mainly singles) households and associated larger versus smaller units. This mismatch analysis is one way to examine gaps in the housing system. It shows a mismatch between what households can reasonably afford to pay for rent and what they have to pay for rent. This analysis is based solely on income and rent levels. It does not consider whether the homes are appropriate in size.

Findings
- There is a shortage of more than 15,000 units for households with incomes under $20,000, who cannot afford to pay more than $500 per month for rent.
- Over 80% (12,000) of this group are non-family households.
- Most rental units exist in the mid-ranges, between $750 to $1,500 per month (shown by dotted line), creating a theoretical surplus in these rent ranges. In reality, both lower and higher income single person households occupy these rental units, so this is not so much a shortage as a mismatch of rental units overall.

Assessment
- The rent distribution (dotted line) does not match the income distribution. As a result, there are insufficient low rent units.
- The lack of low rent options means low income households live in homes that are more expensive relative to their income and pay over 30% (and sometimes over 50%) for shelter.
- An increased supply of low rent options or rental assistance is required.
3.0 Households in Need

Determining need and demand for Non-Market Housing and Market Affordable Housing is one of several reasons for undertaking a housing needs assessment. Comparing the distribution of the households in Non-Market Housing need and Market Affordable Housing demand across the Region will point to current and future gaps. Consistent and reliable data is required to develop integrated plans to address housing imbalances in the Sub-Region and Region. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) has developed a Core Housing Need measure, which uses a two-step process to identify the number and incidence of households in need of housing:

- Does a household experience any one of or a combination of problems based on three standard measures of suitability (number of bedrooms compared to household composition), condition (need for major repair) and affordability (paying greater than 30% of income)? And,
- Is the household’s gross income below a specified threshold (which is calculated separately for each Census Metropolitan Area [CMA] and for each household size)?

Another approach is to examine households experiencing severe shelter cost burdens. This is represented by housing costs in excess of 50% of income from the 2011 National Households Survey (NHS). This measure of acute need is used alongside core need (which uses 30% of income) as a way to help understand which households face a significant housing cost challenge.

As mentioned in the discussion on the housing continuum, the homeless are included in the Non-Market Housing category. Although the homeless are not included in the core need data\(^2\), they are an important aspect of need in all of the Sub-Regions, most significantly in Edmonton. Edmonton does a bi-annual count of the homeless. The 2012 count in Edmonton found 2,252 people to be homeless, which would add another 8.3% of core housing need in the city.

\(^2\) Core Housing Need estimates are derived from the Canada Census every five years, which does not count the homeless.
3.1 Core Housing Need Estimates (2011)

Description
The absolute number of households in core need, along with the incidence rate of different household types, reveals which subgroups (by tenure, age and family type) experience challenges.

Findings
- Because the Edmonton makes up such a large part of the Region, there is a similar distribution of need in Edmonton compared to the Region for all three problem types.
- Affordability is a much larger problem than crowding and condition.
- 14% of the problems are crowding and 13% are poor physical condition of dwellings.
- 13,000 owner households (6%) are in core need. Owners also have an asset in their property that provides financial security not available to renters.
- 27,020 renters experience core housing need and have an incidence rate of 26%.

Assessment
- The incidence and severity of need is much higher among renter households.
- Actions to address core need should focus on renter households.
3.1 Core Housing Need Estimates (continued)

Description
Renters have a high incidence of core need. The charts focus on renter households to identify those in greatest need.

Findings
- Core housing need is most prevalent among lone parent families and non-family households. Over 14,000 non-family households (mainly single persons) are in need. This represents one in every four households.
- 6,700 lone parents live in Edmonton with an incidence rate of 49%.
- 6,000 couple families experience core need with an incidence rate of 17%.
- 14,000 non family renter households experience core housing need with an incidence rate of 26%.
- 4,450 senior households experience core need with an incidence rate of 43%. They are twice as likely to be in need compared to households less than 65 years of age.
- Just over 9,000 renters, aged 30-44 are in need, with an incidence rate of 27%.

Assessment
- See next page.
## 3.1 Core Housing Need Estimates (continued)

### Description
Combining incidence of need by age and household type indicates who is in core need.

### Findings
- The age groups and household types with the highest incidence of core need are:
  - Lone-parent renters 15-29 years of age (67%);
  - Lone-parents renters 30-44 years of age (56%);
  - Single-person renters 65 and over years of age (56%).
- 83% of renters in need are under 65 years old. Non-senior, non-family households (mainly singles) account for 37% of all need.

### Assessment
- Lone parents and non-senior single renters have the highest need of all households in Edmonton.
- In part, the high levels of need among singles and lone parents reflect the low numbers of small sized, lower cost housing starts and limited numbers of existing rental stock available for singles and small households.

### Table T4: Renters in Core Need by Household Type and Age of Maintainer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15 to 29 years</th>
<th>30 to 44 years</th>
<th>45 to 64 years</th>
<th>65+ years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Families</strong></td>
<td>3,310</td>
<td>6,160</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>12,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Couples</strong></td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>6,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lone-Parent</strong></td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>3,395</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>6,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Family</strong></td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>5,065</td>
<td>3,830</td>
<td>14,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,450</td>
<td>9,135</td>
<td>7,975</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>27,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Acute Need

Description

The 2011 National Household Survey (NHS) identifies households that pay more than 50% of their income for housing and are experiencing acute housing needs.*

Findings

- The data shows 21,000 non-family singles have the highest number in acute need. One in every five such households pays more than 50% of their income for rent.
- 10,000 couple family households are in acute need with an incidence rate of 6%.
- Lone parents have a high need, with 20% paying more than 50% of their income for housing.
- If households paying in excess of 100% (10,000) of their income are excluded, the data shows 12,000 singles paying 50% to 100% of their income for housing.
- Some households paying over 50% of their income on housing may be seniors who have low income, but draw down savings to cover costs.
- Across all household types, 22% of renter households pay more than 50% of their income for rent.

Assessment

- Data issues (see footnote) influence acute need, but the high incidence of acute need is a significant concern, representing one in five renter households.

* 5% of all households (8.5% of renters) in the Region pay over 100% of their income for housing. This is a statistical anomaly caused in part by change in household composition or status in prior years. It occurs because NHS collects shelter cost in April 2011, but income data is for the prior year. While included here, this data should be treated with caution.
3.3 Non-Market Housing Portfolio

**Description**
The Non-Market Housing portfolio (Table 5) is assessed to determine who and how many households are being served in comparison to the households that are in need in Edmonton. Emergency shelters are typically for overnight stays only. Transitional accommodation is temporary and usually has a maximum stay period. All other accommodation is permanent.

**Findings**
- There are 26,869 Non-Market Housing units in Edmonton, representing slightly over 89% of the portfolio in the Region.
- The various programs have different subsidy provisions:
  - Programs 1 – 7 are deep subsidy programs;
  - Programs 5 – 7 are Rent-Geared-To-Income (30%);
  - Program 8 consists of RGI and fixed rate (below market) subsidies;
  - Programs 9, 10, and 12 are 10 – 15% below market;
  - Program 11 is homeownership.

**Assessment**
- The Non-Market Housing portfolio consists of a variety of different types of accommodations with different subsidy levels.
- The deep subsidy programs were funded in the mid 1970’s to mid 1990’s. The majority of the portfolio developed since 2000 are shallow subsidy programs like Affordable Housing (10 – 15% below market rental rates).

---

### T5: Edmonton Non-Market Housing Portfolio by Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Housing/Program</th>
<th>Number of Units/Beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Emergency Shelters</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transitional Accommodation</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Permanent Supportive Housing (Lodge)</td>
<td>3,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supported Housing - Semi-independent</td>
<td>4,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-Profit Housing</td>
<td>1,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Community Housing</td>
<td>4,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Seniors’ Self-Contained Housing</td>
<td>3,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rent Supplements</td>
<td>1,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Affordable Housing</td>
<td>4,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Co-op Housing</td>
<td>1,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Secondary Suites</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Other (Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,869</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Edmonton

* There is a wide range of supportive living facilities designed to serve health and related accommodation and nutritional needs. SL2 (Lodge level accommodation) is included in the Non-Market Housing portfolio, but the SL-3 (Assisted Living), SL-4 (Enhanced Assisted Living), SL-4d (Dementia Care) and Continuing Care accommodation are not included mainly because they are health (not income) related and must qualify through Alberta Health Services for entry. Also, the majority of beds/units are not subsidized at any given point in time and should not be included in Non-Market housing portfolio.
3.3 Non-Market Housing Portfolio (continued)

Description

The number of units in the Non-Market Housing portfolio and relative level of access to those units by different household types determines the priority for addressing the current households in need. Here the existing portfolio is compared to the need.

Findings

- The Edmonton Sub-Region dominates Non-Market Housing portfolios and, therefore, data comparison is not meaningful. However, a comparison does show very few Non-Market Housing options exist outside of Edmonton.
- The existing portfolio is fairly evenly distributed between families (34%), non-elderly singles (35%) and seniors (30%).
- While the level of service of the existing portfolio is 48% overall, the level for families (43%) and non-elderly singles (50%) is lower than for seniors (65%).

Assessment

- The first priority for any new Non Market Housing Initiatives is bringing service levels in line with core housing need by household type. The low level of service makes families the immediate priority.
- The assessment of need is based on core need, which does not capture the homeless population. Accordingly, the service levels, especially for singles, are likely over-represented.

| T6: Non-Market Housing Portfolio by Household Type |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|       | Families | Singles | Seniors | Total |
|       | HHs | % | HHs | % | HHs | % | HHs | % |
| Edmonton | 9,258 | 34% | 9,485 | 35% | 8,126 | 30% | 26,869 | 100% |
| Region | 10,355 | 34% | 9,929 | 33% | 9,901 | 33% | 30,163 | 100% |

| T7: Non-Market Housing Portfolio Service Level* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|       | Families | Singles | Seniors | Total** |
|       | HHs | % | HHs | % | HHs | % | HHs | % |
| NMH Portfolio (1) | 9,258 | 34% | 9,485 | 35% | 8,126 | 30% | 26,869 | 100% |
| HHs in Need | 12,380 | 46% | 10,185 | 38% | 4,445 | 16% | 27,020 | 100% |
| Total (2) | 21,638 | 40% | 19,670 | 37% | 12,571 | 24% | 53,889 | 100% |
| Service Level (1/2) | 43% | 48% | 65% | 50% |

Source: City of Edmonton
* The Service Level (SL) refers to the proportion of the households in need that are served by the existing Non-Market Housing portfolio. The SL is calculated for the main household types and is useful for establishing priorities and ensuring a balanced portfolio.
** While totals may not add up exactly due to rounding, there is no material change to the service level percentages.
4.0 Future Housing Market

How housing requirements and needs change over time draws on population and household projections for the Region. The method used to generate the projections include historic fertility, mortality and household formation rates within each Sub-Region. Population projections include the number of households by age cohort from the growth.

The high projection is used in this assessment to estimate the housing requirements resulting from population and employment growth sorted by Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing need and demand. This future need assessment assumes that each Sub-Region continues to maintain its current share of the Region’s population and households. It also assumes that the 2011 incidence of core housing need remains constant.

Total household growth under the low and high projection for the Region was examined to assess the implications for future growth in housing requirements. It revealed that across the Region, household growth over the next six years (2015-2021) is anticipated to average between 10,200-12,800 households per year. This section examines how this affects growth and need in the Edmonton Sub-Region.

T8: Projected Annual Growth in Housing Requirements – Low and High Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Housing Requirements</td>
<td>LOW GROWTH SCENARIO</td>
<td>10,743</td>
<td>10,599</td>
<td>10,205</td>
<td>10,040</td>
<td>9,973</td>
<td>9,911</td>
<td>9,985</td>
<td>10,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Housing Requirements</td>
<td>HIGH GROWTH SCENARIO</td>
<td>13,116</td>
<td>13,093</td>
<td>12,747</td>
<td>12,622</td>
<td>12,598</td>
<td>12,660</td>
<td>12,699</td>
<td>12,791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Projecting long-term population and household growth cannot predict economic downturns and the impact on the number of households in need.

---

3 The population projections used here do not include the adjustment made from the Capital Region Board Growth Plan Update with 2014 municipal census results as this needs assessment requires detailed projections by age and year to project annual housing requirements. The adjustment made for the Growth Plan Update included the total population in 2014 and 2044 only.
4.1 Future Non-Market Housing Needs

**Description**

Projecting the annual growth in housing requirements and needs over the next six years is required for future housing planning. The growth in need presented here draws on an allocation of overall growth from the Region’s high projection scenario and uses the incidence of core need by age cohort from 2011.

**Findings**

- The number of renters in core housing need in Edmonton is projected to grow on average by 1,300 annually over the next six years. During the same time period, growth by age cohorts varies considerably:
  - 15-24 will decrease marginally by 16 households every year;
  - 25-44 will increase on average by 498 households every year, which is 39% of the growth in households in need;
  - 45-64 will increase on average by 254 households or 13% of the total every year;
  - 65-74 will increase on average by 433 households or 33% of the growth in households in need;
  - 75+ will increase more slowly, by 124 households per year or 10% of total growth every year.
- Over the next six years, the 65 and over age cohort will gradually expand its share of the total and all other age groups will decline.

**Assessment**

- 43% of the future growth of households in need will be from households 65 years of age and over. Affordable housing units, such as bachelor and one-bedroom units, will be required to meet the needs of this age cohort.
- Family rental units will be required to address needs of family households, including lone parent families.

---

**T9: Projected Annual Growth of Households in Need by Age, 2015-21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Future Market Housing Requirements

Description
Future Market Affordable Housing requirements are calculated using the overall share of households with incomes above the eligible range for Non-Market Housing but unable to access ownership. These requirements should be compared to earlier data on the form and type of new homes being constructed.

Findings
- 1,428 new Market Affordable Housing units are required annually to accommodate future growth. This represents 11% of new homes required. A breakdown of the annual housing requirements by age are:
  - 15-24 will decline until 2018 with minimal growth thereafter;
  - 25-44 will increase by 566 households (40% of the growth);
  - 45-64 will increase by 366 households (26% of the growth);
  - 65-74 will increase by 401 households (28% of the growth);
  - 75+ will increase by 115 households (8% of the growth).
- Over the next six years, the 65 and over age cohort will grow quickly and expand as a share of the total.

Assessment
- All cohorts over the age of 25 are increasing in size; however, the share of growth will gradually shift in favour of older households. Initially those aged 65-74 will grow most quickly, followed by those over 75 years of age.
- Planning should assess the housing preference and a requirement for supported living as this older cohort expands.
- There is likely to be less demand for larger detached homes as seniors downsize and release existing homes to younger families.

T10: Projected Annual Growth of Market Affordable Demand by Age, 2015-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>1,414</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F32: Projected Annual Growth in Market Affordable Demand by Age, 2015-21

![Graph showing projected annual growth in market affordable demand by age](image-url)
5.0 Gap Analysis

This section summarizes the gaps and potential implications for the housing continuum in the Edmonton Housing Sub-Region. The data and information from the needs assessment is the foundation for developing a Sub-Regional Housing Plan.
5.1 Non-Market Housing Gaps

Description
Non-Market Housing gaps include both existing and future growth of households in core need. The prioritization of these gaps, based on age and household type, will form the basis for allocating any funding for new Non-Market Housing. This considers only renters, for whom need is high.

Findings
- Renter Households with the highest incidence of need are:
  - Young lone parent renters 15-29 years of age (67%);
  - Lone parent renters 30-44 (56%);
  - Single-person renters 65+ years of age (56%).
- Renter Households with the highest number in need are:
  - Non-senior single-persons (10,185);
  - Couples (5,865);
  - Lone-parent families (6,390).
- Over the next six years, 39% of the growth in need will be from households between 30 and 44 years of age and 43% will come from households 65 years and older, especially non-elderly seniors between 65-74 years of age.

Assessment
- Lone-parent families and non-elderly seniors rank high in terms of numbers and incidence of need, now and into the future.
- The 65 and over age cohort will continue to grow and increase its share of the total number of households in need over the next six years.
- All other age cohorts will continue to grow (except the 15-24 age cohort), but will decrease their share of need related to growth.
- The existing needs of non-elderly singles and low-income families must also be priority in the near term to ensure a balance between needs and service levels (supply of Non-Market Housing).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Non-senior</th>
<th>15 to 29 years</th>
<th>30 to 44 years</th>
<th>45 to 64 years</th>
<th>65 years &amp; over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>3310</td>
<td>6,160</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>12,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>5,865</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>6,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone-Parent</td>
<td>6,390</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>3,395</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>6,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family</td>
<td>10,185</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>5,065</td>
<td>3,830</td>
<td>14,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,560</td>
<td>5,450</td>
<td>9,135</td>
<td>7,975</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>27,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals do not add up do to rounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohorts</th>
<th>Core Housing Need, 2015-2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of New Households (Annual Average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 24</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 44</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 64</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 74</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Market Housing Gaps

Description
Market Housing gaps include both the existing and future gaps in the supply and need/demand mismatch related to household incomes and housing costs in Edmonton. Understanding existing and future gaps in the housing market is important for developing policy and program responses to address both Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing requirements.

Findings
- Market Housing requirements (Table 13) indicates a mismatch and a surplus of mid-range homes (ownership and rentals). However, higher income households are living in lower cost units, in part because they elect to spend less than they could theoretically afford at 30% of income, and lower income households that need some assistance occupy some of these surplus mid-range units.
- Separating out renter households similarly reveals a surplus of Market Affordable rental units (10,903) and a shortage of Pure Market Housing. Higher income and lower income households (in need) occupy many of these units.
- Going forward, there is a projected need to add 9,192 homes each year. At least 1,428 of these should be modest in form and price to target moderate income households, including newly forming families, singles and seniors seeking to downsize.

Assessment
- The distribution of dwellings in Edmonton is skewed in both size and price in favour of larger higher rent/priced homes.
- There are surpluses, both for singles and families, in the Market Affordable range and shortages in the Pure Market ranges. However, this is due in part to the absence of lower rent/priced options; lower income households are occupying costlier units.
5.3 Summary

Non-Market Housing Gaps
- In 2011 (NHS), there were 27,020 renter households in Edmonton in core housing need. This represents a backlog of unmet need. Population and household growth might add to this in the future.
- The renter households in need are distributed among families, non-elderly singles and seniors. Seniors represent 16%, non-elderly singles represent 38%, and families represent 46% of the renter households in need.
- The housing needs for seniors will grow as a share of the total future Non-Market Housing needs. All other age groups will decline as a share of the total. Future housing needs will continue to be most acute among lone-parent renter households, who will require family units, and among non-elderly singles.
- The existing Non-Market Housing portfolio in Edmonton serves 56% of seniors in need, compared to 43% for families and 39% for non-elderly singles.
- The priority in the short term is non-elderly singles and lone parent family housing to address the backlog of need.

Market Affordable Housing Gaps
- While there is strong demand for Market Affordable Housing, the current supply of housing units is sufficient with a theoretical surplus of just over 32,297 (Table 13, previous page). If owners are removed, the surplus is 10,903 rental units in the Market Affordable rent range. However, the surplus is theoretical because households from the other income ranges occupy many of these homes.
- There is a requirement for about 1,428 units of Market Affordable rental housing for families, in particular for three and four-bedroom units.

Pure Market Housing Gaps
- The main gaps in Pure Market Housing are the lack of multi-family housing and purpose built rental housing. Lack of such options results in higher income households occupying lower cost units, and crowding out those with low to moderate income.
6.0 Where To From Here

- Both existing unmet needs and future housing need and demand are used in the development of public policy and planning for Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing across the Capital Region. The development of long-range plans and land use policies can ensure the housing market is balanced and functioning in an inclusive manner, as well as support initiatives to improve housing affordability, specifically Market Affordable Housing.

- The next step in implementing the Capital Region Board Housing Plan is development of a Regional Planning Framework that would incorporate both Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing and build upon the results of the Housing Needs Assessments.

- The result will be a Regional Housing Plan with a 5-10 year timeframe that (1) incorporates changing trends and gaps in the existing supply of housing with future housing need and demand, and (2) directs the supply of Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing throughout the Capital Region.
Appendix A: Data Sources and Limitations

Data Sources
The following housing data sources are used to develop this report:
- 2011 Canada Census - National Household Survey (NHS)
- 2011 Core Need Estimates - National Household Survey (NHS)
- Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) housing market reports (new starts, rents and prices and rental vacancies)
- Edmonton Real Estate Board (EREB) sales data on existing house prices from the Multiple List Service (MLS)
- Administrative data related to existing supportive and social housing inventories, provided by the CRB municipalities and Housing Management Bodies in each Sub-region, the Housing Division of the Alberta Government, the City of Edmonton, and CMHC.

Data Limitations
As with any data, there are limitations. This may include accuracy of the data, when it was collected, the variables collected, and how the data can be disaggregated.

CMHC Core Housing Need Estimates
CMHC uses the census/NHS to generate estimates of core housing need. In this assessment, the 2011 NHS data are used to develop estimates of core need (2011). These are augmented with additional analysis: households paying over 50% of income as a separate measure of acute need.

Canada Census National Household Survey (NHS)
The census provides a rich data set, but is limited by frequency (every 5 years) and a delay in publication (2-3 years). Data can become 8 years out of date by the end of the census cycle. Other data sources are needed to supplement the census/NHS and to provide inter-censual updates.

Statistics Canada Tax Filer Data
Income data is available from Statistics Canada using Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) tax files data and is updated annually, with an 18-month lag. (2011 tax year data currently available; 2012 data will be available in October 2014.) This disaggregates by family type (i.e. two parent and lone parent), as well as non-family households, but does not provide tenure.

Statistics Canada also updates population estimates and components of population change (natural versus immigration) annually. Some data used to create tables and graphs has missing or blank cells. This is due to Statistics Canada’s data suppression policy, which ensures that individuals and households cannot be identified through the data. The details can be found in the Disclosure Control at http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/12-539-x/steps-ettes/4058325-eng.htm.

CMHC Monthly Market Surveys
Rental data (rents and vacancies) are surveyed and published semiannually by CMHC providing regular updates on the state of the market. The data covers privately owned rental apartment buildings containing 3 or more units. Smaller buildings and condominiums are not surveyed, nor is the secondary rental market, such as single detached houses, and basement suites. Due to the lack of a traditional rental market in the Sub-Regions, the survey only covers a small portion of the housing that most renters occupy (less than 25% in some cases) and is therefore not a very reliable indicator of vacancy and rental rates in these areas. Data from the 2011 NHS
provides an estimate (based on occupant assessed values in 2011) of the current rental rates of rented accommodation in the Sub-Region.

**Market Affordable Housing Supply and Demand Analysis**

Market Affordable Housing is modest-sized, entry-level, family-oriented housing capable of being produced without upfront or on-going direct subsidies from any order of government for households earning moderate incomes (see Glossary). There is no available source of data that clearly articulates the type and amount of supply and demand for Market Affordable Housing. A methodology was developed to show how the existing supply of housing (ownership and rental) matches with household incomes (demand). The method is explained in detail in Appendix C.
Appendix B: The Housing Continuum Demand and Supply Gaps and Mismatch - Methodology and Assumptions

A continuum is a useful way to review the full range of housing options and assess both current supply and requirements based on incomes and household demographics. The concept of a housing continuum is widely adopted across Canadian municipalities as a way to set the broader context, as well as to help identify where gaps exist between need and demand versus supply. Figure 1 is extracted from the 2009 Capital Region Housing Plan. It presents an overview of the housing continuum from homelessness to the pure market response. This separates Market and Non-Market aspects of the housing system and includes the important category of Market Affordable Housing referenced in the Capital Region Housing Mandate. ¹

Figure B1: The Housing Continuum

The Non-Market side (Figure 1, left side) of the continuum includes services that represent an add-on to housing (accommodation). They provide varying levels of support services reflecting the special needs of the sub-population. This includes emergency shelters and housing in which support services are incorporated or delivered separately via community social service agencies.

The important element from the perspective of quantifying housing need and requirements is that affordable housing stock to facilitate the delivery of such support services is available. Mainly, this speaks to requirements for subsidized or low rent options where low-income persons transitioning from homelessness or living with mental health challenges, or with restricted ability to perform activities of daily living can afford to live while receiving additional supports.

¹ Figure 1, extracted from the “Capital Region Housing Plan” uses reference income bands that vary from those used in this guide. As described below, these have been calculated as a way to quantify the continuum.
While the Capital Region Board Housing Plan report does include an income related quantum based on percentage of median income, this was preliminary. It is possible to refine the income categories (as percentage of median or average income) accurately using eligibility income thresholds for social/affordable housing. This can then be used to align each part of the continuum against the price/rent of housing availability. This does not need to be done for each Sub-Region. A region-wide benchmark can be created, as this is a regional market in which consumers make locational choices. While using a Region benchmark, the existing requirements and availability in each Sub-Region should be determined with local data (i.e. how many units exist within each band of the continuum in that Sub-Region).

The standard measures used in Canada as eligibility for Social Housing, have an income threshold called Housing Income Limits (HILs). These are derived from median market rents, which are updated annually from CMHC rental survey. HILs determine the income required to afford the median rent at 30% of income. These are calculated by household size (number of persons) and rounded to the nearest $1,000. HILs are calculated and applied at the CMA scale (i.e. not calculated at any sub-regional level).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B1: Derived Proxy Housing Income Limits (HILs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Single - Bachelor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Person - One-bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Person - Two-bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Person - Three-bed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (E.g. 2 bed = #1,034 divided by 30% times 12 months = $41,360 rounded to $41,000)

Because median rents are not readily available, a proxy based on average rents is used here. For consistency with the 2011 NHS data used in assessment, the following HILs are calculated against the Oct 2011 Edmonton (CMA) average rents.

The 2010 NHS reports median and average incomes for Edmonton (CMA) as $79,090 and $97,516 respectively. Tax filer data for 2010 reports an average of $82,603 blended across all household types. This had increased to $85,414 in 2011. In the assessment, the average of $85,000 is used.

The income of $85,000 for all households is too high to use as a threshold to assess Non-Market need. A household with an income of $80,000 can afford a rent of $2,000 and a home purchase price of $400,000 and cannot be used as a measure of need.

In targeting programs, the United States of America uses 50-60% of area median family income. Separate analysis in Canada has found that 60% of median income roughly approximates the income calculated under the HIL method based on average rent for two-bed units. In our case, 50% of average 2011 income would

---

5 In developing HILs CMHC generates a data set of median rents based on units that include heat, however these rents are not published. This tends to be slightly different from the published average rent data. Here the average rent is used to estimate HILs for purpose of quantifying the continuum.
translate to an income of $42,500 with affordable rent and house price of roughly $1,000 per month and $200,000, respectively.

When comparing the derived HILs, which reflect the upper limit for eligibility for social housing, to the average 2011 income (tax data) of $85,400, it is clear that, as a benchmark against median or average household income, an adjustment is required. The upper limits should be closer to 50% for families and 30-35% for non-family (mainly singles) for whom smaller units with lower rents are appropriate.

### Table B2: Edmonton 2011 Derived HIL’s and Average Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Annual Income</th>
<th>As % 2011 income (CMA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Single - Bachelor</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Person - One-bed</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Person - Two-bed</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Person - Three-bed</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing these CMA HILs to the CMA regional median income the continuum can be quantified.

### Table B3: The Housing Continuum Income Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGE INCOME EDMONTON CMA 2011 = $85,000 (= BASE FOR BENCHMARKS)</th>
<th>Non-Market</th>
<th>Market Affordable</th>
<th>Pure Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single (Income as % Benchmark =)</td>
<td>0 - 35%</td>
<td>35 - 50%</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (Income as % Benchmark =)</td>
<td>0 - 50%</td>
<td>50 - 80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Households (Incomes as % Benchmark =)</td>
<td>0 – 35/50%</td>
<td>35/50% - 50/80%</td>
<td>&gt;50/80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum affordable price and rent for threshold income can be readily calculated based on paying 30% of income for rent or mortgage. These rent and price ranges can then be compared against the rent and price distribution in each jurisdiction as a way to identify gaps in the continuum.

The continuum can be refined to include an intermediate market category as a transition between Non-Market and Pure market. Given the incomes and distribution of households (families and singles separately), the affordable rent price for each income band can be calculated. This can then be compared against the existing rents and prices in the stock in a Sub-Region or municipality, as well as against the rents and prices of recently constructed housing.

Unfortunately, the census (NHS) data does not distinguish between smaller sized units for singles (bachelor/one-bedroom) and larger family sized units (2-3+ bedroom). However, the National Household Survey custom data file obtained for this work provides reasonable proxies. For owners, the file provides
dwelling values by structure type. Larger dwelling types (single-detached, semi, row and mobiles) are assigned as family housing; apartments and attached units are assigned to non-family (singles) housing.

The data files for renters include rent ranges with household type; family and non-family households can be extracted. The incomes of both family and non-family households are also available separately. Counting the number of households within each income range provides a way to quantify demand and to compare this with supply (availability by rent or price).

The results for the Edmonton Sub-Region are included in Tables B4. The continuum shows a shortfall of housing options (either to rent or to buy) against the lower income need.

Table B4: Quantifying the Continuum for All Households - Edmonton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average income (= base for benchmarks) - $85,000</th>
<th>Non-Market</th>
<th>Market Affordable</th>
<th>Pure Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Income as % Benchmark =)* 0 - 35%/50%</td>
<td>35/50% - 50/80%</td>
<td>&gt;50/80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Income benchmark 29,500/42,500</td>
<td>42,500/68,000</td>
<td>&gt; 42,500/68,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max afford rent 744 (S); 1063 (F)</td>
<td>$1,063 (S)/$1,700 (F)</td>
<td>&gt;$1,063 (S)/$1,700 (F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max afford buy 134k S)/192K (F)</td>
<td>$192K(S)/307K (F)</td>
<td>&gt; $192K(S)/307K (F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent units available 37,402</td>
<td>49,134</td>
<td>27,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes priced in range 9,827</td>
<td>38,628</td>
<td>162,201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total dwellings in range 47,228</td>
<td>87,761</td>
<td>189,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households in income range 75,208</td>
<td>50,465</td>
<td>199,067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall (27,980)</td>
<td>37,297</td>
<td>(9,317)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The income benchmark is different for singles and families, e.g. for Non-Market it is 35% singles and 50% family so two values are used in each part of the continuum.

The results show a shortage of almost 28,000 units (owned and rented) of Non-Market Housing for households earning less than $29,500 for singles and $42,500 for families. The Market Affordable and Pure Market categories show a theoretical surplus. These households can access housing in lower categories without being in need. However, this does exclude lower income households because they cannot afford to compete with higher income households.

Given that the focus of the need assessment is on renter households, due to the high incidence and magnitude of need, this approach can be adapted to focus only on renter family and non-family households. Table B5 and Graph B2 show the results for all renter households and rental units in each category.
Table B5: Quantifying the Continuum for Renters – All Households Edmonton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average income (= base for benchmarks) - $85,000*</th>
<th>Non-Market</th>
<th>Market Affordable</th>
<th>Pure Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Income as % Benchmark =)</td>
<td>0 -35%/50%</td>
<td>35/50% - 50/80%</td>
<td>&gt;50/80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Income benchmark</td>
<td>29,500 (S)/42,500 (F)</td>
<td>42,500 (S)/68,000 (F)</td>
<td>&gt;42,500 (S)/68,000 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max afford rent</td>
<td>744 (S); 1063 (F)</td>
<td>1,063 (S)/1,700 (F)</td>
<td>&gt;1,063 (S)/1,700 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent units available</td>
<td>37,402</td>
<td>49,134</td>
<td>27,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental HHs in income range</td>
<td>43,517</td>
<td>38,231</td>
<td>32,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(Shortfall)</td>
<td>(6,115)</td>
<td>10,903</td>
<td>(4,788)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from Table B5 and Figure B2 show a shortage of 6,115 units of Non-Market Housing and a theoretical shortage of almost 4,800 units of Pure Market Housing. To gain greater insight, the family and non-family renter households and rental units can be assessed separately. The following two sets of tables and graphs provide this breakdown.
Table B6: Quantifying the Continuum for Renters - Single Person Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average income (= base for benchmarks) - $85,000*</th>
<th>Non-Market</th>
<th>Market Affordable</th>
<th>Pure Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income as % Benchmark =)</td>
<td>0 - 35%</td>
<td>35 - 50%</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Income benchmark</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>&gt; 42,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max afford rent</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>$1,063</td>
<td>&gt;$1,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent units available</td>
<td>14,900</td>
<td>25,056</td>
<td>20,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental HHs in income range</td>
<td>24,944</td>
<td>7,887</td>
<td>27,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(Shortfall)</td>
<td>(10,043)</td>
<td>17,170</td>
<td>(7,131)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the quantified continuum is broken down this way, it reveals the unit shortage is more significant among single person households than for families. Table B6 and Figure B3 show a deficit of 10,000 rental housing options for single person renters earning less than 35% of median income ($29,500). Conversely, the data shows a surplus of just over 17,000 rental units for single renters earning between 35% and 50% ($29,500 - $42,500) of median income. A theoretical shortage of 7,000 units is indicated for households with above 80% (> $42,500) of median income. Households in this upper income range can and do live in units priced in the mid-range. Due to insufficient numbers of low rent units, lower income renters also live in the mid-range units, and are identified earlier as paying well in excess of 30% (and sometimes over 50%) of their income for rent.
B7: Quantifying the Continuum for Renters - Family Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Income as % Benchmark =)</th>
<th>Non-Market</th>
<th>Market Affordable</th>
<th>Pure Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% - 80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Income benchmark</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max afford rent</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent units available</td>
<td>22,501</td>
<td>24,078</td>
<td>6,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental HHs in income range</td>
<td>18,573</td>
<td>30,345</td>
<td>4,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(Shortfall)</td>
<td>3,928</td>
<td>(6,267)</td>
<td>2,344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B4: Housing Availability and Requirements by Income Band - Family Households

There appears to be a surplus of lower rent units for families (Table B7 and Figure B4). These surplus units are theoretical and may be occupied by households in the mid-income band. This is one reason why the incidence and percentage of core housing need among couple families are quite low. Some existing older units are still relatively affordable. A small theoretical surplus also exists for households above 80% of median income (>$85,000). This suggests that there is not a significant gap for families, however, within the stock there may be a crowding out effect as singles occupy more moderately priced units that could help low-income families. The issue may be a lack of housing options for singles.
Appendix C: Glossary and Acronyms

**Affordable Housing Program**
The Province of Alberta’s Affordable Housing Program provides one-time capital grants for the construction/acquisition of rental housing units. Grant recipients are required to provide rents that are at least 10% below market. Units are targeted at households with incomes at or below HILs. There are no operating subsidies for these units.

**Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC)**
CMHC is Canada’s national housing agency. Established as a government-owned corporation in 1946 to address Canada’s post-war housing shortage, the agency has grown into a major national institution. CMHC is Canada’s premier provider of mortgage loan insurance, mortgage-backed securities, housing policy and programs, and housing research.

**Capital Region**
The Capital Region includes lands lying within the boundaries of the participating municipalities: Beaumont, Bon Accord, Bruderheim, Calmar, Devon, Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, Gibbons, Lamont, Lamont County, Leduc, Leduc County, Legal, Morinville, Sturgeon County, Redwater, St. Albert, Spruce Grove, Stony Plain, Strathcona County, Sturgeon County, Thorsby, Wabamun, and Warburg.

**Capital Region Board**
The Capital Region Board was established in 2008, under Capital Region Board Regulation 38/2012, of the Municipal Government Act. The Capital Region Board is a non-profit corporation comprised of 24 member municipalities from within the Region.

**Co-Operative Housing (Co-Op)**
Co-op housing is collectively owned and managed by its members who live in the housing. Co-op members actively participate in decision-making and share the work involved in managing the building and housing community.

**Community Amenities**
Community amenities are capital facilities or improvements needed to service a growing population or to create a more complete community such as leisure centres, police buildings, cultural centres, libraries, parks, and playgrounds. Some definitions also include the natural amenities of rivers, lakes, and walking trails. Other definitions include access to commercial amenities such as shopping centres, medical facilities, and restaurants.

**Community Housing Program**
The Province of Alberta’s Community Housing Program provides subsidized rental housing to low-income households who cannot afford private sector accommodation. Applicants whose income falls below CNITS are eligible to apply. Management and tenant selection is delegated to the local housing operators (usually a Management Body). Applicants are given priority based on need, as determined by income, assets, and current housing condition. A tenant's rent, which includes heat, water and sewer expenses, is based on 30 percent of a household's adjusted income. The tenant is responsible for electricity, telephone and cable television, as well as any additional services they may request (such as parking). Operating deficits are cost-shared with Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. One of the orders of government owns the units.
Core Housing Need
This is a concept developed in the 1980’s to define housing need and involves a two-step assessment. First, does a household experience any one or combination of housing problems covering suitability (crowding), adequacy (building condition) or affordability (paying greater than 30% for shelter)? Second, is their income below a defined income threshold that varies by market/city and by household size?

CMA
Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation establish local income limits each year. Households with annual incomes equal to or less than the HIL are said to have insufficient income to afford the on-going costs of suitable and adequate rental units in their area. Incomes below this level may be eligible for various rental subsidy programs.

CNITS (Core Need Income Thresholds)
Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation establish local income limits each year. Households with annual incomes equal to or less than the HIL are said to have insufficient income to afford the on-going costs of suitable and adequate rental units in their area. Incomes below this level may be eligible for various rental subsidy programs.

Condominium (Condo)
This is a form of tenure that creates title and ownership rights in virtual three dimensions, as opposed to land title. The term refers to a legal ownership structure and should not be confused with built form. For example, an apartment that is owned may be a condominium, but an apartment may also be rented.

Diversification of Housing Types
This is a range of housing types, including single-family dwellings, duplex, townhome, condominium and apartment types, mixed throughout neighborhoods to serve a broad range of residents of varied age and income.

EREB
The Edmonton Real Estate Board is an Association of realtors and provides data and statistics on home sales and prices in the Edmonton area.

Garage Suites
A garage suite is a self-contained dwelling located above a rear attached garage which is accessory to a single detached dwelling. It must have an entrance separate from the vehicle entrance, either from the interior or exterior of the structure, and include cooking facilities, a bathroom and bedroom(s).

Habitat for Humanity Homes
Housing units are built with voluntary labour, using cash and material donations. When completed the units are sold to qualifying, working, low and moderate income households. The household is provided an interest free mortgage and the mortgage is amortized to 25% of the household’s income. When the recipient household decides to sell the unit, it is sold back to Habitat for Humanity and another qualifying household receives a place to live.

HAT
Housing Assessment Tool. The HAT is the tool developed for the Capital Region to assess housing need across all Sub-Regions.

HICO
Housing In Canada Online. A CMHC interactive data file providing historic data and core need estimates for a wide geography of cities and census areas.
HIL
Housing Income Limits (new label for former CNITs, as above).

Home Program
Through education, financial assistance and one-on-one counselling, the HOME Program helps low income people become homeowners. Education sessions are available to anyone interested in owning a home. Participants do not have to be first time buyers or low-income buyers. Low-income buyers (below CNITS) who have completed education sessions can apply for down payment assistance.

Household
Refers to a person or a group of persons (other than foreign residents) who occupy the same dwelling and do not have a usual place of residence elsewhere in Canada. It may consist of a family group (census family) with or without other persons, of two or more families sharing a dwelling, of a group of unrelated persons, or of one person living alone. When age is cross-tabulated with households, this uses the reported age of the household maintainer.

Housing Allowance
This is housing assistance to help households manage high shelter cost burden and is distinct from the Rent Supplement. Payments are made to the household, not to the property owner, and the Housing Allowance is therefore portable. A Housing Allowance may be structured to pay a fixed monthly allowance or can pay based on the RGI-market rent difference.

Housing Continuum
This is a conceptual framework used to describe a range of housing options from homeless supports to independent market rate housing.

Incidence of Need
The frequency (or incidence) of need refers to the tendency that a particular household will experience housing need. For example, if 60 lone-parent households out of 100 lone-parent households experience affordability problems, the incidence (or chance) of need among lone-parents is 60%. In the assessment, incidence refers to affordability need only.

Inclusive Communities
Inclusive communities have a variety of housing, commerce, recreational, institutional, social, and public amenities within their boundary. Inclusive communities provide a physical and social environment where residents can live, learn, work, and play without having to travel beyond the community boundary.

Infill Development
Development or redevelopment in existing developed areas includes building on vacant or underutilized lands, or re-development of a developed site to a higher density.

Intensification
This is the development of a property, site or area at a higher density than currently exists. For example, this includes redevelopment (including the reuse of Brownfield sites), development of vacant and/or underutilized lots, the conversion or expansion of existing buildings, and infill development, and may include Greenfield sites with development densities higher than historical norms.
Major Repairs Needed
This includes dwellings needing major repairs such as defective plumbing, electrical wiring, and structural repairs to walls, floors, or ceilings.

Market Housing
Market Housing is defined as housing supplied by the private market, without direct government subsidies. Under Market Housing, one sub category, Market Affordable Housing, has been further delineated:

**Market Affordable Housing**
Market Affordable Housing is defined as rental or ownership housing that is modest in form and specification and is capable of being produced for moderate income households without upfront or on-going direct government subsidies (such as through regulatory relaxations, efficient design, or tax incentives). This applies to households earning moderate incomes between 100% and 150% of median income.

**Pure Market** is used to further delineate housing that is affordable to those with incomes greater than median income

Minor Repairs Needed
This includes dwellings needing minor repairs such as missing or loose floor tiles, bricks, or shingles and defective steps, railing, or siding.

Mixed-Income Development
This is a type of development that includes families at various income levels. Mixed-income developments are intended to promote de-concentration of poverty and give lower-income households access to improved amenities.

Mixed-Use Development
This development mixes compatible residential, commercial, institutional and recreational land uses. The development may exist within an area of land, and/or within buildings, in order to increase density, reduce development footprint through intensification of land use, and to improve public accessibility to the range of mixed land uses.

Multi-family Housing
A building constructed for residential purposes for use by two or more families, such as duplexes, townhomes, and row house developments, multistory, and high-rise apartments.

NHS
National Household Survey (the replacement for the Statistics Canada long form census), administered in May 2011.

Non-Market Housing
Non-Market Housing is defined as housing that is operated and funded, or created, through direct government subsidies. It includes categories of housing based on the associated services needed by the clients. Non-Market Housing is further segmented into the categories of Affordable Housing and Subsidized Housing:

**Affordable Housing** is rental or ownership housing that generally does not require on-going (operating) subsidies. It is both affordable and targeted for long-term occupancy to households with incomes between 100% and 80% of the median renter income for their household size.
Social Housing is rental housing that requires on-going operating subsidies to make it affordable on a long-term basis to households with incomes between 80% and 65% or less of the median renter income for their household size.6

Other Non-profit
These are non-profit organizations providing rental housing at rents below market rates who do not receive housing subsidies from government.

Provincial Private Non-profit Program
This program provides monthly subsidies to non-profit organizations to cover operating deficits, including a reserve allocation and the mortgage principal and interest payment based on eligible capital costs. Individuals who currently occupy a crowded or inadequate dwelling would be eligible for housing in these units owned by private non-profit groups. The operating deficits are cost-shared with Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Rents are based on 30 percent of a household’s adjusted income.

RGI
Rent Geared to Income.

Rent Supplement Program
A subsidy is provided to reduce the market rent for a household with income below CNITs. There is a variety of rent supplement programs, some providing subsidies directly to the property owner, others directly to the tenant. The subsidy can be a fixed rate or based on the income of the household. Typically, these subsidies are funded by the province and administered by a management body.

Rural and Native Housing Program
This provincial program funds the construction of a small number of housing units throughout Alberta. Management bodies typically rent out the units in the same manner as the Community Housing Program defined above.

Secondary Suites
A secondary suite is a separate and subordinate dwelling unit contained within a detached dwelling. A secondary suite must have a separate entrance from the entrance to the principal dwelling and include a cooking facility, bathroom and bedroom(s) that are separate from those of the principal dwelling.

Seniors Self-Contained Program
The Alberta Government provides apartment style accommodation to low and moderate income seniors who are functionally independent with or without assistance from existing community services. Rent, which includes water, heat and sewer expenses, is based on 30% of a household’s adjusted income. The Province owns most of the apartments funded under this program and any operating deficits are fully funded by the Alberta Government. Household income must be below the CNITs to qualify for the program.

6 “Non-Market Housing” also includes “Emergency Shelters”, “Transitional Housing” and “Supportive Housing”, and requires deeper capital and operating subsidies provided under government programs to enable affordability to households with considerably lower incomes or no incomes at all.
Emergency Shelters
These are temporary places for people to live until housing that is more permanent is found. An emergency shelter supports people fleeing a specific situation, such as natural or man-made disasters, domestic violence or sexual abuse. Emergency shelters sometimes facilitate support groups, and provide meals.

Special Needs Housing
Special needs housing are dwellings that have been modified with special features to help people live independently in the community. For example, a unit may be adapted for wheelchair access.

Supportive Housing
Supportive housing offers support services onsite to assist tenants to live independently. For example, some providers will offer support for youth or people with substance abuse problems.

Support Services
Housing support services help people live independently in the community, regardless of their tenure. They support people who want to stay in their own home. A wide range of people with particular needs can receive housing support services, including homeless people, refugees, women escaping domestic violence, people with a chronic illness, people with a physical impairment or learning disability, seniors, ex-offenders, people with drug and alcohol related problems, and others who need support. They may use these services when their accommodation is temporary (for example, in a crisis) or when they are being re-housed.

A wide range of supported accommodation models exist and some examples include:
- Sheltered housing with 30 or 40 self-contained units of accommodation with on-site support
- Communal facilities and call systems
- Homeless hostels
- Group homes where people share accommodation supported by residential or visiting housing support workers
- Individual scattered or clustered dwellings with floating (flexible) support
- Wet houses for people with substance misuse problems

Supported Housing
Rental Housing for less than median income households for whom outreach services are accessed from an off-site source (e.g. homecare, aids to daily living, etc.).

Supportive Living Lodge
Supportive living settings are operated under the Alberta Housing Act (usually by a Management Body) and are designed to provide room and board for seniors who are functionally independent with or without the assistance of community-based services.
The Lamont Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment identifies housing need and demand to support planning for a diverse range of housing options within the Capital Region. This document is one of six Sub-Regional assessments covering the Capital Region.

Lamont Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment

Headwater Group with Focus Consulting and Gordon & Associates
The Lamont Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment provides a comprehensive overview of the housing market and demographics, in order to assess the current and future housing needs in the Sub-Region. The Capital Region Board (CRB) developed the Housing Assessment Tool (HAT) used in this assessment as an important first step in providing an overview of the current housing situation, recent trends and future needs in each of its six housing sub-regions, toward the creation of an integrated regional housing plan.

**Household Core Need Analysis:**
- There are currently 85 renter households estimated to be in core housing need.
- Core housing need challenges across the Region are mainly affordability, especially among renters, who are almost four times as likely as owners to be in core need.
- Non-elderly singles and families with maintainers between the ages of 30 and 44 years of age who rent have the highest incidence and number of households in need of Non-Market Housing.
- There are 214 Non-Market Housing units in the Lamont Sub-Region.
- On average, 73% of households in core need are served by the Non-Market housing portfolio. The average for the Region is 49%. Lamont is the only Sub-Region above 50%

**Existing Core Need by Household Type, 2011***

- **Singles:**
  - 10 (12%)
  - 20 (25%)
  - 50 (63%)
- **Families:**
  - 85 (100%)
- **Seniors:**
  - 13 (18%)

**Projected Growth in Need and Demand, 2015-21**

- **Non-Market**
  - Households who spend >30% of income on housing
  - 13 (18%)
- **Market Affordable**
  - Housing affordable to households above median income
  - 21 (28%)
- **Pure Market**
  - Housing affordable to households below median income
  - 40 (54%)

* While totals may not add up exactly due to rounding, there is no material change to the service level percentages.
Future annual housing demand is growing at an average annual rate of 74 units: 13 of those units are for households in core housing need; 21 units are for households requiring Market Affordable housing, and; 40 units are households requiring pure market housing.
- Households with maintainers 65+ years of age are increasing as a share of the total need and those below 65 years of age are decreasing over the coming 6 years.

Housing Stock Considerations:
- The predominant form of housing supply is detached single-family homes, which meet the requirements of families with children.
- The older housing stock has a significantly higher proportion of dwellings that require major repairs.
- The growing population of single person (including seniors) households require smaller, more appropriate form of rental housing such as apartments and other options.
- The limited supply of smaller apartment options can lead to high rents. The lack of smaller apartment options will lead to young singles, as well as some seniors, moving from their current community.
- Affordable housing for families with maintainers between 25 and 64 years old are needed.
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1.0 Introduction

Note: In this report, Lamont means the “Lamont Housing Sub-Region” which includes the County and the Towns of Bruderheim and Lamont.

The Lamont Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment identifies housing need and demand to support planning for a diverse range of housing options within the Capital Region. Needs Assessments are also available for the Edmonton, Leduc, Parkland, Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan, and Sturgeon Housing Sub-Regions (see Diagram 1).

The purpose of the Needs Assessment is to:
- Inform the Capital Region Board of existing and projected Non-Market Housing need and Market Affordable Housing supply, need and demand conditions, and trends in each sub-region;
- Lead to a coordinated planning approach to meet housing need and demand through a sufficient supply and balanced mix of dwelling types across the housing continuum in each sub-region.

The Needs Assessments are not intended to identify and assess the availability and gaps in community amenities and support services. Amenities and services required by households in need will be identified and coordinated during the planning and delivery of Non-Market Housing.

The Housing Needs Assessments for all six Housing Sub-Regions are to inform Sub-Regional Housing Plans that are part of the Capital Region Board Regional Housing Planning process (Diagram 2).
1.0 Introduction (continued)

The Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessment follows the nine-step approach outlined in the Capital Region Board Housing Needs Assessment Framework. The Framework includes a Housing Assessment Tool (HAT) that extrapolates core data to assess the current housing situation, recent trends and future patterns of development across the Region.

**Report Structure**

This Needs Assessment Report provides core data in four main sections:
- Housing Market Overview – Housing stock, prices and household characteristics;
- Households in Need – Core housing need estimates;
- Future Housing Market – Housing, rental market continuum, housing need and demand 2015-2021;
- Gap Analysis – Existing and future housing need gaps, Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing.

**Appendices**

Appendix A: Data Sources and Limitations
Appendix B: The Housing Continuum Demand and Supply Mismatch – Methodology and Assumptions
Appendix C: Glossary and Acronyms

* Figures 14, 15, and 17 use CMHC data and Figure 16 uses Edmonton Real Estate Board data. All other figures use data from the Canada Census, mainly the National Household Survey (NHS) for 2011 and the Long Form Census for previous years.

2.0 Housing Market Overview

The Housing Market Overview describes the status of the housing market in the Lamont Sub-Region and contrasts it against the Capital Region in four main areas:

- Housing Stock Characteristics;
- Population and Household Characteristics;
- Household Income Profile;
- House Prices and Rental Rates.

Many of the variables used in this section will form the baseline from which future progress will be measured. A thorough understanding of the local housing market and conditions is fundamental to develop effective policy and program responses.
2.1 Housing Stock Characteristics: Current State (2011)

Description
Housing stock characteristics include the dwelling type, tenure, age and condition of the supply. This establishes the context for housing options and trends.

Findings
- There are 2,630 dwellings in the Lamont Sub-Region and 390 (15%) of them are rented.
- The housing stock is almost all single-family detached (SFD) housing (93%). Of the remainder, 4% are other (mobile homes), 2% are apartment and 1% semi. A lack of diversity exists in the housing stock.
- The ownership rate is 85% compared to 71% for the Region. In terms of dwelling type, the ownership rate is highest for apartments at 100% and mobiles at 91%. SFDs have the lowest rate of homeownership at 87%.
- The majority of the 390 rental housing units are SFDs; there are 305 units which represent 78% of the rental stock. Another 60 apartment units are rented.
- Lamont has a comparatively older housing stock than the Region. 63% of the dwellings were constructed before 1980 compared to 49% for the Region and 13% were constructed after 2000 compared to 24% for the Region.
- 8% of owned dwellings are in need of major repairs compared to 6% for the Region. 29% of the rented dwellings are in need of major repairs compared to 9% for the Region.

Assessment
- The housing stock is dominated by single detached dwellings, with few options and choices for renters. Tenure is skewed toward homeownership.
- The majority of renters live in SFDs and mobile homes. The limited supply of small sized rental housing, such as apartments, is challenging for smaller and lower income households to find housing in Lamont.
- The older housing stock (higher proportion built before 1980) reflects a slower growth rate over the past 35 years compared to the average for the Region.
- The higher than average share of housing stock in need of repair, especially the rental stock, suggests some older dwellings/areas may be ready for redevelopment.

Description
Housing supply is assessed by examining trends in new construction, including built form (type) and intended tenure at time of construction of new starts.

Findings
- With the exception of 2013 and 2014, all housing starts were SFDs. A peak in the number of housing starts occurred in 2007 and 2008.
- A 31-unit condominium project was started in 2013 and a 36-unit rental project was started in 2014, for a total of 67 new apartment-style ownership and rental housing units.

Assessment
- New construction has created more multi-family products in recent years, but otherwise new housing supply (starts) continues to be exclusively SFD’s.
- The rental starts in 2013 and 2014 are encouraging, however, rental options are still limited, making it difficult for lower income households.
- Adding new rental housing supply will increase options and hopefully moderate rental rates.
2.3 Household Characteristics: Type and Size (2011)

**Description**

The type of household and number of people per household are two characteristics affecting need and demand for housing.

**Findings**

- Families are the prevalent type of household, reflecting the single detached housing stock, and account for 79% of households. Couples with and without children represent 66% of total households compared to 53% in the Region.
- Non-family households represent 21% of total households compared to 32% in the Region.
- There are a greater percentage of households with two people. All other categories are lower compared to the Region.

**Assessment**

- The high proportion of family households reflects the predominantly SFD housing stock in Lamont.
- Recent starts suggest that the industry is responding to the shifting demand, however, newer housing is usually more expensive and will not likely be affordable for lower income households.
2.4 Household Characteristics: Age of Household Maintainer (2011)

**Description**
Two characteristics of household maintainers are assessed: age and tenure, including percent of households in each age cohort that are owners.

**Findings**
- 19% of households are under 40 years of age compared to 33% for the Region. Typically, households under 40 years of age are first time homebuyers.
- 81% of households are over 39 years of age. This age cohort is responsible for the high ownership rate in Lamont.
- 24% of households are 65 years of age and older compared to 17% for the Region.
- 2% of households are under 25 years of age compared to 5% for the Region.

**Assessment**
- Lamont has an older average age of household maintainer than the Region. As a result, the number of households 65 years of age and over will grow at a faster pace than the Region. The need and demand for seniors housing will increase at a corresponding pace.
- Lamont needs to encourage more affordable housing options, including rental, for the 19% of households under the age of 40 or it could risk losing them to another community.
2.5 Household Characteristics: Tenure by Household Type (2011)

Description
The ratio of household types by tenure is partly determined by the makeup of the housing stock. There are 385 renter households in Lamont. They occupy 15% of the housing stock, most of which are SFD’s. This chart focuses only on this subset of households.

Findings
- 47% of renter households are non-families compared to 57% for the Region. Non-family households are evenly split between one-person and two-person households. Most non-family households are one-person in the Region.
- 53% of renter households are families compared to 43% for the Region. 32% are couple families compared to 26% for the Region. 13% are other families compared to 7% for the Region. There are fewer lone parent families in Lamont than for the Region.

Assessment
- Lamont has a higher ratio of family-based rental tenures than the Region.
- Families represent the majority of renter households partly because there are few apartments and other rental housing options available for singles.
- Many renter families who have lower and modest incomes would benefit from more housing options such as built form (multi-family housing) and tenure (more traditional rental options).
- More rental housing would also enable more seniors and non-elderly singles to remain in Lamont.
2.6 Household Income Profile (2011)

**Description**
Household income provides a base indicator to determine affordability. Median household income is used to determine a household’s ability to find housing in their community at an affordable price.

**Findings**
- The median income in Lamont is about 5.5% higher than the Region.
- The median income for owners is 19% lower than the Region. Conversely, the median income for renters is 15% higher than the Region.
- Higher household incomes in Lamont are reflected in the following:
  - More households with 3 or more people and less households with one person than the Region
  - Fewer renters, which on average have much lower household incomes, than the Region
  - High ownership rate
- Median incomes are more moderate in Lamont than the Region. There are relatively fewer low income households. 7% of households earn less than $20,000 per year compared to 10% for the Region. 32% of households earn above $100,000 compared to 37% for the Region.

**Assessment**
- The lower owner income than the Region is a reflection of the employment income opportunities in Lamont.
- The higher renter income than the Region reflects more family renters who have high incomes. (Family incomes are always higher on average because many families consist of two income earners.)
2.7 House Prices (Current)

Description
Current house prices reveal the cost to purchase a house in Lamont based on data from the Edmonton Real Estate Board (MLS 2014) augmented by data from the NHS (2011).

Findings
- House sales data from the Multiple Listing Service (MLS) shows there were 68 sales in 2014. Only one of those 68 sales was not a SFD. The average sales house price for an SFD in the Region is 35% higher than in Lamont.
- NHS data (occupant-assessed price) from 2011 shows home values are on average 14% lower than the Region. This reflects the older age and condition of the housing stock in Lamont.
- 50% of homes in Lamont are valued below $300,000 compared to 25% for the Region. The results are displayed in Figure 12.

Assessment
- The high proportion of homes below $300,000 provides some affordability for first time homebuyers. However, the lower prices may be related to the condition of the dwellings and may require costly repairs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Type</th>
<th>Lamont</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>$259,999</td>
<td>$402,000</td>
<td>-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/Row</td>
<td>1 sale only</td>
<td>$332,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$233,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![F12: Distribution of Home Prices, 2011]
2.8 Rental Rates (Current)

Description
The CMHC rental survey, which covers only purpose-built structures of 3+ units, does not reflect rented SFDs. These are captured in the distribution (Figure 13).

Findings
- There is no data from the CMHC rental survey for Lamont.
- Data from the NHS data (2011) shows that a significantly higher proportion of rental households pay lower rents than in the Region.
  - 53% of renters pay less than $800 per month compared to only 22% for the Region.
  - 22% of renters pay more than $1,200 per month compared to 34% for the Region.

Assessment
- The high proportion of households paying relatively lower rents reflects the age and condition of the rental stock. The data is from 2011 and does not include the new rental and condominium starts in 2013 and 2014, which will have significantly higher rents.
- More purpose-built rental housing costing less than $800 per month is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Apartment Rental Rates</th>
<th>Lamont</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Difference (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-bedroom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-bedroom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ bedroom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,339</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F13: Distribution of Rents, 2011

T3: Average Apartment Rental Rates, 2014
2.9 House Prices (Trends)

Description
Trends in house prices reveal the changing costs to purchase a house in Lamont and provide an indicator of cost barriers for different household types. This assessment draws on both CMHC new price data as well as MLS data from the Edmonton Real Estate Board.

Findings
- New home prices are lower in Lamont than for the Region. Over the past 7 years, new home prices have not kept pace with price increases in the Region. (No data was available for 2011 and 2014.) Median new home prices decreased slightly from 2007 to 2013, compared to an 8% increase in the Region.
- Median sales prices for SFD’s decreased from $255,500 in 2007 to $217,000 in 2010, a drop of 15%. Prices have since rebounded to $260,000 in 2014.
- Median sales prices have changed as follows over the past 7 years:
  - Single-family: -2%
  - Semi-detached: N/A
  - Condo/apartment: N/A

Assessment
- New house prices command a premium over existing dwellings, but new house prices have not risen over the past 7 years. Resale house prices are marginally higher now than they were in 2007 and provide affordable options for first time homebuyers.
- Lower priced housing options, such as condominiums and other higher density accommodation, are still required to meet the demand from smaller households and first time homebuyers. If some of the older housing stock is demolished, more affordable housing will be required to replace them.

![Graph of New House Prices (SFD/Semi only)](image1)

![Graph of Median Home Prices](image2)
2.10 Rental Rates (Trends)

Description
Examining trends in rental distribution can provide insight into how the housing market responds to need and demand. These charts show both the rent distribution for 3 census periods, as well as how this has changed over that decade.

Findings
- Lamont has a stock of 390 rental units. The following changes have occurred since 2001:
  - 125 units with rents under $600 per month have been lost.
  - 290 units with rents between $600 and $900 per month were also lost.
- 130 additional units with rents $1,500 per month and over represent the largest growth in distribution. Another 45 units were added with rents between $800 and $999 per month.

Assessment
- A loss of 415 units with rents under $900 per month occurred between 2001 and 2011. The number of rental units decreased by 25 units from 2001 to 2011, which suggests that some units were removed from the market.
- More rental housing is required to replace the affordable units lost and to encourage and enable lower income families, single people and seniors to live in Lamont.
2.11 The Housing Continuum

The concept of a housing continuum is widely adopted across Canadian municipalities to help identify where gaps exist between need and demand versus supply. It locates housing need and requirements against a continuum of options. These range from subsidized or Non-Market housing through moderate rent/priced market options, called Market Affordable, to Pure Market priced options both in the rental and ownership sector. The following terms are used to reflect this range throughout the remainder of this report:

A. **Non-Market** describes households with incomes below those required to access social housing. This translates to 35% of median household income for singles and 50% of median for families.

B. **Market Affordable** describes the income group accessing modest to mid rent/priced homes. They have incomes above those required to be eligible for social housing (“A” above), but below those needed to have wide market choice (as defined by “C” below).

C. **Pure (or Pure) Market** housing is that which starts at the Regional entry-level home prices (median condominium for singles and first quartile detached home for family). Converting these into incomes (income required to buy entry-level price, as defined) results in a benchmark pegged at 50% of median family income for singles and 80% of median income for families. Households with incomes above these thresholds are deemed able to rent/buy at market prices.

Using these income thresholds, households are allocated into one of the three income demand categories and dwelling units are similarly sorted into one of three categories, based on rents and prices derived at 30% of the related income thresholds. See Appendix B for method and details.

(Source: 2009 Capital Region Housing Plan)
2.12 Housing Availability and Requirements by Income Band

Availability of rental units to households in the housing continuum identifies rental unit shortages or surpluses in Lamont (green bar). The maximum income benchmarks, associated maximum affordable rents, and house prices are outlined in detail in Appendix B.

Findings and Assessment

- There is a surplus of 84 rental housing units affordable to households with incomes in the Non-Market category of the continuum.
- The 52-unit shortage consists of a surplus of 29 rental units for non-family households and a shortfall of 81 rental units for family households. The family households earn less than $42,500 and require 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings, that cost less than $1,063 per month.
- There is a surplus of 28 units of Pure market rental units.
2.13 Rental Rates and Household Income Balance

**Description**
An indicator of the number of rental units required by rental price range can be determined by comparing the rental units in each rent range (units available) to renter incomes, using 30% as an affordability measure to convert their income into a rent range (units required, based on income). Based on this assessment, the net mismatch in each rent range (Figure 20) shows the shortages and surpluses by rent range.

**Findings**
- Overall, the rental market in Lamont is balanced. There is a surplus of units with rents below $750 per month in Lamont, but a shortage of units with rents $750 and $1,499 per month.
- The net rental market mismatch shows the following:
  - A surplus of 104 rental units with rents below $750 per month
  - A shortage of 59 units with rents between $750 and $1,499 per month.

**Assessment**
- A significant portion of the rental stock is in disrepair and accounts for much of the lower cost rental housing. This suggests some redevelopment is required.
- Demand from family households has created a shortage of rental units in the $750 to $1,499 per month range.
- Demand from non-family households, including both seniors and non-elderly single person households, has created a shortage of high rent units in the $2000 per month and over range.
2.14 Rental Market Supply and Affordability

Description
The comparison of actual units in the stock (2011) against the number required, based on income and affordability at 30% of income, can be further examined by separating family and non-family households and associated larger versus smaller sized units.

Findings
- There is a surplus of 104 rental units available for households who cannot afford to pay more than $749 per month for rent.
- There is a shortage of 59 units with rents between $750 and $1,499 per month. The demand for these units is from family and non-family households.
- There is a shortage of 85 units for family households with rents of $2,000 per month. However, the shortage is theoretical because some of these higher income households are occupying dwellings in the lower rent ranges.

Assessment
- The mismatch analysis is one way to examine gaps in the housing system. It shows a mismatch between what households can reasonably afford to pay for rent and what they have to pay for rent. This analysis is based solely on income and rent levels. It does not consider whether the homes are appropriate in size.
- The analysis suggests that more rental housing in the Pure Market category is required for both family and non-family households.
3.0 Households in Need

Determining need and demand for Non-Market Housing and Market Affordable Housing is one of several reasons for undertaking a housing needs assessment. Comparing the distribution of the households in Non-Market Housing need and Market Affordable Housing demand across the Region will point to current and future gaps. Consistent and reliable data is required to develop integrated plans to address housing imbalances in the Sub-Region and Region. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) have developed a Core Housing Need measure, which uses a two-step process to identify the number and incidence of households in need of housing:

- Does a household experience any one of or a combination of problems based on three standard measures of suitability (number of bedrooms compared to household composition), condition (need for major repair) and affordability (paying greater than 30%)? And,
- Is the household’s gross income below a specified threshold (which is calculated separately for each Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) and for each household size, such as one-person or two-person households)?

Another approach is to examine households experiencing severe shelter cost burdens. This is represented by housing costs in excess of 50% of income from the 2011 National Households Survey (NHS). This measure of acute need is used alongside core need (which uses 30% of income) as a way to help understand which households face a significant housing cost challenge.

Concern was expressed that demand from transient construction workers for temporary accommodation will put a strain on the Lamont housing market over the next several years. This could result in workers who are unable to find accommodation being temporarily homeless and needing some form of temporary shelter. Similar situations have developed in other communities where large-scale industrial development has occurred.
### 3.1 Core Housing Need Estimates (2011)

#### Description
Core housing need magnitude (number of households) and incidence (likelihood) provides insight into the needs by key characteristics (tenure, age and family type).

#### Findings
- Affordability is a larger problem than crowding and condition. 72% of problems are affordability related in Lamont compared to 91% for the Region.
- 11% of problems are crowding compared to 13% in the Region.
- 46% of households live in housing in need of major repair.
- 220 owner households experience core housing need with an incidence rate of 13%. 85 renter households experience core need and have an incidence rate of 24% or double that of owners. Owners also have an asset in their property that provides financial security not available to renters.

#### Assessment
- A high proportion of households in poor condition suggests a rehabilitation or demolition/replacement initiative is required. Given the size of the problem (46%), a major redevelopment may be required that could give Lamont an opportunity to realign the housing stock with the needs of the community.
- Actions to address core need must focus on the affordability of renter households due to their low household incomes and relative high incidence of need compared to other problems. Renters are also much more likely than owners (29% versus 8%) to experience need due to poor building conditions.
3.1 Core Housing Need Estimates (continued)

Description
Renters have a high incidence of core need. The charts focus on renter households to identify those in greatest need.

Findings
- Core housing need is most prevalent among non-family renters in Lamont. 35 non-family (mainly singles) households are in need, with an incidence rate of 25%.
- 20 couple families are in need and have an incidence rate of 16% chance of being in core need.
- There are no lone parent families in core need recorded in Lamont.
- 35 households with maintainers between the ages of 30 and 44 are in core need and have an incidence rate of 39%.
- There are ten senior households who experience core need with an incidence rate of 20%.

Assessment
- See next page.
3.1 Core Housing Need Estimates (continued)

Description
Combining incidence of need by age and household type indicates who is in core need.

Findings
- There are 85 renter households living in core housing need in Lamont.
- Core housing need is most prevalent among non-family renters. 25 non-elderly singles and 10 seniors are in core need, all with an incidence of 25%.
- 50 families are in core need with an incidence rate of 16%.
- 35 households maintained by 30 to 44 year olds are in core need and have an incidence rate of 39%.

Assessment
- Funding should prioritize non-elderly singles and families maintained by household heads 30 to 44 years of age due to their high incidence of need.
- The high incidence of housing requiring major repairs is also a concern. Nearly 100 owners have dwellings in need of major repair. A more detailed assessment should be completed to determine the extent of the problem.
- Failure to meet these needs in Lamont will result in some young low income families and non-elderly single person households leaving Lamont.

T4: Renters in Core Need by Household Type and Age of Maintainer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-senior</th>
<th>15 to 29 years</th>
<th>30 to 44 years</th>
<th>45 to 64 years</th>
<th>65+ years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone-Parent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Acute Need

Description
The 2011 National Household Survey (NHS) identifies households who pay more than 50% of their income for housing and are experiencing acute housing needs.*

Findings
- The data shows that 105 non-family singles have the highest number in acute need. 25 lone parent family households have the second highest number in acute need.
- Acute affordability appears less significant for couple families. 15 couple families are all paying greater than 100% of their income for housing.
- If households paying in excess of 100% are excluded, 55 single person households are the largest number in acute need. Many of these paying over 50% may be seniors who have low income, but draw down savings to cover costs. There are also 20 lone-parent families in acute need paying over 50%
- Acute need is far more significant among renters than owners. While renters comprise about 18% of Lamont households, 31% of them pay more than 50% on rent.
- The incidence of acute need among renters in Lamont is less than the Region. Only 4% of renters pay over 50% compared to 13% for the Region.

Assessment
- Comparing this measure of acute need (paying over 50%) with the estimates of core need identifies a total of 75 renters in acute need, which is coincidentally similar to the total number of renters in core need. The two different methods corroborate the extent of unmet need.

*Almost 5% of all households (8.5% of renters) in the Region pay over 100% of their income for housing. This is a statistical anomaly caused in part by change in household composition or status in prior years. It occurs because NHS collects shelter cost in April 2011, but income data is for the prior year. While included here, this data should be treated with caution.
3.3 Non-Market Housing Portfolio

**Description**

The Non-Market Housing portfolio (Table 5) must be assessed to determine who and how many households are being served in comparison to the households that are in need in Lamont.

**Findings**

- The majority of the Non-Market Housing portfolio in Lamont is for seniors housing accommodation. This includes both supportive living (lodge) and subsidized seniors’ apartments (30% rent-geared-to-income). There are 112 supportive living units for seniors.
- There are 2 permanent houses provided through the Rural and Native Housing Program and 4 rental supplements provided to family households in Lamont.

**Assessment**

- The Non-Market Housing portfolio is provided almost exclusively to seniors.
- Lower income non-elderly singles and lower income families face challenges finding housing and often have to move to Edmonton or elsewhere to access Non-Market Housing. Any new Non-Market Housing Initiatives must give priority to addressing these unmet needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T5: Lamont Non-Market Housing Portfolio by Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Housing/Program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Emergency Shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transitional Accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Permanent Supportive Housing (Lodge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supported Housing - Semi-independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-Profit Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Community Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Seniors' Self-Contained Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rent Supplements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Co-op Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Habitat for Humanity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Secondary Suites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Other (Rural and Native Housing Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Alberta Seniors

* There is a wide range of supportive living facilities designed to serve health and related accommodation and nutritional needs. SL2 (Lodge level accommodation) is included in the Non-Market Housing portfolio, but the SL-3 (Assisted Living), SL-4 (Enhanced Assisted Living), SL-4d (Dementia Care) and Continuing Care accommodation are not included mainly because they are health (not income) related and must qualify through Alberta Health Services for entry. Also, the majority of beds/units are not subsidized at any given point in time and should not be included in Non-Market housing portfolio.
3.3 Non-Market Housing Portfolio (continued)

Description
The number of units in the Non-Market Housing Portfolio and relative level of access to those units by different household types determines the priority for addressing the current households in need. Here the existing portfolio is compared to the need.

Findings
- Virtually all of the Non-Market Housing Portfolio is seniors housing, while only 8 units or 4% of the portfolio is family housing. There is no Non-Market accommodation for non-elderly singles in the Lamont Sub-Region.
- Overall, the service level (share of total need being served) for Lamont is 73%. However, the service level is 95% for seniors and only 14% for families.

Assessment
- Given the extreme imbalance in the service levels, the first priority for any new Non-Market Housing Initiatives is bringing service levels in line with core housing need by household type.
- Providing Non-Market Housing for lower income non-elderly singles and families is the priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T6: Non-Market Housing Portfolio by Household Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Alberta Seniors and Housing and the City of Edmonton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T7: Non-Market Housing Portfolio Service Level*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lamont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMH Portfolio (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs in Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Level (1/2)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Alberta Seniors and Housing, City of Edmonton and Statistics Canada

* The Service Level (SL) refers to the proportion of the households in need that are served by the existing Non-Market Housing portfolio. The SL is calculated for the main household types and is useful for establishing priorities and ensuring a balanced portfolio.

** While totals may not add up exactly due to rounding, there is no material change to the service level percentages.
4.0 Future Housing Market

How housing requirement and need changes over time draws on population and household projections for the Region. The method used to generate the projections included historic fertility, mortality and household formation rates within each sub-region. Population projections include the number of households by age cohort from the growth.

The high projection is used in this assessment to estimate the housing requirement resulting population and employment growth, sorted by Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing need and demand. This future need assessment assumes that each sub-region continues to maintain its current share of the Region’s population and households. It also assumes that the 2011 incidence of core housing need remains constant.

Total household growth under the low and high projection for the Region was examined to assess the implications for future growth in housing requirements. It revealed that across the Region, household growth over the next six years (2015-2021) is anticipated to average between 10,200-12,800 households per year. This section examines how this impacts growth and need in the Lamont Sub-Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOW GROWTH SCENARIO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Housing Requirements</td>
<td>10,743</td>
<td>10,599</td>
<td>10,205</td>
<td>10,040</td>
<td>9,973</td>
<td>9,911</td>
<td>9,985</td>
<td>10,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH GROWTH SCENARIO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Housing Requirements</td>
<td>13,116</td>
<td>13,093</td>
<td>12,747</td>
<td>12,622</td>
<td>12,660</td>
<td>12,598</td>
<td>12,699</td>
<td>12,791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Projecting long-term population and household growth cannot predict economic downturns and the impact on the number of households in need. Any spike in households in need, which appears to be showing in the significant increases in wait lists for Non-Market housing.

---

1 The populations projections used here do not include the adjustment made from the Capital Region Board Growth Plan Update with 2014 municipal census results as this needs assessment requires detailed projections by age and year to project annual housing requirements. The adjustment made for the Growth Plan Update included the total population in 2014 and 2044 only.
4.1 Future Non-Market Housing Needs

Description
Projecting the annual growth in housing requirements and needs over the next 6 years is required for future housing planning. The growth in need presented here draws on an allocation of overall growth from the CRB’s “high projection” scenario and uses the incidence of core need, by age cohort from 2011.

Findings
- The number of renters in core need is projected to grow by 13 renters annually over the next 6 years. During the same time period, growth by age cohort will vary considerably:
  - 15-24 age cohort will remain constant;
  - 25-44 age cohort will increase by six households every year, which represents 47% of growth of households in need;
  - 45-64 age cohort will increase by two households or 16% every year;
  - The 65-74 age cohort will increase on average by 4 households every year, which is 29% of the growth in households in need;
  - Those 75 and over will increase more slowly, by 1 per year (8% of total growth).
- Over the next 6 years, the 65 years of age and over cohort will expand as a share of the total and all other age groups will decline (Figure 31).

Assessment
- Family rental units will be required to address the needs of family households, including some lone parent families.
- Affordable housing units, such as bachelor and one-bedroom units, will be required to meet the needs of non-family households, including seniors.
4.2 Future Market Housing Requirements

Description
Future Market Affordable Housing requirements are calculated using the overall share of households with incomes above the eligible range for Non-Market housing but unable to access ownership. These requirements should be compared to earlier data of the form and type of new homes being constructed.

Findings
- On average, 21 new housing units are required annually as Market Affordable Housing to accommodate future growth. This represents 13% of new homes required. A breakdown of the annual housing requirements by age are:
  - 15-24 age cohort will decrease slightly (2% of the growth);
  - 25-44 age cohort will increase by 8 households (38% of the growth);
  - 45-64 age cohort will increase by 5 households (24% of the growth);
  - 65-74 age cohort will increase by 6 households (29% of the growth);
  - 75+ age cohort will increase by 2 households (10% of the growth).
- Over the next 6 years, the 65 and over age cohort will expand as a share of the total and all other age groups will decline (Figure 32), but at a slower rate than households in core housing need.

Assessment
- The decline of the 15-24 and 25-44 age group may be influenced by the housing options available. The younger cohort may be declining, in part due to a lack of small sized rental options.
- The largest growth is from those over 45 years of age. There is a need to examine the changing housing preferences, including small sized and affordable rental options, and needs of an aging population.
5.0 Gap Analysis

This section summarizes the gaps and potential implications for the housing continuum in the Lamont Housing Sub-Region. The data and information from the needs assessment is the foundation for developing a Sub-Regional Housing Plan.
5.1 Non-Market Housing Gaps

Description
Non-Market Housing gaps include both the existing and the future growth of households in core need. The prioritization of these gaps, based on age and household type, will form the basis for allocating any funding for new Non-Market Housing. As before, this considers only renters, for whom need is high.

Findings
- Core housing need is most prevalent among non-family renters in Lamont. 35 non-family (mainly singles) households are in need, with an incidence rate of 25%.
- 50 family households are in core need with an incidence rate of 16%.
- 35 households with maintainers between the ages of 30 and 44 are in core need with an incidence rate of 39%.
- Over the next 6 years, 47% of the growth in need will be from households between 30 and 44 years of age and 37% will come from households 65 years and older, especially the 65-74 years of age cohorts.

Assessment
- Immediate funding priority should be considered for non-elderly singles and families between the ages of 30 and 44 years of age, due to their high incidence of need.
- The high incidence of housing requiring major repairs is also a concern. Nearly 100 owners have dwellings in need of major repair. A more detailed assessment should be completed to determine the extent of the problem.
- Failure to meet these needs in Lamont will result in some young low income families and non-elderly single person households leaving Lamont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Non-senior</th>
<th>15 to 29 years</th>
<th>30 to 44 years</th>
<th>45 to 64 years</th>
<th>65+ years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone-Parent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Families</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals do not add up do to rounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohorts</th>
<th>Core Housing Need, 2015 - 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of New Households (Annual Average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 44</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 64</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 74</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Market Housing Gaps

Description
Market Housing gaps include both the existing and future gaps in the supply and need/demand mismatch related to household incomes and housing costs in Lamont. Understanding existing and future gaps in the housing market is important for developing policy and program responses to address both Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing requirements.

Findings
- Currently, there is a surplus of 284 units of Market Affordable and a shortage of 38 units of Pure Market Housing (based on rent and price). However, some of these surplus units are occupied by lower income households who need some financial assistance.
- There are shortages of rental housing both for singles and families in the Market Affordable and Pure Market ranges. Families require more Market Affordable Housing and singles require more Pure Market rental housing.
- There is a projected need to add 74 homes each year. At least 21 of these should be modest in form and price to target moderate income households, including newly forming families and singles, and seniors seeking to downsize.

Assessment
- There is a sufficient supply of dwellings in Lamont. However, housing stock is skewed in size and price in favour of large sized, high rent/prices homes.
- More high density rental housing is required.
- More low rent/cost housing is required for newly forming families.
- More traditional Pure Market rental housing is required for higher income single person households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T13: Market Housing Requirements, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market Affordable Housing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (Shortage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Households Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (Shortage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T14: Annual Growth in Market Affordable/Market Housing, 2015-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Housing Requirements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76    76    74    73    74    73    74    74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market Affordable Housing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22    21    21    21    21    21    21    21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Summary

Non-Market Housing Gaps
- 85 renter households in need are distributed among families (60%), non-elderly singles (24%) and seniors (12%).
- Future Non-Market Housing needs for seniors will continue to grow as a share of the total need. All other age groups will decline as a share of the total.
- Immediate funding priority must be given to non-elderly singles and families between the ages of 30 and 44 years of age, due to their high incidence of need.
- The high proportion of households in need due to the poor condition of their dwelling strongly suggests that a rehabilitation and demolition/replacement initiative is required.

Market Affordable Housing Gaps
- There is strong demand for Market Affordable Housing, especially from younger families and some higher income non-elderly singles. The 284 unit surplus is theoretical because households from the other income ranges occupy many of these homes.
- There is a requirement for about 50 units of Market Affordable rental housing for families.

Pure Market Housing Gaps
- The main gaps in Pure Market Housing are the lack of multi-family housing and traditional rental housing for non-elderly single person households. Lack of such options results in higher housing costs compared to a more diversified and balanced housing stock of structure types and tenures.
- Due to the high incidence of housing requiring major repairs, a more detailed assessment of the condition of housing in Lamont should be completed to determine the extent of the problem.

T15: Existing Core Need by Households Type, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>Share of Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family (Singles)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals do not add up do to rounding.

T16: Projected Annual Growth in Need and Demand, 2015-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Non-Market Housing Need (Renters)</th>
<th>Annual Future Housing Needs and Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household Growth</td>
<td>Non-Market Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>30,720</td>
<td>12,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Where To From Here

- Both existing unmet needs and future housing need and demand are used in the development of public policy and planning for Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing across the Capital Region. The development of long-range plans and land use policies can ensure the housing market is balanced and functioning in an inclusive manner, as well as support initiatives to improve housing affordability, specifically Market Affordable Housing.

- The next step in implementing the Capital Region Board Housing Plan is development of a Regional Planning Framework that would incorporate both Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing and build upon the results of the need assessment.

- The result will be a Regional Housing Plan with a 5 - 10 year timeframe that (1) incorporates changing trends and gaps in the existing supply of housing with future housing need and demand, and (2) directs the supply of Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing throughout the Capital Region.
Appendix A: Data Sources and Limitations

Data Sources
The following housing data sources are used to develop this report:

- 2011 Canada Census - National Household Survey (NHS)
- 2011 Core Need Estimates - National Household Survey (NHS)
- Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) housing market reports (new starts, rents and prices and rental vacancies)
- Edmonton Real Estate Board (EREB) sales data on existing house prices from the Multiple List Service (MLS)
- Administrative data related to existing supportive and social housing inventories, provided by the CRB municipalities and Housing Management Bodies in each sub-region, the Housing Division of the Alberta Government, the City of Edmonton, and CMHC.

Data Limitations
As with any data, there are limitations. This may include accuracy of the data, when it was collected, the variables collected, and how the data can be disaggregated.

CMHC Core Housing Need Estimates
CMHC uses the census/NHS to generate estimates of core housing need. In this assessment, the 2011 NHS data are used to develop estimates of core need (2011). These are augmented with additional analysis: households paying over 50% of income as a separate measure of acute need.

Canada Census National Household Survey (NHS)
The census provides a rich data set, but is limited by frequency (every 5 years) and a delay in publication (2-3 years). Data can become 8 years out of date by the end of the census cycle. Other data sources are needed to supplement the census/NHS and to provide inter-censual updates.

Statistics Canada Tax Filer Data
Income data is available from Statistics Canada using Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) tax files data and is updated annually, with an 18-month lag. (2011 tax year data currently available; 2012 data will be available in October 2014.) This disaggregates by family type (i.e. two parent and lone parent), as well as non-family households, but does not provide tenure.

Statistics Canada also updates population estimates and components of population change (natural versus immigration) annually. Some data used to create tables and graphs has missing or blank cells. This is due to Statistics Canada’s data suppression policy, which ensures that individuals and households cannot be identified through the data. The details can be found in the Disclosure Control at http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/12-539-x/steps-ettes/4058325-eng.htm.

CMHC Monthly Market Surveys
Rental data (rents and vacancies) are surveyed and published semiannually by CMHC providing regular updates on the state of the market. The data covers privately owned rental apartment buildings containing 3 or more units. Smaller buildings and condominiums are not surveyed, nor is the secondary rental market, such as single detached houses, and basement suites. Due to the lack of a traditional rental market in the sub-regions, the survey only covers a small portion of the housing that most renters occupy (less than 25% in some cases) and is therefore not a very reliable indicator of vacancy and rental rates in these areas. Data from the 2011 NHS
provides an estimate (based on occupant assessed values in 2011) of the current rental rates of rented accommodation in the sub-region.

**Market Affordable Housing Supply and Demand Analysis**

Market Affordable Housing is modest-sized, entry-level, family-oriented housing capable of being produced without upfront or on-going direct subsidies from any order of government for households earning moderate incomes (see Glossary). There is no available source of data that clearly articulates the type and amount of supply and demand for Market Affordable Housing. A methodology was developed to show how the existing supply of housing (ownership and rental) matches with household incomes (demand). The method is explained in detail in Appendix C.
Appendix B: The Housing Continuum Demand and Supply Gaps and Mismatch - Methodology and Assumptions

A continuum is a useful way to review the full range of housing options and assess both current supply and requirements based on incomes and household demographics. The concept of a housing continuum is widely adopted across Canadian municipalities as a way to set the broader context, as well as to help identify where gaps exist between need and demand versus supply. It presents an overview of the housing continuum from homelessness to the Pure Market response. This separates Market and Non-Market aspects of the housing system and includes the important category of Market Affordable Housing referenced in the Capital Region Housing Mandate.  

Figure B1: The Housing Continuum

The Non-Market side (Figure 1, left side) of the Continuum includes services that represent an add-on to housing (accommodation). They provide varying levels of support services reflecting the special needs of the sub-population. This includes Emergency Shelters and housing in which support services are incorporated or delivered separately via community social service agencies.

The important element from the perspective of quantifying housing need and requirements is that affordable housing stock to facilitate the delivery of such support services is available. This speaks to requirements for subsidized or low rent options where low-income persons transitioning from homelessness or living with mental health challenges, or with restricted ability to perform activities of daily living can afford to live while receiving additional supports.

---

2 Figure 1, extracted from the “Capital Region Housing Plan” uses reference income bands that vary from those used in this guide. As described below, these have been calculated as a way to quantify the continuum.
The Capital Region Housing Plan report does include a preliminary income related quantum based on percentage of median income. It is possible to refine the income categories (as percentage of median or average income) accurately using eligibility income thresholds for social/affordable housing. This can then be used to align each part of the continuum against the price/rent of housing availability. This does not need to be done for each sub-region. A Region-wide benchmark can be created, as this is a regional market in which consumers make locational choices. While using a Region benchmark, the existing requirements and availability in each sub-region should be determined with local data (i.e. how many units exist within each band of the continuum in that sub-region).

The standard measures, used in Canada as eligibility for Social Housing, have an income threshold called Housing Income Limits (HILs). These are derived from median market rents, which are updated annually from CMHC rental survey. HILs determine the income required to afford the median rent at 30% of income. These are calculated by household size (number persons) and rounded to the nearest $1,000. HILs are calculated and applied at the CMA scale (i.e. not calculated at any sub-regional level).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Rent (2011)</th>
<th>Derived HIL*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Single - Bachelor</td>
<td>$713</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Person - One-bed</td>
<td>$857</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Person - Two-bed</td>
<td>$1034</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Person - Three bed</td>
<td>$1191</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (e.g. 2 bed = #1,034 divided by 30% times 12 months = $41,360 rounded to $41,000)

Because median rents are not readily available, a proxy based on average rents is used here. For consistency with the 2011 NHS data used in assessment, the following HILs are calculated against the Oct 2011 Edmonton (CMA) average rents.

The 2010 NHS reports median and average incomes for Edmonton (CMA) as $79,090 and $97,516 respectively. Tax filer data for 2010 reports an average of $82,603 blended across all household types. This had increased to $85,414 in 2011. In the assessment, the average of $85,000 is used.

The average (or median) income of $85,000 for all households is too high to use as a threshold to assess Non-Market need. A household with an income of $80,000 can afford a rent of $2,000 and a home purchase price of $400,000 and cannot be used as a measure of need.

In targeting programs, the United States of America uses 50-60% of area median family income. Separate analysis in Canada has found that 60% of median income roughly approximates the income calculated under the HIL method based on average rent for two-bed units. In our case, 50% of average 2011 income would

---

3 In developing HILs CMHC generates a data set of median rents based on units that include heat; however, these rents are not published. This tends to be slightly different from the published average rent data. Here the average rent is used to estimate HILs for purpose of quantifying the continuum.
translate to an income of $42,500 with affordable rent and house price of roughly $1,000 per month and $200,000, respectively.

When comparing the derived HILs, which reflect the upper limit for eligibility for social housing, to the average 2011 income (tax data) of $85,400, it is clear that, as a benchmark against median or average household income, an adjustment is required. The upper limits should be closer to 50% for families and 30-35% for non-family (mainly singles) for whom smaller units with lower rents are appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Annual Income</th>
<th>As % 2011 income (CMA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Single - Bachelor</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Person - One-bed</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Person - Two-bed</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Person - Three-bed</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing these CMA HILs to the CMA regional median income the continuum can be quantified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGE INCOME EDMONTON CMA 2011 = $85,000 (= BASE FOR BENCHMARKS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single</strong> (Income as % Benchmark =)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Market: 0 - 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Affordable: 35 - 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Market: &gt;50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family</strong> (Income as % Benchmark =)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Market: 0 - 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Affordable: 50 - 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Market: &gt;80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Households</strong> (Incomes as % Benchmark =)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Market: 0 - 35/50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Affordable: 35/50% - 50/80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Market: &gt;50/80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum affordable price and rent for threshold income can be readily calculated based on paying 30% of income for rent or mortgage. These rent and price ranges can then be compared against the rent and price distribution in each jurisdiction as a way to identify gaps in the continuum.

The continuum can be refined to include an intermediate market category as a transition between Non-Market and Pure Market. Given the incomes and distribution of households (families and singles separately), the affordable rent price for each income band can be calculated. This can then be compared against the existing rents and prices in the stock in a sub-region or municipality, as well as against the rents and prices of recently constructed housing.

Unfortunately, the census (NHS) data does not distinguish between smaller sized units for singles (bachelor/one-bedroom) and larger family sized units (2-3+ bedroom). However, the National Household Survey custom data file obtained for this work provides reasonable proxies. For owners, the file provides
dwelling values by structure type. Larger dwelling types (single-detached, semi, row and mobiles) are assigned as family housing; apartments and attached units are assigned to non-family (singles) housing.

The data files for renters include rent ranges with household type; family and non-family households can be extracted. The incomes of both family and non-family households are also available separately. Counting the number of households within each income range provides a way to quantify demand and to compare this with supply (availability by rent or price).

The results for the Lamont Sub-Region are included in Tables B4. The continuum shows a shortfall of housing options (either to rent or to buy) against the lower income need.

### Table B4: Quantifying the Continuum for All Households - Lamont

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average income (= base for benchmarks) - $85,000</th>
<th>Non-Market</th>
<th>Market Affordable</th>
<th>Pure Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Income as % Benchmark =)*</td>
<td>0 - 35%/50%</td>
<td>35/50% - 50/80%</td>
<td>&gt;50/80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Income benchmark</td>
<td>29,500/42,500</td>
<td>42,500/68,000</td>
<td>&gt; 42,500/68,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max afford rent</td>
<td>744 (S); 1063 (F)</td>
<td>$1,063 (S)/$1,700 (F)</td>
<td>&gt;$1,063 (S)/$1,700 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max afford buy</td>
<td>134K (S)/192K (F)</td>
<td>$192K(S)/307K (F)</td>
<td>&gt; $192K(S)/307K (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent units available</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes priced in range</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total dwellings in range</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>1,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households in income range</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>1,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>(301)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The income benchmark is different for singles and families, e.g. for Non-Market it is 35% singles and 50% family so two values are used in each part of the continuum

The results show a surplus of 12 units (owned and rented) of Non-Market Housing for households earning less than $29,500 for singles and $42,500 for families. The Affordable Housing category also shows a surplus 284 units. The Pure Market Housing category shows a theoretical surplus. These households can access housing in lower categories without being in need. However, this does exclude lower income households because they cannot afford to compete with higher income households.

Given that the focus of the need assessment is on renter households, due to the high incidence and magnitude of need, this approach can be adapted to focus only on renter family and non-family households. Table B5 and Graph B2 show the results for all renter households and rental units in each category.
Table B5: Quantifying the Continuum for Renters - All Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average income (= base for benchmarks) - $85,000*</th>
<th>Non-Market</th>
<th>Market Affordable</th>
<th>Pure Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Income as % Benchmark =)</td>
<td>0 -35%/50%</td>
<td>35/50% - 50/80%</td>
<td>&gt;50/80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Income benchmark</td>
<td>29,500 (S)/42,500 (F)</td>
<td>42,500 (S)/68,000 (F)</td>
<td>&gt;42,500 (S)/68,000 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max afford rent</td>
<td>744 (S); 1063 (F)</td>
<td>1,063 (S)/1,700 (F)</td>
<td>&gt;1,063 (S)/1,700 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent units available</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental HHs in income range</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(Shortfall)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from Table B5 and Figure B2 show a surplus of 84 units of Non-Market Housing and a theoretical shortage of 28 units of Pure Market Housing. To gain greater insight, the family and non-family renter households and rental units can be assessed separately. The following two sets of tables and graphs provide this breakdown.
Table B6: Quantifying the Continuum for Renters - Single Person Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Income as % Benchmark =)</th>
<th>Non-Market</th>
<th>Market Affordable</th>
<th>Pure Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max Income benchmark</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>29,500-42,500</td>
<td>&gt; 42,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max afford rent</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>$1,063</td>
<td>&gt;$1,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent units available</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental HHs in income range</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(Shortfall)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B6 and Figure B3 show a surplus of 45 rental housing options for single renters earning less than 35% of median income ($29,500). For single renters earning between 35% and 50% ($29,500 - $42,500) of median income, there is a surplus of 29 rental units. Above 80% (>42,500) of median income, there is a theoretical shortage of 29 rental housing units. Higher income households access housing in the lower cost categories and crowd out lower income households. Affordable rental housing options for singles are limited and in short supply.
There is a surplus of 39 housing units for families (Table B7 and Figure B4) earning less than 50% of the median income ($42,500). There is a shortage of 81 rental housing units for families earning between 50% and 80% ($42,500 to $68,000) of median income. There is a surplus of 57 rental housing units for those earning above 80% of median income (> $85,000). This suggests the gap for many renter families is a lack of available Market Affordable rental housing.
Appendix C: Glossary and Acronyms

Affordable Housing Program
The Province of Alberta’s Affordable Housing Program provides one-time capital grants for the construction/acquisition of rental housing units. Grant recipients are required to provide rents that are at least 10% below market. Units are targeted at households with incomes at or below HILs. There are no operating subsidies for these units.

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC)
CMHC is Canada’s national housing agency. Established as a government-owned corporation in 1946 to address Canada’s post-war housing shortage, the agency has grown into a major national institution. CMHC is Canada’s premier provider of mortgage loan insurance, mortgage-backed securities, housing policy and programs, and housing research.

Capital Region
The Capital Region includes lands lying within the boundaries of the participating municipalities: Beaumont, Bon Accord, Bruderheim, Calmar, Devon, Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, Gibbons, Lamont, Lamont County, Leduc, Leduc County, Legal, Morinville, Sturgeon County, Redwater, St. Albert, Spruce Grove, Stony Plain, Strathcona County, Sturgeon County, Thorsby, Wabamun, and Warburg.

Capital Region Board
The Capital Region Board was established in 2008, under Capital Region Board Regulation 38/2012, of the Municipal Government Act. The Capital Region Board is a non-profit corporation comprised of 24 member municipalities from within the Region.

Co-Operative Housing (Co-Op)
Co-op housing is collectively owned and managed by its members who live in the housing. Co-op members actively participate in decision-making and share the work involved in managing the building and housing community.

Community Amenities
Community amenities are capital facilities or improvements needed to service a growing population or to create a more complete community such as leisure centres, police buildings, cultural centres, libraries, parks, and playgrounds. Some definitions also include the natural amenities of rivers, lakes, and walking trails. Other definitions include access to commercial amenities such as shopping centres, medical facilities, and restaurants.

Community Housing Program
The Province of Alberta’s Community Housing Program provides subsidized rental housing to low-income households who cannot afford private sector accommodation. Applicants whose income falls below CNITS are eligible to apply. Management and tenant selection is delegated to the local housing operators (usually a Management Body). Applicants are given priority based on need, as determined by income, assets, and current housing condition. A tenant’s rent, which includes heat, water and sewer expenses, is based on 30 percent of a household’s adjusted income. The tenant is responsible for electricity, telephone and cable television, as well as any additional services they may request (such as parking). Operating deficits are cost-shared with Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. One of the orders of government owns the units.
Core Housing Need
This is a concept developed in the 1980’s to define housing need and involves a two-step assessment. First, does a household experience any one or combination of housing problems covering suitability (crowding), adequacy (building condition) or affordability (paying greater than 30% for shelter)? Second, is their income below a defined income threshold that varies by market/city and by household size?

CMA
Census Metropolitan Area.

CNITS (Core Need Income Thresholds)
Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation establish local income limits each year. Households with annual incomes equal to or less than the HIL are said to have insufficient income to afford the on-going costs of suitable and adequate rental units in their area. Incomes below this level may be eligible for various rental subsidy programs.

Condominium (Condo)
This is a form of tenure that creates title and ownership rights in virtual three dimensions, as opposed to land title. The term refers to a legal ownership structure and should not be confused with built form. For example, an apartment that is owned may be a condominium, but an apartment may also be rented.

Diversification of Housing Types
This is a range of housing types, including single-family dwellings, duplex, townhome, condominium and apartment types, mixed throughout neighborhoods to serve a broad range of residents of varied age and income.

EREB
The Edmonton Real Estate Board is an Association of realtors and provides data and statistics on home sales and prices in the Edmonton area.

Garage Suites
A garage suite is a self-contained dwelling located above a rear attached garage which is accessory to a single detached dwelling. It must have an entrance separate from the vehicle entrance, either from the interior or exterior of the structure, and include cooking facilities, a bathroom and bedroom(s).

Habitat for Humanity Homes
Housing units are built with voluntary labour, using cash and material donations. When completed the units are sold to qualifying, working, low and moderate income households. The household is provided an interest free mortgage and the mortgage is amortized to 25% of the household’s income. When the recipient household decides to sell the unit, it is sold back to Habitat for Humanity and another qualifying household receives a place to live.

HAT
Housing Assessment Tool. The HAT is the tool developed for the Capital Region to assess housing need across all Sub-Regions.

HICO
Housing In Canada Online. A CMHC interactive data file providing historic data and core need estimates for a wide geography of cities and census areas.
HIL
Housing Income Limits (new label for former CNITs, as above).

Home Program
Through education, financial assistance and one-on-one counselling, the HOME Program helps low income people become homeowners. Education sessions are available to anyone interested in owning a home. Participants do not have to be first time buyers or low-income buyers. Low-income buyers (below CNITS) who have completed education sessions can apply for down payment assistance.

Household
Refers to a person or a group of persons (other than foreign residents) who occupy the same dwelling and do not have a usual place of residence elsewhere in Canada. It may consist of a family group (census family) with or without other persons, of two or more families sharing a dwelling, of a group of unrelated persons, or of one person living alone. When age is cross-tabulated with households, this uses the reported age of the household maintainer.

Housing Allowance
This is housing assistance to help households manage high shelter cost burden and is distinct from the Rent Supplement. Payments are made to the household, not to the property owner, and the Housing Allowance is therefore portable. A Housing Allowance may be structured to pay a fixed monthly allowance or can pay based on the RGI-market rent difference.

Housing Continuum
This is a conceptual framework used to describe a range of housing options from homeless supports to independent market rate housing.

Incidence of Need
The frequency (or incidence) of need refers to the tendency that a particular household will experience housing need. For example, if 60 lone-parent households out of 100 lone-parent households experience affordability problems, the incidence (or chance) of need among lone-parents is 60%. In the assessment, incidence refers to affordability need only.

Inclusive Communities
Inclusive communities have a variety of housing, commerce, recreational, institutional, social, and public amenities within their boundary. Inclusive communities provide a physical and social environment where residents can live, learn, work, and play without having to travel beyond the community boundary.

Infill Development
Development or redevelopment in existing developed areas includes building on vacant or underutilized lands, or re-development of a developed site to a higher density.

Intensification
This is the development of a property, site or area at a higher density than currently exists. For example, this includes redevelopment (including the reuse of Brownfield sites), development of vacant and/or underutilized lots, the conversion or expansion of existing buildings, and infill development, and may include Greenfield sites with development densities higher than historical norms.
Major Repairs Needed
This includes dwellings needing major repairs such as defective plumbing, electrical wiring, and structural repairs to walls, floors, or ceilings.

Market Housing
Market Housing is defined as housing supplied by the private market, without direct government subsidies. Under Market Housing, one sub category, Market Affordable Housing, has been further delineated:

  Market Affordable Housing
  Market Affordable Housing is defined as rental or ownership housing that is modest in form and specification and is capable of being produced for moderate income households without upfront or ongoing direct government subsidies (such as through regulatory relaxations, efficient design, or tax incentives). This applies to households earning moderate incomes between 100% and 150% of median income.

  Pure Market is used to further delineate housing that is affordable to those with incomes greater than median income

Minor Repairs Needed
This includes dwellings needing minor repairs such as missing or loose floor tiles, bricks, or shingles and defective steps, railing, or siding.

Mixed-Income Development
This is a type of development that includes families at various income levels. Mixed-income developments are intended to promote de-concentration of poverty and give lower-income households access to improved amenities.

Mixed-Use Development
This development mixes compatible residential, commercial, institutional and recreational land uses. The development may exist within an area of land, and/or within buildings, in order to increase density, reduce development footprint through intensification of land use, and to improve public accessibility to the range of mixed land uses.

Multi-family Housing
A building constructed for residential purposes for use by two or more families, such as duplexes, townhomes, and row house developments, multistory, and high-rise apartments.

NHS
National Household Survey (the replacement for the Statistics Canada long form census), administered in May 2011.

Non-Market Housing
Non-Market Housing is defined as housing that is operated and funded, or created, through direct government subsidies. It includes categories of housing based on the associated services needed by the clients. Non-Market Housing is further segmented into the categories of Affordable Housing and Subsidized Housing:

  Affordable Housing is rental or ownership housing that generally does not require on-going (operating) subsidies. It is both affordable and targeted for long-term occupancy to households with incomes between 100% and 80% of the median renter income for their household size.
Social Housing is rental housing that requires on-going operating subsidies to make it affordable on a long-term basis to households with incomes between 80% and 65% or less of the median renter income for their household size.4

Other Non-profit
These are non-profit organizations providing rental housing at rents below market rates who do not receive housing subsidies from government.

Provincial Private Non-profit Program
This program provides monthly subsidies to non-profit organizations to cover operating deficits, including a reserve allocation and the mortgage principal and interest payment based on eligible capital costs. Individuals who currently occupy a crowded or inadequate dwelling would be eligible for housing in these units owned by private non-profit groups. The operating deficits are cost-shared with Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Rents are based on 30 percent of a household’s adjusted income.

RGI
Rent Geared to Income.

Rent Supplement Program
A subsidy is provided to reduce the market rent for a household with income below CNITs. There is a variety of rent supplement programs, some providing subsidies directly to the property owner, others directly to the tenant. The subsidy can be a fixed rate or based on the income of the household. Typically, these subsidies are funded by the province and administered by a management body.

Rural and Native Housing Program
This provincial program funds the construction of a small number of housing units throughout Alberta. Management bodies typically rent out the units in the same manner as the Community Housing Program defined above.

Secondary Suites
A secondary suite is a separate and subordinate dwelling unit contained within a detached dwelling. A secondary suite must have a separate entrance from the entrance to the principal dwelling and include a cooking facility, bathroom and bedroom (s) that are separate from those of the principal dwelling.

Seniors Self-Contained Program
The Alberta Government provides apartment style accommodation to low and moderate income seniors who are functionally independent with or without assistance from existing community services. Rent, which includes water, heat and sewer expenses, is based on 30% of a household’s adjusted income. The Province owns most of the apartments funded under this program and any operating deficits are fully funded by the Alberta Government. Household income must be below the CNITs to qualify for the program.

---

4 “Non-Market Housing” also includes “Emergency Shelters”, “Transitional Housing” and “Supportive Housing”, and requires deeper capital and operating subsidies provided under government programs to enable affordability to households with considerably lower incomes or no incomes at all.
Emergency Shelters
These are temporary places for people to live until housing that is more permanent is found. An emergency shelter supports people fleeing a specific situation, such as natural or man-made disasters, domestic violence or sexual abuse. Emergency shelters sometimes facilitate support groups, and provide meals.

Special Needs Housing
Special needs housing are dwellings that have been modified with special features to help people live independently in the community. For example, a unit may be adapted for wheelchair access.

Supportive Housing
Supportive housing offers support services onsite to assist tenants to live independently. For example, some providers will offer support for youth or people with substance abuse problems.

Support Services
Housing support services help people live independently in the community, regardless of their tenure. They support people who want to stay in their own home. A wide range of people with particular needs can receive housing support services, including homeless people, refugees, women escaping domestic violence, people with a chronic illness, people with a physical impairment or learning disability, seniors, ex-offenders, people with drug and alcohol related problems, and others who need support. They may use these services when their accommodation is temporary (for example, in a crisis) or when they are being re-housed.

A wide range of supported accommodation models exist and some examples include:
- Sheltered housing with 30 or 40 self-contained units of accommodation with on-site support
- Communal facilities and call systems
- Homeless hostels
- Group homes where people share accommodation supported by residential or visiting housing support workers
- Individual scattered or clustered dwellings with floating (flexible) support
- Wet houses for people with substance misuse problems

Supported Housing
Rental Housing for less than median income households for whom outreach services are accessed from an off-site source (e.g. homecare, aids to daily living, etc.).

Supportive Living Lodge
Supportive living settings are operated under the Alberta Housing Act (usually by a Management Body) and are designed to provide room and board for seniors who are functionally independent with or without the assistance of community-based services.
The Parkland Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment identifies housing need and demand to support planning for a diverse range of housing options within the Capital Region. This document is one of six assessments for each Housing Sub-Region¹.

Parkland Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment

Headwater Group with Focus Consulting and Gordon & Associates
Foreword

The Parkland Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment provides a comprehensive overview of the housing market and demographics, in order to assess the current and future housing needs in the Sub-Region. The Capital Region Board (CRB) developed the Housing Assessment Tool (HAT) used in this assessment as an important first step in providing an overview of the current housing situation, recent trends and future needs in each of its six housing Sub-Regions, toward the creation of an integrated regional housing plan.

Household Core Need Analysis:
- There are currently 830 renter households estimated to be in core housing need.
- Core housing need challenges across the Region are mainly affordability, especially among renters, who are six times as likely as owners to be in core need.
- Lone parent families and seniors who rent have the highest incidence and number of households in need of Non-Market Housing.
- There are 616 Non-Market Housing units in the Parkland Sub-Region.
- On average, 43% of households in core need in Parkland are served by the Non-Market Housing portfolio. The average for the Region is 49%.

Existing Core Need by Household Type, 2011

![Pie chart showing existing core need by household type]

- Singles
- Families
- Seniors

830 renter households in Parkland are in core housing need

Projected Annual Growth in Need and Demand, 2015-21

![Pie chart showing projected annual growth in need and demand]

- Non-Market: 61 (8%)
- Market Affordable: 579 (78%)
- Pure Market: 106 (14%)

- Non-Market = Households who spend >30% of income on housing
- Pure Market = Housing affordable to households above median income
- Market Affordable = Housing affordable to households below CRB median income
Future annual housing demand is growing at an average annual rate of 746 units: 61 of those units are for households in core housing need; 106 units are for households requiring Market Affordable housing, and 579 units are households requiring Pure Market housing.

Renter households in need with maintainers 65+ years of age are increasing as a share of the total need and those below 65 years of age are decreasing over the coming six years.

**Housing Stock Considerations:**
- The predominant form of housing supply is detached single-family homes, which meet the requirements of families with children.
- The growing population of single person (including seniors) households require smaller, more appropriate forms of rental housing such as apartments and other options.
- The limited supply of smaller apartment options can lead to high rents. The lack of smaller apartment options will lead to young singles, as well as some seniors, moving from their current community.
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The Parkland Sub-Region acknowledges the significant amount of work that has been, and continues to be, done with respect to homelessness. The Parkland Sub-Region and the University of Alberta are currently completing work on the needs of the homeless, which complements the Parkland Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment.
1.0 Introduction

Note: In this report, Parkland means the “Parkland Housing Sub-Region” which is the County and all municipalities located within, including Spruce Grove, Stony Plain, and Wabamun.

The Parkland Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment identifies housing need and demand to support planning for a diverse range of housing options within the Capital Region. Needs Assessments are also available for the Edmonton, Lamont, Leduc, Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan, and Sturgeon Housing Sub-Regions (see Diagram 1).

The purpose of the Needs Assessment is to:
  o Inform the Capital Region Board of existing and projected Non-Market Housing need and Market Affordable Housing supply, need and demand conditions, and trends in each Sub-Region;
  o Lead to a coordinated planning approach to meet housing need and demand through a sufficient supply and balanced mix of dwelling types across the housing continuum in each Sub-Region.

The Needs Assessments are not intended to identify and assess the availability and gaps in community amenities and support services. Amenities and services required by households in need will be identified and coordinated during the planning and delivery of Non-Market Housing.

The Needs Assessments for all six Housing Sub-Regions are to inform Sub-Regional Housing Plans that are part of the Capital Region Board Regional Housing Planning process (see Diagram 2).
1.0 Introduction (continued)

The Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessment follows the nine-step approach outlined in the Capital Region Board Housing Needs Assessment Framework (2014). The Framework includes a Housing Assessment Tool (HAT) that extrapolates core data to assess the current housing situation, recent trends and future patterns of development across the Region.

**Report Structure**

This Needs Assessment Report provides core data in four main sections:

- **Housing Market Overview** – Housing stock, prices and household characteristics;
- **Households in Need** – Core housing need estimates;
- **Future Housing Market** – Housing, rental market continuum, housing need and demand 2015-2021;
- **Gap Analysis** – Existing and future housing need gaps, Non-market and Market Affordable Housing.

**Appendices**

Appendix A: Data Sources* and Limitations
Appendix B: The Housing Continuum Demand and Supply Mismatch – Methodology and Assumptions
Appendix C: Glossary and Acronyms

*Figures 14, 15, and 17 use CMHC data and Figure 16 uses Edmonton Real Estate Board data. All other Figures use data from the Canada Census, mainly the National Household Survey (NHS) for 2011 and the Long Form Census for previous years.

2.0 Housing Market Overview

The Housing Market Overview describes the status of the housing market in the Parkland Sub-Region and contrasts it against the Capital Region in four main areas:

- Housing Stock Characteristics;
- Population and Household Characteristics;
- Household Income Profile;
- House Prices and Rental Rates.

Many of the variables used in this section will form the baseline from which future progress will be measured. A thorough understanding of the local housing market and conditions is fundamental to develop effective policy and program responses.
2.1 Housing Stock Characteristics: Current State (2011)

**Description**
Housing stock characteristics include dwelling type, tenure, age and condition of supply. This establishes the context for housing options and trends.

**Findings**
- Parkland has 26,640 dwellings or 5.9% of the Region’s housing stock and 6.3% of the Region’s population.
- Housing stock is predominantly single family (SFD) housing; only 7% are apartments compared to 24% in the Region. Other (mainly mobile homes) comprise 8% of the housing stock compared to 2% in the Region.
- The majority of households are owners (86%) compared to 71% for the Region; the ownership rate is highest for SFDs (94%) and other (91%).
- There are 3,725 rented dwellings which consist mainly of apartments (the only dwelling type where the majority of occupants are renters at 77%), followed by row housing (32%) and semi-detached (26%).
- Parkland has a comparatively young housing stock. 33% of the dwellings were constructed before 1980 compared to 49% for the Region; 35% of the dwellings were constructed since 2000 compared to 24% for the Region.
- Parkland’s housing is in good condition. 5% of the owned dwellings are in need of major repairs compared to 6% for the Region; 6% of the rented dwellings are in need of major repairs compared to 9% for the Region.

**Assessment**
- The housing stock is dominated by single detached dwellings, reflecting the skewed tenure toward ownership.
- An insufficient supply of rental units and high density housing results in fewer options for smaller and lower income households and puts upward pressure on rents.
- The relatively young age of the housing stock (35% constructed since 2000) reflects an era of rapid expansion and newer suburban development.
- Despite the younger stock, the percent in need of major repair indicates some older housing may be ready for redevelopment.

**Description**
Housing supply is assessed by examining trends in new construction, including built form (type) and intended tenure at time of construction of new starts.

**Findings**
- Single detached housing has declined as a share of new housing starts from 83% in 2006 to 52% in 2013. After peaking in 2007 at 1,700 annual housing starts, supply growth since 2008 averages just under 800 units.
- Multiple (semi-detached, row and apartment) unit starts in 2013-2015 are encouraging signs of a more diversified housing market.
- Condominium starts, a portion of which is commonly used for rental housing, are not a significant part of the market with the exception of the high starts in 2007 and 2015.
- Rental housing construction has been minimal, except for 2011 and 2013 when 103 and 177 rental units, respectively, started construction. More modest levels of rental starts were also experienced in 2014 and 2015.

**Assessment**
- New construction has created more multi-family products in recent years, but new housing supply (starts) continues to be dominated by single detached dwellings.
- While the rental starts in 2011 and 2013 are encouraging, rental options are still limited, making it difficult for lower income households.
- Adding new rental housing supply will help moderate rent levels in the longer term and help renter households with moderate affordability problems.
2.3 Household Characteristics: Type and Size (2011)

Description

Two household characteristics are assessed: type and size of households.

Findings

- Families are the prevalent type of household in Parkland. Couples with and without children represent 67% of total households compared to 53% in the Region.
- Non-family households represent 22% of total households compared to 32% in the Region.
- There is a greater percentage of households with two or more people. Only 18% of households are one person compared to 26% in the Region.

Assessment

- The high proportion of families reflects the high proportion of single-family detached housing stock.
- Parkland will have difficulty retaining and attracting a more balanced population until a more housing stock is developed.
- There are few options for younger new households. Parkland will face challenges retaining young residents as they form new households until more housing choices are available, including both built forms and tenure options.
2.4 Household Characteristics: Age of Household Maintainer (2011)

**Description**
Two characteristics of household maintainers are assessed: age and tenure, including percent of households in each age cohort that are owners.

**Findings**
- There are very few households under 25 years of age and about half of them are renters.
- The 25-39 year age cohort is proportionally smaller at 25% compared to 28% for the Region. As well, 80% of them are owners compared to 65% for the Region. This group, which are traditionally first time homebuyers, represents the largest number of renters in Parkland.
- The 40-54 year age cohort represents 35% of households and has a high rate of ownership at 91%, which is higher than the Region.
- The proportion of households in the 55 and over age cohorts is similar to the Region, but the homeowner ratio is higher in Parkland.

**Assessment**
- Parkland has an older average age of household maintainer overall than the Region.
- A greater percentage of household maintainers are 40 years of age and over compared to the Region. The number of households with maintainers 65 years of age and over will grow at a faster pace than the Region, increasing the need and demand for seniors housing.
- The lower proportion of households with maintainers below the age of 40 in Parkland will directly affect the demand for rental housing and ownership housing in future years. Adding some rental housing and entry-level affordable ownership opportunities could help attract younger households to Parkland.
2.5 Household Characteristics: Tenure by Household Type (2011)

Description
The ratio of household types by tenure is partly determined by the makeup of the housing stock. The chart focuses on renter households only, due to their high incidence of need.

Findings
- The majority of renter households (55%) are families compared to 49% for the Region. About 67% of family renter households are two parent families.
- Only 46% of renter households are non-families compared to 52% in the Region. Nearly one in five non-family households is comprised of two or more persons.

Assessment
- Parkland has a higher ratio of family-based rental tenures than the Region.
- Families represent the majority of renter households partly because there are few appropriate rental housing options available to them.
- Many renter families who have lower and modest incomes would benefit from greater diversity of the housing stock. Examples of diverse housing stock include built form (multi-family housing) and tenure (rental options).
- More rental housing would also enable more seniors and non-elderly singles to remain in Parkland.
2.6 Household Income Profile (2011)

Description
Household income provides a base indicator to determine affordability. Median household income is used to determine a household's ability to find housing in their community at an affordable price.

Findings
- Overall, the median income is higher in Parkland than the Region. The median income is 5.5% higher for owners and 10% higher for renters, compared to the Region.
- Owner incomes tend to be higher than renter incomes. Renter median incomes are 53% of owner median incomes in Parkland.
- Higher household incomes in Parkland are reflected in the following:
  o More two-earner, established households;
  o Fewer renters, which on average have much lower household incomes, than the Region;
  o High ownership rate.
- Parkland’s higher household income is reflected in the distribution: 4% earn less than $20,000 compared to 10% for the Region; 23% earn $20,000-$60,000 compared to 28% for the Region; 46% of households earn above $100,000 compared to 37% for the Region.

Assessment
- The higher median incomes in Parkland are partly a reflection of the high percent of owners, who have much higher incomes than renter households do.
- The higher renter incomes do enable more households to afford higher rents, so smaller gaps between median household incomes and market rents exist overall, compared to the Region. However, there are households that need more affordable rental options.
2.7 House Prices (Current)

**Description**
Current house prices reveal the cost to purchase a house in Parkland. Data from recent MLS house prices and 2011 NHS data are used to compare prices.

**Findings**
- House sales data from the Multiple Listing Service (MLS) shows house prices in the Region are between 3.3% and 4.4% higher than in Parkland, depending on the type of dwelling.
- Condominiums provide the most affordability at 73% of the median price of SFDs.
- NHS data (occupant-assessed price) from 2011 shows home values average out to 8% higher than the Region. This reflects the predominance of detached homes in Parkland, whereas a higher proportion of lower priced condominiums and other higher density built forms influence the average for the Region.
- House prices are distributed as follows:
  - 21% of homes are valued at less than $300,000;
  - 33% are valued at between $300,000 and $400,000;
  - 39% of homes are valued at between $400,000 and $750,000;
- Parkland has a higher percent of homes priced above $500,000 (25%) compared to the Region (19%).

**Assessment**
- Lower sales prices for comparable types of dwellings provide a modest improvement in affordability for Parkland. However, due to the dominance of single detached housing, the distribution of these house values is skewed toward the higher end of the market.
- Nine percent of house prices are below $200,000, which provides some options for first time homebuyers. This also supports the statement in 2.1 that some older housing stock may be ready for redevelopment.
2.8 Rental Rates (Current)

Description
The CMHC rental survey, which covers only purpose-built structures of 3+ units, does not reflect rented SFDs. These are captured in the distribution of rents (F13).

Findings
- According to the CMHC survey, average rents for two and three bedroom apartments in Parkland are about 3.5% lower than the Region. One-bedroom apartments are the same in both locations.
- The NHS data indicates that a slightly higher proportion of rental households pay higher rents than the Region.
- Most renters pay between $800 and $2,000 per month, compared to the Region where most households pay between $600 and $1,500.

Assessment
- The marginally lower rents for two and three bedroom apartments provide a modest break for family households.
- Parkland has a higher percentage of renter households paying above $1,500 per month for rent - 20% compared to 15% in the Region. This is a result of the low number of suitable rental housing units in Parkland. Many renter households have no options other than renting dwellings that are larger, more expensive and suited to ownership (e.g. single detached).
- More purpose-built rental housing costing less than $800/month is required to meet the needs of lower income households in Parkland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Apartment Rental Rates</th>
<th>Parkland</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Difference (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-bedroom</td>
<td>$990</td>
<td>$986</td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-bedroom</td>
<td>$1,196</td>
<td>$1,240</td>
<td>(3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ bedroom</td>
<td>$1,298</td>
<td>$1,339</td>
<td>(3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average</td>
<td>$1,145</td>
<td>$1,193</td>
<td>(4.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.9 House Prices (Trends)

Description
Trends in house prices and rental rates reveal the changing costs to live in Parkland and provide an indicator of cost barriers for different household types. This assessment draws on both CMHC new price data as well as MLS data from the Edmonton Real Estate Board.

Findings
- New home prices in Parkland and the Region have followed a similar trend over the past seven years. Overall, median new home prices rose by 76% compared to 63% for the Region.
- The difference between median house prices in Parkland and the Region has narrowed; median new house prices were 15% higher in 2007 and by 2014 had narrowed to 7% higher in the Region.
- The first quartile new home price has also narrowed over the years from a spread of 19% in 2017 to 4% in 2014. The price of $345,000 is high for first-time homebuyers.
- Median sales prices have changes as follows over the past seven years:
  - Single-family 4%
  - Semi-detached 6%
  - Condo/apartment -10%

Assessment
- New house prices command a premium over existing dwellings. They have risen well above the rate of inflation over the past seven years. However, resale house prices have remained stagnant over the same time, improving overall affordability for new homebuyers.
- Lower priced housing options, such as condominiums and other higher density accommodation, are still required to meet the demand from smaller households and first-time homebuyers.
2.10 Rental Rates (Trends)

Description
Trends in rental rates detail the overall changes in rent levels and include a comparison of existing versus newly constructed rental units (CMHC surveyed purpose built structures of 3+ units).

Findings
- Rental rates have increased from an average of $770 in 2006 to $1,145 in 2014, an overall increase of 49% over eight years.
- Data shows the rents for new units are generally 15% - 20% higher than for units built prior to 2000 (see green line in Figure 17).
- Data also shows that units constructed in the last four or five years rent at more even more of a premium. 280 rental units were constructed in 2011 and 2013, with rental premiums closer to 25% above the older units.
- Rental rates increased by $154/month from 2012 to 2014 (15.5%), well above average wage increases and inflation, making housing even more difficult to afford for lower-income households.

Assessment
- Since 2010, low vacancy rates have stimulated some new rental construction. The new supply of apartments and other higher density rental housing will have higher rents, but it will also help moderate rents in the older stock in Parkland.
- Low vacancy rates also result in rising rental rates, reduced affordability and are especially difficult on lower income renter households. Rising rents also put upward pressure on the number of households in need and the severity of their need.
### 2.10 Rental Rates (continued)

**Description**
Extracing trends in rental distribution can provide insight into how the housing market responds to need and demand. These charts show both the rent distribution for three census periods and how rent distribution has changed over that period.

**Findings**
- Parkland has a stock of 3,725 rental units. While the rental stock grew by 1,000 units between 2001 and 2011 (37%), fewer than 300 were purpose-built rental units. The majority of new rental units were semi-detached housing; row housing and apartments accounted for the remainder.
- Since 2001, the following changes have occurred:
  - 330 units with rents under $500 per month have been lost due to rent increases;
  - 1,030 units with rents between $500 and $800 per month were also lost for the same reason.
- The largest growth in distribution has been units with rents above $1,000 per month, specifically units with rents of $1,500 per month and over.
- Only 645 units, or 17% of the rental stock, had rents under $800 per month in 2011.

**Assessment**
- A loss of nearly 1,400 units with rents under $800 per month occurred between 2001 and 2011. A loss of this size (37% of the rental stock) puts significant upward pressure on the number of renters in core housing need.
- More rental housing is required to replace the affordable units lost and to encourage and enable lower income families, single people and seniors to live in Parkland.
## 2.11 The Housing Continuum

The concept of a housing continuum is widely adopted across Canadian municipalities to help identify where gaps exist between need and demand versus supply. It locates housing need and requirements against a continuum of options. These range from subsidized or Non-Market housing through moderate rent/priced market options, called Market Affordable, to full market priced options both in the rental and ownership sector. The following terms are used to reflect this range throughout the remainder of this report:

A. **Non-Market** describes households with incomes below those required to access social housing. This translates to 35% of median household income for singles and 50% of median income for families.

B. **Market Affordable** describes the income group accessing modest to mid rent/priced homes. They have incomes above those required to be eligible for social housing (“A” above), but below those needed to have wide market choice (as defined by “C” below).

C. **Pure (or Full) Market** housing is that which starts at the regional entry-level home prices (median condominium for singles and first quartile detached home for family). Converting these into incomes (income required to buy at entry-level price, as defined) results in a benchmark pegged at 50% of median family income for singles and 80% of median income for families. Households with incomes above these thresholds are deemed able to rent/buy at market prices.

Using these income thresholds, households are allocated into one of the three income demand categories and dwelling units are similarly sorted into one of three categories, based on rents and prices derived at 30% of the related income thresholds. See Appendix B for method and details.

### Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsidized Housing</th>
<th>Affordable Housing</th>
<th>Market Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelters</td>
<td>Rental and Ownership housing generally requiring no ongoing subsidies, though may include rent supplements for income challenged households</td>
<td>80-85% of households whose housing need and demand is sufficiently met by the private market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>65-80% Below Median Income</td>
<td>Rental and Ownership housing provided by the Private Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Housing</td>
<td>80-100% Below Median Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receives direct subsidies enabling rents to be provided on a geared to income basis for a range of low-income and/or special needs households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-80% Below Median Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: 2009 Capital Region Housing Plan)
2.12 Housing Availability and Requirements by Income Band

Availability of rental units (blue bars) compared to households of a specific income range (red bars) in the housing continuum identifies rental unit shortages and surpluses in Parkland (green bar). The maximum income benchmarks, associated maximum affordable rents, and house prices used to quantify this continuum are presented in detail in Appendix B.

**Findings and Assessment**

- There is a shortage of 155 rental units affordable to households with incomes in the Non-Market category of the continuum. These households have to access housing in the Market Affordable category (+/-$1,000/month), and have to pay in excess of 30% of their income.
- The 155 unit shortage of rental housing consists of a surplus of 65 rental units for families and a shortfall of 220 rental units for non-family (single) households. The single-person households earn less than $29,750 and require housing, such as bachelor and one-bedroom apartments, that cost less than $744/month.
- The shortage of 297 of Full Market rental units is theoretical because these higher income households can access the 433 Market Affordable Housing surplus rental units.
2.13 Rental Rates and Household Income Balance

Description
An indicator of the number of rental units required by rental price range can be determined by comparing the rental units in each rent range (units available) to renter incomes, using 30% of income as an affordability measure to convert their income into a rent range (units required, based on income). Based on this assessment, the net mismatch in each rent range (Figure 22) shows the shortages and surpluses by rent range.

Findings
- A sufficient supply of units with rents in the mid-range of $750 - $1,999 per month exists in Parkland, but a shortage of units with rents less $750 per month is evident. The net mismatch shows the following shortages:
  - 262 affordable units with rents under $499/month;
  - 54 units with rents between $500 and $749/month.

Assessment
- Renters in need of lower cost housing must rent housing in the $750 per month or higher ranges and pay in excess of 30%, sometimes up to 50%, of their income for housing.
- The shortage of high rent units ($2000 and over) is theoretical (see Section 2.12) because higher income renters access housing in the lower rent ranges.
2.14 Rental Market Supply and Affordability

Description
The comparison of actual units in the stock (2011) against the number required, based on income and affordability at 30% of income can be further examined by separating family and non-family households (mainly singles), and associated larger versus smaller units.

Findings
- A mentioned on the previous page, there is a shortage of 262 rental units for households that cannot afford to pay more than $500/month for rent. 85% (228) are needed by non-family households.
- There is also a shortage of 54 units with rents between $500 and $749/month. 94% (205) are needed by family households.
- Most rental units exist in the mid-ranges, between $750 and $1,999 (dotted line), creating a theoretical surplus in these rent ranges. In reality, both lower and higher income single person households occupy these rental units.

Assessment
- This mismatch analysis is one way to examine gaps in the housing system. It shows a mismatch between what households can reasonably afford to pay for rent and what they have to pay for rent. This analysis is based solely on income and rent levels. It does not consider whether the homes are appropriate in size.
- While the total number of homes is sufficient, the rent distribution (dotted line) does not match the income distribution. As a result, there are insufficient low rent units. 231 smaller units are needed for non-family households and 84 units are needed for families, all with rents below $750 per month.
- The lack of low rent options means low income households live in homes that are more expensive relative to their income, and they pay over 30% (and sometimes over 50%) for shelter.
### 3.0 Households in Need

Determining need and demand for Non-Market Housing and Market Affordable Housing is one of several reasons for undertaking a housing needs assessment. Comparing the distribution of the households in Non-Market Housing need and Market Affordable Housing demand across the Region will point to current and future gaps. Consistent and reliable data is required to develop integrated plans to address housing imbalances in the Sub-Region and Region. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) has developed a Core Housing Need measure, which uses a two-step process to identify the number and incidence of households in need of housing:

- Does a household experience any one of or a combination of problems based on three standard measures of suitability (number of bedrooms compared to household composition), condition (need for major repair) and affordability (paying greater than 30% of income)? And,
- Is the household’s gross income below a specified threshold (which is calculated separately for each Census Metropolitan Area [CMA] and for each household size, such as one-person or two-person households)?

Another approach is to examine households experiencing severe shelter cost burdens. This is represented by housing costs in excess of 50% of income from the 2011 National Households Survey (NHS). This measure of acute need is used alongside core need (which uses 30% of income) as a way to help understand which households face a significant housing cost challenge.

As mentioned in the discussion on the housing continuum, the homeless are included in the Non-Market Housing category. Although the homeless are not included in the core need data, they are an important aspect of need in all of the Sub-Regions, most significantly in Edmonton. The Parkland Sub-Region and the University of Alberta are currently completing work on the needs of the homeless, which complement the Parkland Sub-Region Housing Assessment.

---

1. Core Housing Need estimates are derived from the Canada Census every five years, which does not count the homeless.
3.1 Core Housing Need Estimates (2011)

Description
Core housing need is estimated using magnitude (number of households) and incidence or tendency to be in need. The CMHC data provides insight into the characteristics (tenure, age and family type) of households in need.

Findings
- Affordability is a much larger problem than crowding and condition. Most households with crowding problems (10%) are families. Housing with major repair problems are experienced by all household types.
- Renters experience core housing need at about six times the rate of homeowners.
  - 910 households or about 4% of owners are in core need. Owners also have an asset in their property that provides financial security not available to renters.
  - 830 households or about 24% of renters are in core need.

Assessment
- Actions to address core need should focus on affordability for renter households due to their lower household incomes and relative high incidence of need.
3.1 Core Housing Need Estimates (continued)

Description
Renters have a high incidence of core need. The charts focus on renter households to identify those in greatest need.

Findings
- Lone parent renters have a disproportionately high incidence or likelihood of being in core need at 43%. There are 220 lone parent households, which is almost one in every two households.
- There are 440 non-family renters in core need with an incidence of 28% or more than one in four households.
- There are 165 couple households in core need with an incidence of only 12% or less than one in eight households.
- 53% of renter households in need are non-families and 27% are lone parent families.
- Senior households experience the highest incidence of need at 52% or more than one in every two households. They are nearly three times as likely to be in need compared to households less than 65 years of age.

Assessment
- See next page.
3.1 Core Housing Need Estimates (continued)

Description
Combining incidence of need by age and household type indicates who is in core housing need.

Findings
- The age groups and household types with the highest incidence of core need are:
  - Lone parent renters 15-29 years of age (70%) and 30-44 ages (44%);
  - Lone parent renters 65+ years of age (69%);
  - Non-family (singles) renters 65+ years of age (62%).
- 61.5% are under the age of 65. Family households under 65 years of age represent 39% of the households in core need.
- 56% of family households in core housing need are lone parents and 71% of them are between the ages of 15 and 44.

Assessment
- Lone parent renter families and seniors have the highest incidence of need in Parkland. However, in terms of magnitude, there are 45% more seniors than lone parent families in core need.
- The households in need reflect the gaps in the availability of Non-Market Housing in Parkland. More housing appropriate for lower income families and seniors is required.
- Failure to meet these needs will result in some lone parent families and seniors leaving Parkland.

F28: Incidence of Need by Household Type and Age for Renters

T4: Renters in Core Need by Household Type and Age of Maintainer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-senior</th>
<th>15-29 years</th>
<th>30-44 years</th>
<th>45-64 years</th>
<th>65+ years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone-Parent</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Acute Need

Description
The 2011 National Household Survey (NHS) identifies households that pay more than 50% of their income for housing and are experiencing acute housing needs.*

Findings
- The data shows couple families have the highest number in acute need at 845 households, closely followed by single person households at 825.
- If households paying in excess of 100% are excluded, single person households are the largest number in acute need at 540. Slightly less than one in eight of these households pay more than 50% of their income for rent.
- Overall, 17% of renters pay more than 50% of their income on rent, compared to 21% in the Region.

Assessment
- Data issues, as footnoted below, influence acute need, but overall the high incidence of acute need is a significant concern.
- Single person households have the greatest need in terms of numbers (540) and severity of need - one in eight pays more than 50% - and require small, affordable housing units.
- The lower percent of renter households in Parkland in acute need is positive, but it still represents almost one in five renter households.

* 5% of all households (8.5% of renters) in the Region pay over 100% of their income for housing. This is a statistical anomaly caused in part by change in household composition or status in prior years. It occurs because NHS collected shelter cost in April 2011, but income data is for the prior year. While included here, this data should be treated with caution.
3.3 Non-Market Housing Portfolio

**Description**
The Non-Market Housing portfolio (Table 5) is assessed to determine who and how many households are being served in comparison to the households that are in need in Parkland.

**Findings**
- There are 616 Non-Market Housing units in Parkland, or about two percent of the portfolio in the Region.
- The various programs have different subsidy provisions:
  - Programs 1 – 7 are deep subsidy programs;
  - Programs 5 – 7 are Rent-Geared-To-Income (30%);
  - Program 8 consists of RGI and fixed rate (below market) subsidies;
  - Programs 9, 10, and 12 are 10 – 15% below market;
  - Program 11 is homeownership.

**Assessment**
- The Non-Market Housing portfolio consists of a variety of different types of accommodations with different subsidy levels.
- The deep subsidy programs were funded in the mid 1970’s to early 1990’s. The majority of the portfolio developed since 1995 are shallow subsidy programs like Affordable Housing (10 – 15% below market rental rates).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Housing/Program</th>
<th>Number of Units/Beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Emergency Shelters</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transitional Accommodation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Permanent Supportive Housing (Lodge)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supported Housing - Semi-independent</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-Profit Housing</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Community Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Seniors’ Self- Contained Housing</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rent Supplements</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Affordable Housing</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Co-op Housing</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Secondary Suites</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Other (Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>616</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Meridian Foundation and Alberta Seniors

* There is a wide range of supportive living facilities designed to serve health and related accommodation and nutritional needs. SL2 (Lodge level accommodation) is included in the Non-Market Housing portfolio, but the SL-3 (Assisted Living), SL-4 (Enhanced Assisted Living), SL-4d (Dementia Care) and Continuing Care accommodation are not included mainly because they are health (not income) related and must qualify through Alberta Health Services for entry. Also, the majority of beds/units are not subsidized at any given point in time and should not be included in Non-Market Housing portfolio.
3.3 Non-Market Housing Portfolio (continued)

Description
The number of units in the Non-Market Housing Portfolio and relative level of access to those units by different household types is an important component of determining the priority for addressing the current households in need. Here the existing portfolio is compared to the need.

Findings
- The Parkland Non-Market Housing Portfolio consists mainly of units for families (46%) and seniors (45%). Only nine percent of the portfolio is for singles.
- The overall service level of the Non-Market Housing portfolio in Parkland is 43%. Seniors are above the average at 46% and families and singles are lower at 37% and 23% respectively.

Assessment
- The first priority for any new Non-Market Housing initiatives is bringing the services levels in line with core housing need by household type.
- The low level of service provided to non-elderly singles makes them the priority. Families and especially lone parent families are also a high priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Singles</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HHs</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>10,355</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>9,929</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Singles</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Total**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HHs</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS in Need</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (2)</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Level</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Service Level (SL) refers to the proportion of the households in need that are served by the existing Non-Market Housing portfolio. The SL is calculated for the main household types and is useful for establishing priorities and ensuring a balanced portfolio.

** While totals may not add up exactly due to rounding, there is no material change to the service level percentages.
4.0 Future Housing Market

How housing requirements and needs change over time draws on population and household projections for the Region. The method used to generate the projections include historic fertility, mortality and household formation rates within each Sub-Region. Population projections include the number of households by age cohort from the growth.

The high projection is used in this assessment to estimate the housing requirements resulting from population and employment growth sorted by Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing need and demand. This future need assessment assumes that each Sub-Region continues to maintain its current share of the Region’s population and households. It also assumes that the 2011 incidence of core housing need remains constant.

Total household growth under the low and high projection for the Region was examined to assess the implications for future growth in housing requirements. It revealed that across the Region, household growth over the next six years (2015-2021) is anticipated to average between 10,200-12,800 households per year. This section examines how this affects growth and need in the Parkland Sub-Region.

| T8: Projected Annual Growth in Housing Requirements – Low and High Scenarios² |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| LOW GROWTH SCENARIO             |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| New Housing Requirements        | 10,743          | 10,599          | 10,205          | 10,040          | 9,973           | 9,911           | 9,985           | 10,208          |
| HIGH GROWTH SCENARIO            |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| New Housing Requirements        | 13,116          | 13,093          | 12,747          | 12,622          | 12,660          | 12,598          | 12,699          | 12,791          |

Note: Projecting long-term population and household growth cannot predict economic downturns and the impact on the number of households in need.

² The population projections used here do not include the adjustment made from the Capital Region Board Growth Plan Update with 2014 municipal census results as this needs assessment requires detailed projections by age and year to project annual housing requirements. The adjustment made for the Growth Plan Update included the total population in 2014 and 2044 only.
4.1 Future Non-Market Housing Needs

Description

Projecting the annual growth in housing requirements and needs over the next six years is required for future housing planning. The growth in need presented here draws on an allocation of overall growth from the Region’s high projection scenario and uses the incidence of core need by age cohort from 2011.

Findings

- The number of renters in core housing need in Parkland is projected to grow on average by 61 annually over the next six years. During the same time period, growth by age cohort varies considerably, as evidenced below:
  - The 15-24 age cohort will decrease on average by one household every year;
  - The 25-44 age cohort will increase on average by 19 households every year, which is 30% of the growth in households in need;
  - The 45-64 age cohort will increase on average by nine households or 15% of the total every year;
  - The 65 and over age cohort will increase on average by 35 households every year, which is 56% of the growth in households in need. 77% of the growth in seniors is from households 65-74 years old.
- Over the next six years, the 65 and over age cohort is rapidly expanding as a share of the total and all other age groups are declining (Figure 31).

Assessment

- Seniors will account for 56% of the future growth of households in need over the coming six years. Affordable, smaller housing units, such as bachelor and one-bedroom apartments, will be required to meet their needs.
- Family rental units will be required to address needs of family households, including lone parent families.

### T9: Projected Annual Growth of Households in Need by Age, 2015-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F31: Projected Annual Growth of Households in Need by Age, 2015-21

![Projected Annual Growth of Households in Need by Age, 2015-21](image)
4.2 Future Market Housing Requirements

Description

Future Market Affordable Housing requirements are calculated using the overall share of households with incomes above the eligible range for Non-Market Housing but unable to access ownership. These requirements should be compared to earlier data on the form and type of new homes being constructed.

Findings

- On average, 106 or 14% of new housing units are required as Market Affordable Housing to accommodate future growth. A breakdown of the annual housing requirements by age are:
  - The 15-24 age cohort decreases by one household;
  - The 25-44 age cohort increases by 42 households (40% of the growth);
  - The 45-64 age cohort increases by 27 households (25% of the growth);
  - The 65-74 age cohort increases by 30 households (28% of the growth);
  - The 75+ age cohort increases by nine households (8% of the growth).
- Over the next six years, the 65 and over age cohort will expand as a share of the total and all other age groups will decline (Figure 31), but at a slower rate than households in core housing need.

Assessment

- The declining 15-24 age group will negatively affect the demand for rental housing because virtually all of these households are renters.
- The 25-44 age group continues to grow the most (although at a slowing pace), which will positively affect demand from higher income renters and first time homebuyers.
- While there is a surplus Market Affordable Housing units now, demand will continue to grow as the population increases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F32: Projected Annual Growth in Market Affordable
Demand by Age, 2015-21
5.0 Gap Analysis

This section summarizes the gaps and potential implications for the housing continuum in the Parkland Housing Sub-Region. The data and information from the needs assessment is the foundation for developing a Sub-Regional Housing Plan.
5.1 Non-Market Housing Gaps

Description

Non-Market Housing gaps include both existing and future growth of households in core need. The prioritization of these gaps, based on age and household type, will form the basis for allocating any funding for new Non-Market Housing. As before, this considers only renters, for whom need is high.

Findings

- Renter households with the highest incidence of need (Figure 28) are:
  - Lone-parent renters 15-29 years of age (70%);
  - Lone-parent renters 65+ years of age (69%);
  - Single-person renters 65+ years of age (62%);
- Renter households with the highest number in need are:
  - Seniors (320);
  - Non-senior singles (185);
  - Lone-parent families (175).
- Over the next six years, 30% of the growth in need will be from households between 30-44 years of age and 56% will come from households 65 years and older.

Assessment

- Lone-parent families and seniors rank high in terms of numbers and incidence of need, now and into the future.
- The 65 and over age cohort will continue to grow and increase its share of the total number of households in need over the next six years.
- All other age cohorts will continue to grow (except the 15-24 age cohort), but will decrease their share of need related to growth.
- The existing needs of non-elderly singles and low-income families must also be priority in the near term to ensure a balance between needs and service levels (supply of Non-Market Housing).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Non-senior</th>
<th>15-29 years</th>
<th>30-44 years</th>
<th>45-64 years</th>
<th>65 years +</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone-Parent</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals do not add up do to rounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohorts</th>
<th>Core Housing Need, 2015-2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of New Households (Annual Average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 24</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 44</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 64</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 74</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Market Housing Gaps

Description
Market Housing gaps include both the existing and future gaps in the supply and need/demand mismatch related to household incomes and housing costs in Parkland. Understanding existing and future gaps in the housing market is important for developing policy and program responses to address both Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing requirements.

Findings
- Currently, there is a surplus of Market Affordable and Pure Market Housing.
- Separating out renter households reveals there is a surplus of Market Affordable rental units for non-family households, but a shortage of about 50 units for families (see Table 7 in Appendix B).

Assessment
- There appears to be a sufficient supply of dwellings in Parkland, however, the housing cost (price/rent) does not match household incomes.
- There is a shortage of 50 units Market Affordable Housing required for family households (three and four bedroom units), even though there is currently a surplus of 433 Market Housing units overall.
- There is a current shortage of 425 units of Market Housing - 268 units for singles and 162 units for families (see Tables B6 and B7 in Appendix B). Future Market Housing investment should be aware of this potential demand for rental housing from the Pure Market side of the housing continuum.

T13: Market Housing Requirements, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Market Affordable Housing</th>
<th>Pure Market Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (Shortage)</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>1,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Households Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (Shortage)</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>(425)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T14: Annual Growth in Market Affordable/Market Housing, 2015-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Requirements</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Affordable Housing</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Summary

Non-Market Housing Gaps
- In 2011 (NHS), there were 830 renter households in Parkland in core housing need. This represents a backlog of unmet need. Population and household growth might add to this in the future.
- The 830 renter households in need are distributed among families, non-elderly singles and seniors. Families and seniors account for 39% each and non-elderly singles make up 22% of households in need. Single person households have the most acute needs (many pay more than 50% for housing).
- Future Non-Market Housing needs for seniors will continue to grow as a share of the total need. All other age groups will decline as a share of the total.
- Future needs will continue to be most acute among lone-parent renter households, which will require larger family units, and among non-elderly singles.
- The existing Non-Market Housing portfolio in Parkland is mainly for families and seniors. Non-elderly singles are the priority in the short term to raise the level of service for them and to address the backlog of need that exists.

Market Affordable Housing Gaps
- While there is strong demand for Market Affordable Housing, the current supply of housing units is sufficient, with a surplus of 998 units in this rent/price range. If owners are removed, the surplus is 433 rental units in this rent range. However, the surplus is theoretical because households from the other income ranges occupy many of these homes.
- There is a requirement for about 50 units of Market Affordable rental housing, in particular three and four bedroom units, for families.

Pure Market Housing Gaps
- The main gaps in Pure Market Housing are the lack of multi-family housing and traditional rental housing. Lack of such options results in higher housing costs compared to a more diversified and balanced housing stock of structure types and tenures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Number of Households in Need</th>
<th>Share of Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family (Singles)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Non-Market Housing Need</th>
<th>Annual Future Housing Needs and Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Household Growth</td>
<td>Non-Market Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>30,720</td>
<td>12,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Where To From Here

- Both existing unmet needs and future housing need and demand are used in the development of public policy and planning for Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing across the Capital Region. The development of long-range plans and land use policies can ensure the housing market is balanced and functioning in an inclusive manner, as well as support initiatives to improve housing affordability, specifically Market Affordable Housing.

- The next step in implementing the Capital Region Housing Plan is development of a Regional Planning Framework that would incorporate both Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing, and build upon the results of the Housing Needs Assessments.

- The result will be a Regional Housing Plan with a 5 - 10 year timeframe that (1) incorporates changing trends and gaps in the existing supply of housing with future housing need and demand, and (2) directs the supply of Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing throughout the Capital Region.
Appendix A: Data Sources and Limitations

Data Sources
The following housing data sources are used to develop this report:

- 2011 Canada Census - National Household Survey (NHS)
- 2011 Core Need Estimates - National Household Survey (NHS)
- Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) housing market reports (new starts, rents and prices and rental vacancies)
- Edmonton Real Estate Board (EREB) sales data on existing house prices from the Multiple List Service (MLS)
- Administrative data related to existing supportive and social housing inventories, provided by the CRB municipalities and Housing Management Bodies in each Sub-region, the Housing Division of the Alberta Government, the City of Edmonton, and CMHC.

Data Limitations
As with any data, there are limitations. This may include accuracy of the data, when it was collected, the variables collected, and how the data can be disaggregated.

CMHC Core Housing Need Estimates
CMHC uses the census/NHS to generate estimates of core housing need. In this assessment, the 2011 NHS data are used to develop estimates of core need (2011). These are augmented with additional analysis: households paying over 50% of income as a separate measure of acute need.

Canada Census National Household Survey (NHS)
The census provides a rich data set, but is limited by frequency (every 5 years) and a delay in publication (2-3 years). Data can become 8 years out of date by the end of the census cycle. Other data sources are needed to supplement the census/NHS and to provide inter-censual updates.

Statistics Canada Tax Filer Data
Income data is available from Statistics Canada using Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) tax files data and is updated annually, with an 18-month lag. (2011 tax year data currently available; 2012 data will be available in October 2014.) This disaggregates by family type (i.e. two parent and lone parent), as well as non-family households, but does not provide tenure.

Statistics Canada also updates population estimates and components of population change (natural versus immigration) annually. Some data used to create tables and graphs has missing or blank cells. This is due to Statistics Canada’s data suppression policy, which ensures that individuals and households cannot be identified through the data. The details can be found in the Disclosure Control at http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/12-539-x/steeps-etaspe/4058325-eng.htm.

CMHC Monthly Market Surveys
Rental data (rents and vacancies) are surveyed and published semiannually by CMHC providing regular updates on the state of the market. The data covers privately owned rental apartment buildings containing 3 or more units. Smaller buildings and condominiums are not surveyed, nor is the secondary rental market, such as single detached houses, and basement suites. Due to the lack of a traditional rental market in the Sub-regions, the
survey only covers a small portion of the housing that most renters occupy (less than 25% in some cases) and is therefore not a very reliable indicator of vacancy and rental rates in these areas. Data from the 2011 NHS provides an estimate (based on occupant assessed values in 2011) of the current rental rates of rented accommodation in the Sub-region.

**Market Affordable Housing Supply and Demand Analysis**

Market Affordable Housing is modest-sized, entry-level, family-oriented housing capable of being produced without upfront or on-going direct subsidies from any order of government for households earning moderate incomes (see Glossary). There is no available source of data that clearly articulates the type and amount of supply and demand for Market Affordable Housing. A methodology was developed to show how the existing supply of housing (ownership and rental) matches with household incomes (demand). The method is explained in detail in Appendix C.
Appendix B: The Housing Continuum Demand and Supply Gaps and Mismatch - Methodology and Assumptions

A continuum is a useful way to review the full range of housing options and assess both current supply and requirements based on incomes and household demographics. The concept of a housing continuum is widely adopted across Canadian municipalities as a way to set the broader context, as well as to help identify where gaps exist between need and demand versus supply. It presents an overview of the housing continuum from homelessness to the pure market response. This separates Market and Non-Market aspects of the housing system and includes the important category of Market Affordable Housing referenced in the Capital Region Housing Mandate. 

Figure B1: The Housing Continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Market Housing</th>
<th>Market Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-20% of households whose housing needs are not met by the market</td>
<td>80-85% of households whose housing need and demand is sufficiently met by the private market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing operated, funded or created by government funding and is comprised of different categories of housing based on the associated services included and the level of public funding achieved</td>
<td>Rental and Ownership housing provided by the Private Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires direct capital and/or operating subsidies to enable rents or ownership costs to be provided for short or long term occupancy by lower income and/or special needs households</td>
<td>Market Affordable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receives direct subsidies enabling rents to be provided on a geared to income basis for a range of low-income and/or special needs households</td>
<td>Household income can exceed median income, Minimum rent or ownership changes calculated through private financing based on cost effective construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-80% Below Median Income</td>
<td>80-100% Below Median Income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Non-Market side (Figure 1, left side) of the continuum includes services that represent an add-on to housing (accommodation). They provide varying levels of support services reflecting the special needs of the sub-population. This includes emergency shelters and housing in which support services are incorporated or delivered separately via community social service agencies.

The important element from the perspective of quantifying housing need and requirements is that affordable housing stock to facilitate the delivery of such support services is available. Mainly, this speaks to requirements for subsidized or low rent options where low-income persons transitioning from homelessness or living with mental health challenges, or with restricted ability to perform activities of daily living can afford to live while receiving additional supports.

---

3 Figure 1, extracted from the Capital Region Housing Plan, uses reference income bands that vary from those used in this guide. As described below, these have been calculated as a way to quantify the continuum.
The Capital Region Housing Plan includes a preliminary income related quantum based on percentage of median income. It is possible to refine the income categories (as percentage of median or average income) accurately using eligibility income thresholds for social/affordable housing. This can then be used to align each part of the continuum against the price/rent of housing availability. This does not need to be done for each Sub-Region. A Region-wide benchmark can be created, as this is a regional market in which consumers make locational choices. While using a Region benchmark, the existing requirements and availability in each sub-region should be determined with local data (i.e. how many units exist within each band of the continuum in that Sub-Region).

The standard measures, used in Canada as eligibility for Social Housing, have an income threshold called Housing Income Limits (HILs). These are derived from median market rents, which are updated annually from CMHC rental surveys. HILs determine the income required to afford the median rent at 30% of income. These are calculated by household size (number of persons) and rounded to the nearest $1,000. HILs are calculated and applied at the CMA scale (i.e. not calculated at any sub-regional level).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Rent (2011)</th>
<th>Derived HIL*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Single - Bachelor</td>
<td>$713</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Person - One-bed</td>
<td>$857</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Person - Two-bed</td>
<td>$1034</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Person - Three-bed</td>
<td>$1191</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (E.g. 2 bed = $1,034 divided by 30% times 12 months = $41,360 rounded to $41,000

Because median rents are not readily available, a proxy based on average rents is used here. For consistency with the 2011 NHS data used in assessment, the following HILs are calculated against the Oct 2011 Edmonton (CMA) average rents.

The 2010 NHS reports median and average incomes for Edmonton (CMA) as $79,090 and $97,516 respectively. Tax filer data for 2010 reports an average of $82,603 blended across all household types. This had increased to $85,414 in 2011. In the assessment, the average of $85,000 is used.

The average (or median) income of $85,000 for all households is too high to use as a threshold to assess Non-Market need. A household with an income of $80,000 can afford a rent of $2,000 and a home purchase price of $400,000 and cannot be used as a measure of need.

In targeting programs, the United States of America uses 50-60% of area median family income. Separate analysis in Canada has found that 60% of median income roughly approximates the income calculated under the HIL method based on average rent for two-bed units. In our case, 50% of average 2011 income would

---

In developing HILs CMHC generates a data set of median rents based on units that include heat; however, these rents are not published. This tends to be slightly different from the published average rent data. Here the average rent is used to estimate HILs for purpose of quantifying the continuum.
translate to an income of $42,500 with affordable rent and house price of roughly $1,000/month and $200,000, respectively.

When comparing the derived HILs, which reflect the upper limit for eligibility for social housing, to the average 2011 income (tax data) of $85,400, it is clear that, as a benchmark against median or average household income, an adjustment is required. The upper limits should be closer to 50% for families and 30-35% for non-family (mainly singles) for whom smaller units with lower rents are appropriate.

Table B2: Edmonton 2011 Derived HIL’s and Average Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Annual Income</th>
<th>As % 2011 income (CMA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Single - Bachelor</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Person - One-bed</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Person - Two-bed</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Person - Three-bed</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing these CMA HILs to the CMA regional median income the continuum can be quantified.

Table B3: The Housing Continuum Income Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGE INCOME EDMONTON CMA 2011 = $85,000 (= BASE FOR BENCHMARKS)</th>
<th>Non-Market</th>
<th>Market Affordable</th>
<th>Pure Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single (Income as % Benchmark =)</td>
<td>0 - 35%</td>
<td>35 - 50%</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (Income as % Benchmark =)</td>
<td>0 - 50%</td>
<td>50 - 80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Households (Incomes as % Benchmark =)</td>
<td>0 - 35/50%</td>
<td>35/50% - 50/80%</td>
<td>&gt;50/80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum affordable price and rent for threshold income can be readily calculated based on paying 30% of income for rent or mortgage. These rent and price ranges can then be compared against the rent and price distribution in each jurisdiction as a way to identify gaps in the continuum.

The continuum can be refined to include an intermediate market category as a transition between Non-Market and Pure Market. Given the incomes and distribution of households (families and singles separately), the affordable rent price for each income band can be calculated. This can then be compared against the existing rents and prices in the stock in a sub-region or municipality, as well as against the rents and prices of recently constructed housing.

Unfortunately, the census (NHS) data does not distinguish between smaller sized units for singles (bachelor/one-bedroom) and larger family sized units (2-3+ bedroom). However, the National Household Survey custom data file obtained for this work provides reasonable proxies. For owners, the file provides
dwelling values by structure type. Larger dwelling types (single-detached, semi, row and mobiles) are assigned as family housing; apartments and attached units are assigned to non-family (singles) housing.

The data files for renters include rent ranges with household type; family and non-family households can be extracted. The incomes of both family and non-family households are also available separately. Counting the number of households within each income range provides a way to quantify demand and to compare this with supply (availability by rent or price).

The results for the Parkland Sub-Region are included in Table B4. The continuum shows a shortfall of housing options (either to rent or to buy) against the lower income need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average income (= base for benchmarks) - $85,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Income as % Benchmark =)*</th>
<th>0 - 35%/50%</th>
<th>35/50% - 50/80%</th>
<th>&gt;50/80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max income benchmark</td>
<td>29,500/42,500</td>
<td>42,500/68,000</td>
<td>&gt; 42,500/68,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max afford rent</td>
<td>744 (S); 1063 (F)</td>
<td>$1,063 (S)/$1,700 (F)</td>
<td>&gt;$1,063 (S)/$1,700 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max afford buy</td>
<td>134k (S)/192k (F)</td>
<td>$192k (S)/307k (F)</td>
<td>&gt; $192k (S)/307k (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent units available</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes priced in range</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>17,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total dwellings in range</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>4,745</td>
<td>18,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households in income range</td>
<td>4,119</td>
<td>3,748</td>
<td>18,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(Shortfall)</td>
<td>(1,249)</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>(424)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The income benchmark is different for singles and families, e.g. for non-market it is 35% singles and 50% family so two values are used in each part of the continuum.

The results show that there is a shortage of some 1,249 units (owned and rented) of Non-Market Housing for households earning less than $29,500 for singles and $42,500 for families. The Market Affordable category shows a theoretical surplus and the Full Market shows a shortage of 424 units. The surplus is theoretical because households from the other categories can access these units, however, this does exclude lower income households because they cannot afford to compete with higher income households.

Given that the focus of the need assessment is on renter households, due to the high incidence and magnitude of need, this approach can be adapted to focus only on renter family and non-family households. Table B5 and Graph B2 show the results for all renter households and rental units in each category.
Table B5: Quantifying the Continuum for Renters - All Households Parkland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Market</th>
<th>Market Affordable</th>
<th>Pure Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Income as % Benchmark =)</td>
<td>0 - 35%/50%</td>
<td>35/50% - 50/80%</td>
<td>&gt;50/80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Income benchmark</td>
<td>29,500 (S)/42,500 (F)</td>
<td>42,500 (S)/68,000 (F)</td>
<td>&gt;42,500 (S)/68,000 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max afford rent</td>
<td>744 (S); 1063 (F)</td>
<td>1,063 (S)/1,700 (F)</td>
<td>&gt;1,063 (S)/1,700 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent units available</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental HHs in income range</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>1,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(Shortfall)</td>
<td>(155)</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>(297)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from Table B5 and Figure B2 show there is a shortage of 155 units of Non-Market Housing and a theoretical shortage of 297 units of Full Market Housing. To gain more insight into and appreciation of the situation, the family and non-family renter households and rental units can be assessed separately. The following two sets of tables and graphs provide this breakdown.
Table B6: Quantifying the Continuum for Renters - Single Person Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average income (= base for benchmarks) - $85,000*</th>
<th>Non-Market</th>
<th>Market Affordable</th>
<th>Pure Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Income as % Benchmark =)</td>
<td>0-35%</td>
<td>35-50%</td>
<td>50%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Income benchmark</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>&gt; 42,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max afford rent</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>$1,063</td>
<td>&gt;$1,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent units available</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental HHs in income range</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(Shortfall)</td>
<td>(220)</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>(268)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing Availability and Requirements by Income Band for Renters
Single Person Households

Table B6 and Figure B3 show there is a deficit of 220 rental housing options for single renters earning less than 35% of median income ($29,500). For single renters earning between 35% and 50% ($29,500 - $42,500) of median income, there is a surplus of 483 rental units. Above 80% (> $42,500) of median income, there is a theoretical shortage of 268 rental housing units. Higher income households access housing in the lower cost categories, so it is not an issue for them, but they do crowd out lower income households. However, this does point to the fact that rental housing options desired by singles are very limited and in short supply, especially affordable rental housing.
B7: Quantifying the Continuum for Renters - Family Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average income (= base for benchmarks) - $85,000*</th>
<th>Non-Market</th>
<th>Market Affordable</th>
<th>Pure Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Income as % Benchmark =)</td>
<td>0 - 50%</td>
<td>50% - 80%</td>
<td>80%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Income benchmark</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max afford rent</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent units available</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental HHs in income range</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(Shortfall)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of families (Table B7 and Figure B4)), there is a surplus of 65 housing units for families earning less than 50% of the median income ($42,500), and a theoretical surplus of some 50 rental housing units for families earning between 50% and 80% ($42,500 to $68,000) of median income. Above 80% of median income (>85,000), there is a theoretical shortage of 30 rental housing units. This suggests that the real gap for many renter families is the lack of any rental housing, especially housing designed for families (e.g. three and four bedroom units).
Appendix C: Glossary and Acronyms

**Affordable Housing Program**
The Province of Alberta’s Affordable Housing Program provides one-time capital grants for the construction/acquisition of rental housing units. Grant recipients are required to provide rents that are at least 10% below market. Units are targeted at households with incomes at or below HILs. There are no operating subsidies for these units.

**Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC)**
CMHC is Canada’s national housing agency. Established as a government-owned corporation in 1946 to address Canada’s post-war housing shortage, the agency has grown into a major national institution. CMHC is Canada’s premier provider of mortgage loan insurance, mortgage-backed securities, housing policy and programs, and housing research.

**Capital Region**
The Capital Region includes lands lying within the boundaries of the participating municipalities: Beaumont, Bon Accord, Bruderheim, Calmar, Devon, Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, Gibbons, Lamont, Lamont County, Leduc, Leduc County, Legal, Morinville, Sturgeon County, Redwater, St. Albert, Spruce Grove, Stony Plain, Strathcona County, Sturgeon County, Thorsby, Wabamun, and Warburg.

**Capital Region Board**
The Capital Region Board was established in 2008, under Capital Region Board Regulation 38/2012, of the Municipal Government Act. The Capital Region Board is a non-profit corporation comprised of 24 member municipalities from within the Region.

**Co-Operative Housing (Co-Op)**
Co-op housing is collectively owned and managed by its members who live in the housing. Co-op members actively participate in decision-making and share the work involved in managing the building and housing community.

**Community Amenities**
Community amenities are capital facilities or improvements needed to service a growing population or to create a more complete community such as leisure centres, police buildings, cultural centres, libraries, parks, and playgrounds. Some definitions also include the natural amenities of rivers, lakes, and walking trails. Other definitions include access to commercial amenities such as shopping centres, medical facilities, and restaurants.

**Community Housing Program**
The Province of Alberta’s Community Housing Program provides subsidized rental housing to low-income households who cannot afford private sector accommodation. Applicants whose income falls below CNITS are eligible to apply. Management and tenant selection is delegated to the local housing operators (usually a Management Body). Applicants are given priority based on need, as determined by income, assets, and current housing condition. A tenant's rent, which includes heat, water and sewer expenses, is based on 30 percent of a household's adjusted income. The tenant is responsible for electricity, telephone and cable television, as well as any additional services they may request (such as parking). Operating deficits are cost-shared with Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. One of the orders of government owns the units.
Core Housing Need
This is a concept developed in the 1980’s to define housing need and involves a two-step assessment. First, does a household experience any one or combination of housing problems covering suitability (crowding), adequacy (building condition) or affordability (paying greater than 30% for shelter)? Second, is their income below a defined income threshold that varies by market/city and by household size?

CMA
Census Metropolitan Area.

CNITS (Core Need Income Thresholds)
Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation establish local income limits each year. Households with annual incomes equal to or less than the HIL are said to have insufficient income to afford the on-going costs of suitable and adequate rental units in their area. Incomes below this level may be eligible for various rental subsidy programs.

Condominium (Condo)
This is a form of tenure that creates title and ownership rights in virtual three dimensions, as opposed to land title. The term refers to a legal ownership structure and should not be confused with built form. For example, an apartment that is owned may be a condominium, but an apartment may also be rented.

Diversification of Housing Types
This is a range of housing types, including single-family dwellings, duplex, townhome, condominium and apartment types, mixed throughout neighborhoods to serve a broad range of residents of varied age and income.

EREB
The Edmonton Real Estate Board is an Association of realtors and provides data and statistics on home sales and prices in the Edmonton area.

Garage Suites
A garage suite is a self-contained dwelling located above a rear attached garage which is accessory to a single detached dwelling. It must have an entrance separate from the vehicle entrance, either from the interior or exterior of the structure, and include cooking facilities, a bathroom and bedroom(s).

Habitat for Humanity Homes
Housing units are built with voluntary labour, using cash and material donations. When completed the units are sold to qualifying, working, low and moderate income households. The household is provided an interest free mortgage and the mortgage is amortized to 25% of the household’s income. When the recipient household decides to sell the unit, it is sold back to Habitat for Humanity and another qualifying household receives a place to live.

HAT
Housing Assessment Tool. The HAT is the tool developed for the Capital Region to assess housing need across all Sub-Regions.

HICO
Housing In Canada Online. A CMHC interactive data file providing historic data and core need estimates for a wide geography of cities and census areas.
HIL
Housing Income Limits (new label for former CNITs, as above).

Home Program
Through education, financial assistance and one-on-one counselling, the HOME Program helps low income people become homeowners. Education sessions are available to anyone interested in owning a home. Participants do not have to be first time buyers or low-income buyers. Low-income buyers (below CNITS) who have completed education sessions can apply for down payment assistance.

Household
Refers to a person or a group of persons (other than foreign residents) who occupy the same dwelling and do not have a usual place of residence elsewhere in Canada. It may consist of a family group (census family) with or without other persons, of two or more families sharing a dwelling, of a group of unrelated persons, or of one person living alone. When age is cross-tabulated with households, this uses the reported age of the household maintainer.

Housing Allowance
This is housing assistance to help households manage high shelter cost burden and is distinct from the Rent Supplement. Payments are made to the household, not to the property owner, and the Housing Allowance is therefore portable. A Housing Allowance may be structured to pay a fixed monthly allowance or can pay based on the RGI-market rent difference.

Housing Continuum
This is a conceptual framework used to describe a range of housing options from homeless supports to independent market rate housing.

Incidence of Need
The frequency (or incidence) of need refers to the tendency that a particular household will experience housing need. For example, if 60 lone-parent households out of 100 lone-parent households experience affordability problems, the incidence (or chance) of need among lone-parents is 60%. In the assessment, incidence refers to affordability need only.

Inclusive Communities
Inclusive communities have a variety of housing, commerce, recreational, institutional, social, and public amenities within their boundary. Inclusive communities provide a physical and social environment where residents can live, learn, work, and play without having to travel beyond the community boundary.

Infill Development
Development or redevelopment in existing developed areas includes building on vacant or underutilized lands, or re-development of a developed site to a higher density.

Intensification
This is the development of a property, site or area at a higher density than currently exists. For example, this includes redevelopment (including the reuse of Brownfield sites), development of vacant and/or underutilized lots, the conversion or expansion of existing buildings, and infill development, and may include Greenfield sites with development densities higher than historical norms.
Major Repairs Needed
This includes dwellings needing major repairs such as defective plumbing, electrical wiring, and structural repairs to walls, floors, or ceilings.

Market Housing
Market Housing is defined as housing supplied by the private market, without direct government subsidies. Under Market Housing, one sub category, Market Affordable Housing, has been further delineated:

  Market Affordable Housing
  Market Affordable Housing is defined as rental or ownership housing that is modest in form and specification and is capable of being produced for moderate income households without upfront or ongoing direct government subsidies (such as through regulatory relaxations, efficient design, or tax incentives). This applies to households earning moderate incomes between 100% and 150% of median income.

  Pure Market is used to further delineate housing that is affordable to those with incomes greater than median income

Minor Repairs Needed
This includes dwellings needing minor repairs such as missing or loose floor tiles, bricks, or shingles and defective steps, railing, or siding.

Mixed-Income Development
This is a type of development that includes families at various income levels. Mixed-income developments are intended to promote de-concentration of poverty and give lower-income households access to improved amenities.

Mixed-Use Development
This development mixes compatible residential, commercial, institutional and recreational land uses. The development may exist within an area of land, and/or within buildings, in order to increase density, reduce development footprint through intensification of land use, and to improve public accessibility to the range of mixed land uses.

Multi-family Housing
A building constructed for residential purposes for use by two or more families, such as duplexes, townhomes, and row house developments, multistory, and high-rise apartments.

NHS
National Household Survey (the replacement for the Statistics Canada long form census), administered in May 2011.

Non-Market Housing
Non-Market Housing is defined as housing that is operated and funded, or created, through direct government subsidies. It includes categories of housing based on the associated services needed by the clients. Non-Market Housing is further segmented into the categories of Affordable Housing and Subsidized Housing:
**Affordable Housing** is rental or ownership housing that generally does not require on-going (operating) subsidies. It is both affordable and targeted for long-term occupancy to households with incomes between 100% and 80% of the median renter income for their household size.

**Social Housing** is rental housing that requires on-going operating subsidies to make it affordable on a long-term basis to households with incomes between 80% and 65% or less of the median renter income for their household size\(^5\).

**Other Non-profit**
These are non-profit organizations providing rental housing at rents below market rates who do not receive housing subsidies from government.

**Provincial Private Non-profit Program**
This program provides monthly subsidies to non-profit organizations to cover operating deficits, including a reserve allocation and the mortgage principal and interest payment based on eligible capital costs. Individuals who currently occupy a crowded or inadequate dwelling would be eligible for housing in these units owned by private non-profit groups. The operating deficits are cost-shared with Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Rents are based on 30 percent of a household’s adjusted income.

**RGI**
Rent Geared to Income.

**Rent Supplement Program**
A subsidy is provided to reduce the market rent for a household with income below CNITS. There is a variety of rent supplement programs, some providing subsidies directly to the property owner, others directly to the tenant. The subsidy can be a fixed rate or based on the income of the household. Typically, these subsidies are funded by the province and administered by a management body.

**Rural and Native Housing Program**
This provincial program funds the construction of a small number of housing units throughout Alberta. Management bodies typically rent out the units in the same manner as the Community Housing Program defined above.

**Secondary Suites**
A secondary suite is a separate and subordinate dwelling unit contained within a detached dwelling. A secondary suite must have a separate entrance from the entrance to the principal dwelling and include a cooking facility, bathroom and bedroom(s) that are separate from those of the principal dwelling.

**Seniors Self-Contained Program**
The Alberta Government provides apartment style accommodation to low and moderate income seniors who are functionally independent with or without assistance from existing community services. Rent, which includes water, heat and sewer expenses, is based on 30% of a household’s adjusted income. The Province

\(^5\) “Non-Market Housing” also includes “Emergency Shelters”, “Transitional Housing” and “Supportive Housing”, and requires deeper capital and operating subsidies provided under government programs to enable affordability to households with considerably lower incomes or no incomes at all.
owns most of the apartments funded under this program and any operating deficits are fully funded by the Alberta Government. Household income must be below the CNITs to qualify for the program.

**Emergency Shelters**
These are temporary places for people to live until housing that is more permanent is found. An emergency shelter supports people fleeing a specific situation, such as natural or man-made disasters, domestic violence or sexual abuse. Emergency shelters sometimes facilitate support groups, and provide meals.

**Special Needs Housing**
Special needs housing are dwellings that have been modified with special features to help people live independently in the community. For example, a unit may be adapted for wheelchair access.

**Supportive Housing**
Supportive housing offers support services onsite to assist tenants to live independently. For example, some providers will offer support for youth or people with substance abuse problems.

**Support Services**
Housing support services help people live independently in the community, regardless of their tenure. They support people who want to stay in their own home. A wide range of people with particular needs can receive housing support services, including homeless people, refugees, women escaping domestic violence, people with a chronic illness, people with a physical impairment or learning disability, seniors, ex-offenders, people with drug and alcohol related problems, and others who need support. They may use these services when their accommodation is temporary (for example, in a crisis) or when they are being re-housed.

A wide range of supported accommodation models exist and some examples include:
- Sheltered housing with 30 or 40 self-contained units of accommodation with on-site support
- Communal facilities and call systems
- Homeless hostels
- Group homes where people share accommodation supported by residential or visiting housing support workers
- Individual scattered or clustered dwellings with floating (flexible) support
- Wet houses for people with substance misuse problems

**Supported Housing**
Rental Housing for less than median income households for whom outreach services are accessed from an off-site source (e.g. homecare, aids to daily living, etc.).

**Supportive Living Lodge**
Supportive living settings are operated under the *Alberta Housing Act (usually by a Management Body)* and are designed to provide room and board for seniors who are functionally independent with or without the assistance of community-based services.
The Sturgeon Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment identifies housing need and demand to support planning for a diverse range of housing options within the Capital Region. This document is one of six assessments for each Housing Sub-Region.
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The Sturgeon Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment provides a comprehensive overview of the housing market and demographics in Sturgeon, in order to assess the current and future housing needs in the Sub-Region. The Capital Region Board (CRB) developed the Housing Assessment Tool (HAT) used in this assessment as an important first step in providing an overview of the current housing situation, recent trends and future needs in each of its six housing Sub-Regions, toward the creation of an integrated regional housing plan.

Household Core Need Analysis:
- There are currently 975 renter households in core need, most paying > 30% of their income and in need of more affordable housing.
- In this analysis, core need is aligned with Non-Market Housing; while 975 are in core need, the current stock of Non-Market options totals 972 units, so it is necessary to double the stock to fully address the backlog of need.
- Families (mainly lone-parents) and seniors who rent have the highest incidence and number of households in need of Non-Market Housing.
- As the population and number of households grow, so will need. Total households are estimated to grow by 990. Of this growth, 8% (81) are likely to be in core need. A further 127 will be moderate income and require homes in the mid-range of rent and prices, so a market response to this level of rent demand is needed. Four-fifths (79%) of growth can be accommodated in market priced options.

Existing Core Need by Household Type, 2011

- Singles, 260 (27%)
- Families, 385 (39%)
- Senior, 330 (34%)

Projected Growth in Need and Demand, 2015-21

- Non-Market
- Market Affordable
- Pure Market

Market Affordable = Housing affordable to households below CRB median income

Non-Market = Households who spend >30% of income on housing

975 renter households currently in Core Need

Pure Market = Housing affordable to households above CRB median income

782 (79%)
Estimated future core need housing requirements

- Total core need, and thus requirements for Non-Market Housing, is expected to grow by 81 households per year.
- Most of this growth will come from seniors over 65 in age, while the non-senior age groups will grow more slowly.
- Over the next six years, growth in need among seniors will increase from 54% to 74% as a share of total growth in core need.
- This will require smaller (one-bedroom) apartments with rents at lower levels.
- While other age groups and household types grow at a slower rate, they too require lower priced options and appropriate building form.

Housing Stock Considerations:

- The predominant form of housing supply in the Sturgeon Sub-Region are detached single-family homes, which meet the requirements of families with children, but may not remain appropriate for the growing population of seniors.
- Very few housing starts in this Sub-Region fit the requirements of smaller households, including singles leaving the family home, lone parents and seniors.
- In the absence of a more diverse housing supply, these smaller and lower income households may be forced to relocate, away from the community where they have lived. Such relocation will contribute to distortion across the Region, rather than balanced distribution of need and housing options.
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The Sturgeon Sub-Region acknowledges the significant amount of work that has been, and continues to be, done with respect to homelessness in the region. The St. Albert Temporary Residential Services Committee is undertaking an assessment of homelessness in St. Albert and the Sturgeon Sub-Region, through the Alberta Rural Development Network Rural and Remote Homeless funding stream in partnership with the University of Alberta.
1.0 Introduction

Note: In this report, Sturgeon means the Sturgeon Housing Sub-Region, which includes the County and its municipalities of Bon Accord, Gibbons, Legal, Morinville, Redwater, and St. Albert.

The Sturgeon Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment identifies housing need and demand to support planning for a diverse range of housing options within the Capital Region. Needs Assessments are also available for the Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan/Strathcona, Lamont, Leduc, and Parkland Housing Sub-Regions (see Diagram 1).

The purpose of the Needs Assessment is to:

- Inform the Capital Region Board of existing and projected Non-Market Housing need and Market Affordable Housing supply, need and demand conditions, and trends in each Sub-Region;
- Lead to a coordinated planning approach to meet housing need and demand through a sufficient supply and balanced mix of dwelling types across the housing continuum in each Sub-Region.

The Needs Assessments are not intended to identify and assess the availability and gaps in community amenities and support services. Amenities and services required by households in need will be identified and coordinated during the planning and delivery of Non-Market Housing.

The Needs Assessments for all six Housing Sub-Regions are to inform Sub-Regional Housing Plans that are part of the Capital Region Board Regional Housing Planning process (see Diagram 2).
1.0 Introduction (continued)

The Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment follows the nine-step approach outlined in the Capital Region Board Housing Needs Assessment Framework\(^1\). The Framework includes a Housing Assessment Tool (HAT) that extrapolates core data to assess the current housing situation, recent trends and future patterns of development across the Region.

**Report Structure**

This Needs Assessment Report provides core data in four main sections:

- Housing Market Overview – Housing stock, prices and household characteristics;
- Households in Need – Core housing need estimates;
- Future Housing Market – Housing, rental market continuum, housing need and demand 2015-2021;
- Gap Analysis – Existing and future housing need gaps, Non-market and Market Affordable Housing.

**Appendices**

Appendix A: Data Sources* and Limitations

Appendix B: The Housing Continuum Demand and Supply Mismatch – Methodology and Assumptions

Appendix C: Glossary and Acronyms

* Figures 14, 15, and 17 use CMHC data and Figure 16 uses Edmonton Real Estate Board data. All other Figures use data from the Canada Census, mainly the National Household Survey (NHS) for 2011 and the Long Form Census for previous years.

\(^1\) Capital Region Board (2014) Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessment Framework.
2.0 Housing Market Overview

The Housing Market Overview describes the status of the housing market in the Sturgeon Sub-Region and contrasts it against the Capital Region in four main areas:

- Housing Stock Characteristics;
- Population and Household Characteristics;
- Household Income Profile;
- House Prices and Rental Rates.

Many of the variables used in this section will form the baseline from which future progress will be measured. A thorough understanding of the local housing market and conditions is fundamental to develop effective policy and program responses.
2.1 Housing Stock Characteristics: Current State (2011)

Description
Housing stock characteristics include dwelling type, tenure, age, and condition of supply. This establishes the context for housing options and trends.

Findings
- There are almost 35,000 dwellings in this Sub-Region and just under 5,000 (16%) of these are rented.
- The housing stock is predominantly single-family detached (SFD) dwellings (78%) with a much smaller stock of apartments (8%) compared to the Regional average (24%).
- The proportion of semi-detached and row dwellings is similar to that of the overall region (12%), as are other (mainly mobile homes), comprising only 2% of all dwellings both in Sturgeon Sub-Region and across the Region.
- 86% of dwellings are owner-occupied compared to 71% for the Region; the ownership rate is highest for SFD (94%) and other (mainly mobiles, 86%). Apartments are the only dwelling type where the majority of occupants are renters (59%).
- Sturgeon has a slightly younger housing stock than the Region. 42% of the dwellings were constructed before 1980 compared to 49% for the Region, although recent starts have lagged, with only 22% of the dwellings constructed since 2000 compared to 24% for the Region.
- Sturgeon’s housing is in good condition. 5% of the owned dwellings are in need of major repairs compared to 6% for the Region. Condition is a little better for rentals with 6% of the rented dwellings in need of major repairs compared to 9% for the Region.

Assessment
- The housing stock is dominated by single detached dwellings, which skew tenure mix toward ownership.
- A relatively small rental sector and few apartments results in fewer options for smaller and lower income households. A small apartment stock may also place some upward pressure on rents due to lack of options.
- The willingness of developers to build rental apartments in smaller communities is low. More needs to be done to encourage rental housing development in smaller centres.

**Description**
Housing supply is assessed by examining trends in construction, including built form (type) and intended tenure at time of construction of new starts.

**Findings**
- After peaking at over 1,700 new homes in 2007, starts in the Sturgeon Sub-Region have declined significantly. Total starts since 2008 have averaged 738 homes per year. Almost two-thirds have been detached homes, although this too has been on a downward trend from 83% of all starts in 2006 to 52% in 2013.
- Data for 2015 is now reflecting the impact of the slowing oil economy, with total starts of only 423 homes.
- An overall reduction in total starts has been accompanied by a higher proportion, and absolute increase, in multi-unit starts (at least until 2014).
- The shift toward more multiple starts (semi-detached, row and apartment) over the decade was an encouraging sign of a more diversified housing market, but this disappeared in 2015.
- Most starts have been targeted to buyers, with minimal volume of rental construction. An increase in rental construction is noted in 2011, 2013 and 2014, which is a significant improvement over previous years. Some of the rental starts were a result of Federal/Provincial affordable housing subsidy programs.
- Condominiums (apartments for sale) are notably absent from the suburban county, except in 2007.

**Assessment**
- New construction has created more multi-family products in recent years, but new housing supply (starts) continues to be dominated by single detached dwellings.
- While the rental starts in 2011 and 2013 are encouraging, rental options are still limited, making it difficult for lower income households.
- Adding new rental housing supply can help to moderate rent levels and help renter households with moderate affordability problems.
2.3 Household Characteristics: Type and Size (2011)

Description
Two sets of household characteristics are assessed: type and size of households.

Findings
- Families are the prevalent type of household and account for three-quarters of households. Family households include childless couples (29%), two parents with children (38%) and lone parents (7%).
- Couples with and without children represent 67% of total households compared to 53% in the Region.
- Non-family households represent 20% of total households compared to 32% in the Region.
- Most of the non-family households are single person households. This group accounts for a smaller proportion in Sturgeon compared to the Region and is a result of fewer small sized housing options in this Sub-Region.

Assessment
- One and two person households make up 53% of all households, which indicates there is strong demand for smaller sized dwellings.
- Sturgeon may have difficulty retaining and attracting a more diversified population until a more balanced and diversified housing stock is available.
2.4 Household Characteristics: Age of Household Maintainer (2011)

Description
Two characteristics of household maintainers are assessed: age and tenure, including percent of households in each age cohort that are owners.

Findings
• First time buyers are typically under 40. This age cohort makes up just over one-quarter of households in the Sturgeon Sub-Region. 49% of this age cohort have purchased homes.
• One third of households are between 40-54 years of age.
• 40% of households are over 55 years of age, similar to the same age group in the region.
• The overall high ownership rate in Sturgeon is influenced by the large proportion of households over 40 years of age. The ownership rate is high for seniors; 86% of households 65 years of age.

Assessment
• Sturgeon has a smaller population and percentage of households under 40 years of age compared to the Region. Lack of housing options, especially for first time buyers, may cause this age group to move elsewhere.
• As their children leave home, some household maintainers over 40 years of age may seek alternatives to the existing family home, in communities within the Sturgeon Sub-Region. They may be forced to move elsewhere if there are no other housing options in Sturgeon.
• The low proportion of renters over 40 years of age may reflect the absence of rental options.
2.5 Household Characteristics: Tenure by Household Type (2011)

**Description**

The ratio of household types by tenure is partly determined by the makeup of the housing stock. Renters represent fewer than 5,000 households in Sturgeon and occupy 14% of the housing stock. This chart focuses only on this subset of households.

**Findings**

- 39% of renter households are non-families compared to 52% in the Region.
- The majority of non-family households are single persons and make up 32% of all renters. The remaining 7% of non-family renter households are made up of two or more unrelated people compared to 12% in the Region.
- Families, including two parent families, have a higher representation in Sturgeon than in the Region.
- Other family households, including multi-families and families with boarders, account for 9%.

**Assessment**

- Sturgeon has a higher ratio of family-based rental tenures than the Region.
- Families represent the majority of renter households.
- Some renter families with lower and modest incomes would benefit from diversity of the housing stock. Examples of diverse housing stock include built form (multi-family housing) and both rental and ownership options.
- More rental housing would enable an increased number of seniors and non-elderly singles to remain in Sturgeon.

---

**F9: Distribution of Renters by Household Type**

- **Sturgeon**:
  - Couple Families: 7%
  - Lone Parents: 32%
  - Family Other: 25%
  - Singles: 40%
  - Non Family 2+ (12%)

- **Region**:
  - Couple Families: 9%
  - Lone Parents: 32%
  - Family Other: 7%
  - Singles: 10%
  - Non Family 2+ (7%)

**Legend**:

- Blue: Couple Families
- Red: Lone Parents
- Purple: Family Other
- Green: Singles
- Teal: Non Family 2+
2.6 Household Income Profile (2011)

Description
Household income provides a base indicator to determine affordability. Median household income is used to determine a household’s ability to find housing in their community at an affordable price.

Findings
- Incomes for both owners and renters in Sturgeon tend to be higher than the median income in the region. The median income for renters is 32% higher than across the Region.
- Renter median incomes are 59% of owner median incomes in Sturgeon, compared to 50% for the Region.
- Higher household incomes in Sturgeon are reflected in the following:
  - More two-earner, older, established households than the Region;
  - Fewer renters, which on average have much lower household incomes, than the Region;
  - High ownership rate.
- Sturgeon is a relatively wealthy part of the Region. The high median income is influenced by 50% of households earning over $100,000 compared to 37% for the Region. Five percent of households earn less than $20,000 per year compared to 10% for the Region.

Assessment
- The high median incomes in Sturgeon are partly a reflection of the high percent of owners, who have higher incomes than renter households.
- The high renter incomes may reflect demand for larger rental homes among families.
2.7 House Prices (Current)

Description
Current house prices reveal the cost to purchase a house in Sturgeon based on recent data from the Edmonton Real Estate Board augmented by 2011 NHS data.

Findings
- House sales data from the 2014 Multiple Listing Service (MLS) show house prices for the predominant SFD form are almost identical to the Region average. Semi-detached and row units are a little lower (11%) than the Region while condominiums are 5% higher. The data for condominiums should be viewed with caution, as the volume of condominium units and condominium sales is very low.
- The 2011 NHS data, which reflects the owner’s assessment of their home value, suggests that home values in Sturgeon tend to be a little higher than the regional median or average. The average home value is 7% higher than the Region, while the median in Sturgeon exceeds the regional median by 9%.
  - NHS data shows a lower proportion of homes priced under $400,000 in Sturgeon compared to the Region and more homes priced above $400,000 than in the Region;
  - 24% of homes are priced above $500,000 compared to 19% in the Region.

Assessment
- The dominance of single detached housing in Sturgeon skews the overall house values toward the higher end of the market.
- Only 11% of homes in 2011 were valued below $250,000, providing few options for first time homebuyers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Type</th>
<th>Sturgeon</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Difference (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$402,000</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/Row</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
<td>$332,000</td>
<td>-11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condo</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>$233,000</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F12: Distribution of Home Prices, 2011
2.8 Rental Rates (Current)

Description
The CMHC rental survey, which covers only purpose-built structures of 3+ units, does not reflect rented SFDs. These are captured in the distribution of rents (F13).

Findings
- CMHC-surveyed rents in Sturgeon are similar to the Region average. One-bed apartments are 4% below the average in the Region and two and three bed units are just above the average in the Region.
- The 2011 NHS data indicates the average rent was 15% higher in Sturgeon than in the Region. This reflects the large number of SFDs that make up much of the rental stock in Sturgeon.
- There are fewer rental units below $800 per month available in Sturgeon than the Region, but there are a larger number of units with high rent available in Sturgeon than the Region.

Assessment
- The rental stock in Sturgeon is small, especially for the formal “purpose-built” part of the stock surveyed by CMHC. Most rentals are in the informal sector and many are detached dwellings. These may not be permanent rentals. Some investor owners who rent their units might sell and new owners might elect to occupy the units.
- 28% of renter households in Sturgeon pay more than $1,500 per month for rent compared to 15% in the Region. This may be due to the lack of small sized formal rental apartments in Sturgeon and households having to rent large sized units.
- The lack of housing options in rent ranges below $800 makes it difficult for low-moderate income households and especially low-income seniors to live in the Sub-Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Apartment Rental Rates</th>
<th>Sturgeon</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Difference (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-bedroom</td>
<td>$944</td>
<td>$986</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-bedroom</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,240</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ bedroom</td>
<td>$1,370</td>
<td>$1,339</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average</td>
<td>$1,222</td>
<td>$1,193</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F13: Distribution of Rents, 2011
2.9 House Prices (Trends)

Description
Trends in house prices and rental rates reveal the changing costs to live in Sturgeon and provide an indicator of cost barriers for different household types. This assessment draws on both CMHC new price data as well as MLS data from the Edmonton Real Estate Board.

Findings
- Prices for new homes are higher and have recently increased more in Sturgeon than the Region.
- First quartile new home median prices (only single-family detached/semi-detached are tracked by CMHC) are well above the regional median price.
- Resale home median prices, as reflected in the MLS median prices (which also include condominium and row), have followed a slightly more moderate path. Prices fell in 2007-09. Thereafter, detached home prices recommenced an increasing trend, while condominium prices increased only modestly. Since 2009, prices have changed as follows:
  - Single-family 13%
  - Semi-detached 6%
  - Condo/apartment 1%

Assessment
- Over the past seven years, new house prices have risen well above the rate of inflation. Resale house prices initially dipped, but recovered, maintaining overall affordability for new homebuyers.
- More options for lower priced housing, such as condominiums and high density accommodation, would meet the demand of smaller households and first time homebuyers.
- The high first quartile new home price in Sturgeon reveals that industry is not creating entry-level product.
2.10 Rental Rates (Trends)

Description
Trends in rental rates detail the overall changes in rent levels and include a comparison of existing versus newly constructed rental units (CMHC surveyed purpose built structures of 3+ units).

Findings
- Average apartment rents have increased from an average of $745 in 2006 to $1,222 in 2014, an overall increase of 64% over eight years.
- New rental construction is limited and data is not available for all years. The available data indicates that new units are more expensive than the existing stock.
- Rents for new units built after 2012 are 30% above the existing average. In 2014, units built prior to 2000 had an average rent of $1,106 compared to $1,447 for newer rentals.
- New rental housing has a higher proportion of two-bedroom units, which are suitable for singles sharing, potentially reducing shelter costs.

Assessment
- Low vacancy rates have stimulated some new rental construction. New rental units supported with subsidy programs can be affordable to moderate income households.
- Increasing rents in the existing stock create affordability issues for low-moderate income renters.
- Development costs of new apartments and other high density rental housing can lead to high rents, however, new supply can create vacancies and moderate rents in older stock.
2.10 Rental Rate (continued)

Description
Examining trends in rental distribution can provide insight into how the housing market responds to need and demand. These charts show both the rent distribution for the census periods, as well as how this has changed over the decade.

Findings
- Sturgeon has a stock of almost 4,800 rental units. The following changes have occurred since 2001:
  - The number of units with rents below $600 per month has declined by 600. Most units were lost between 2001 and 2006;
  - The number of units with rents between $600 and $800 per month has declined by 1,100.
- The largest growth in distribution has been units with rents $1,500 per month and over.
- Only 635 units, representing 13% of the rental stock, had rents under $800 per month in 2011.
- Some units were lost through demolition or conversion into owned units; most units had an increase in rent. Figure 19 shows the shift in the number of units in the next rent range over the five-year periods of 2001-06 and 2006-11.

Assessment
- A loss of 1,700 units with rents under $800 per month occurred between 2001 and 2011, due to rent increases. Renter incomes did not increase at the same rate as rent increases and more renters experienced affordability challenges.
- Promoting new rental development is important. It is also critical to monitor erosion of the existing affordable low rent stock.
- More rental housing is required to replace the affordable units lost and to encourage and enable lower income families, single people and seniors to live in Sturgeon.
2.11 The Housing Continuum

The concept of a housing continuum is widely adopted across Canadian municipalities to help identify where gaps exist between need and demand versus supply. It locates housing need and requirements against a continuum of options. These range from subsidized or Non-Market housing through moderate rent/priced market options, called Market Affordable, to full market priced options both in the rental and ownership sector. The following terms are used to reflect this range throughout the remainder of this report:

A. **Non-Market** describes households with incomes below those required to access social housing. This translates to 35% of median household income for singles and 50% of median income for families.

B. **Market Affordable** describes the income group accessing modest to mid rent/priced homes. They have incomes above those required to be eligible for social housing (“A” above), but below those needed to have wide market choice (as defined by “C” below).

C. **Pure (or Full) Market** housing is that which starts at the regional entry-level home prices (median condominium for singles and first quartile detached home for family). Converting these into incomes (income required to buy at entry-level price, as defined) results in a benchmark pegged at 50% of median family income for singles and 80% of median income for families. Households with incomes above these thresholds are deemed able to rent/buy at market prices.

Using these income thresholds, households are allocated into one of the three income demand categories and dwelling units are similarly sorted into one of three categories, based on rents and prices derived at 30% of the related income thresholds. See Appendix B for method and details.
2.12 Housing Availability and Requirements by Income Band

Availability of rental units to households in the housing continuum identifies rental unit shortages and surpluses in Sturgeon (green bar). The maximum income benchmarks, associated maximum affordable rents, and house prices used to quantify this continuum are outlined in detail in Appendix B.

Findings and Assessment

- There is a shortage of 209 rental units affordable to households with incomes in the Non-Market category of the continuum (singles with income below $29,750; families with income below $42,500). Without sufficient lower priced options, these households have to live in units in the more expensive Market Affordable category (+/-$1,000/month), and have to pay well in excess of 30% of their income.
- The single-person households earn less than $29,750 and require housing, such as bachelor and one-bedroom apartments, that cost less than $744/month.
- The shortage of 384 full market rental units is theoretical because these higher income households can and do live in lower rent Market Affordable Housing surplus rental units.
2.13 Rental Rates and Household Income Balance

Description
An indicator of the number of rental units required by rental price range can be determined by comparing the rental units in each rent range (units available) to renter incomes, using 30% as an affordability measure to convert their income into a rent range (units required, based on income). Based on this assessment, the net mismatch in each rent range (Figure 22) shows the shortages and surpluses by rent range.

Findings
- There are insufficient low rent units below $750 per month. Most units are in the mid-range with rents at $1000 to $1,500. These are too expensive for many low income households who consequently pay more than 30% of their income for housing.
- The net mismatch shows the following shortages:
  - 305 units with rents under $499 per month;
  - 229 units with rents between $500 and $749 per month.

Assessment
- The shortage of 1,300 units with rents $2000 and over is theoretical (see Section 2.12). There are 1,600 households with incomes that can afford this rent level, but only 300 such dwellings units available. These high income households have found low rent homes and enjoy a low shelter cost ratio.
2.14 Rental Market Supply and Affordability

**Description**
The comparison of actual units in the stock (2011) against the number required, based on income and affordability at 30% of income, can be further examined by separating family and non-family households, and associated large versus small sized units.

**Findings**
- As mentioned on the previous page, there is a shortage of 305 rental units for households who cannot afford to pay more than $500 per month for rent.
- 240 (almost 80%) of the 305 rental units are occupied by non-family households.
- There is also a shortage of 229 units with rents between $500 and $749/month.
- 201 (88%) of the 229 rental units are occupied by non-family households.
- Most rental units exist in the mid ranges between $750 and 1,999 (dotted line), creating a theoretical surplus. However, in reality, these mid-range rental units are occupied by both lower and higher income households.

**Assessment**
- This mismatch analysis is one way to examine gaps in the housing system. It shows a mismatch between what households can reasonably afford to pay for rent and what they have to pay for rent. This analysis is based solely on income and rent levels. It does not consider whether the homes are appropriate in size.
- The analysis shows that the shortage of rental units below $750 per month are needed mainly by non-family (singles) households and rental units above $1,000 per month are needed by families.
3.0 Households in Need

Determining need and demand for Non-Market Housing and Market Affordable Housing is one of several reasons for undertaking a housing needs assessment. Comparing the distribution of the households in Non-Market Housing need and Market Affordable Housing demand across the Region will point to current and future gaps. Consistent and reliable data is required to develop integrated plans to address housing imbalances in the Sub-Region and Region. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) has developed a Core Housing Need measure, which uses a two-step process to identify the number and incidence of households in need of housing:

- Does a household experience any one of or a combination of problems based on three standard measures of suitability (number of bedrooms compared to household composition), condition (need for major repair) and affordability (paying greater than 30% of income)? And,
- Is the household’s gross income below a specified threshold (which is calculated separately for each Census Metropolitan Area [CMA] and for each household size, such as one-person or two-person households)?

Another approach is to examine households experiencing severe shelter cost burdens. This is represented by housing costs in excess of 50% of income from the 2011 National Households Survey (NHS). This measure of acute need is used alongside core need (which uses 30% of income) as a way to help understand which households face a significant housing cost challenge.

As mentioned in the discussion on the housing continuum, the homeless are included in the Non-Market Housing category. Although the homeless are not included in the core need data\(^1\), they are an important aspect of need in all of the Sub-Regions. The St. Albert Temporary Residential Services Committee is undertaking an assessment of homelessness in St. Albert and the Sturgeon Sub-Region, through the Alberta Rural Development Network Rural and Remote Homeless funding stream in partnership with the University of Alberta.

---

\(^1\) Core Housing Need estimates are derived from the Canada Census every five years, which does not count the homeless.
3.1 Core Housing Need Estimates (2011)

Description
Core housing need is estimated using magnitude (number of households) and incidence or tendency to be in need. The CMHC data provides insight into the characteristics (tenure, age and family type) of households in need.

Findings
- Affordability is a much larger problem than crowding and condition. It is also more significant in Sturgeon, compared to the Region.
- Crowding is not a significant issue, but almost 10% of households in core need live in homes that are in need of major repair.
- 1,300 owners in Sturgeon experience core housing need. This represents 5% of owners. While the issues are not as severe, owners also have an asset in their property that provides financial security not available to renters.
- 975 households living in rental units experience core housing need, which is about five times (22%) the rate of homeowners (5%).

Assessment
- Renter households have a much higher incidence and severity of need than owner households.
- Actions to address core need should focus on affordability for renter households.
3.1 Core Housing Need Estimates (continued)

**Description**
Figures 26 and 27 focus on renter households because of their high incidence of core need, to identify those in greatest need.

**Findings**
- Core housing need is most prevalent among lone parent family and non-family households. Almost 600 (33%) non-family (mainly single person) households experience need. This represents one in every three renters in the Sturgeon Sub-Region.
  - 240 lone parent families (37%) experience core need;
  - 155 couple families (8%) experience core need.
- Over 300 senior households, which account for almost one in five renter households in the Sturgeon Sub-Region, experience the highest incidence of need at 40%. This group is twice as likely to be in need compared to households less than 65 years of age.

**Assessment**
- See next page.
3.1 Core Housing Need Estimates (continued)

**Description**
Combining incidence of need by age and household type indicates who is in core need.

**Findings**
- Age groups and household types with the highest incidence of core need are:
  - Lone-parent renters 15-29 years of age (69%);
  - Single-person renters 65+ years of age (56%);
  - Lone-parents 45-64 (39%).
- 22% of renter households in Sturgeon experience core housing need. One third of these are over 65.
- Two thirds of renter households in need are under 65 years old.
  - 240 renter households are lone parent families;
  - 260 renter households are non-family (singles) under 65 years old.
- Families account for 40% of core need, however, their incidence of need is only 7%.

**Assessment**
- The greatest need is among lone parents and senior renters. In part, this need reflects low household incomes. Also, lone parents, who require larger homes to accommodate children, are impacted by high rents.
- Non-elderly singles also require Non-Market Housing units to meet their needs. The low number and cost of small sized rental units in the market results in limited options for singles and small households of all ages.
3.2 Acute Need

**Description**

The 2011 National Household Survey (NHS) identifies households that pay more than 50% of their income for housing and are experiencing acute housing needs.*

**Findings**

- There are 1,155 non-family single person households in acute need. 845 couple families are in acute need. 440 lone-parent families pay over 50% of their income for housing.
- If households paying in excess of 100% are excluded, 775 single person households are the largest number in acute need.
- Many of those paying over 50% of their income may be seniors who have low income, but draw down savings to cover costs.
- As in core need, acute need is far more significant among renters. While renters comprise fewer than 15% of Sturgeon households, 34% of those renters pay more than 50% of their income on rent.
- 21% of Sturgeon renters experience acute need, which is the same percentage as the Region. Excluding households paying in excess of 100% results in Sturgeon having 15% of renters in acute need, compared to 13% for the Region.

**Assessment**

- Comparing acute need with estimates of core need identifies a total of 980 renters in acute need (paying over 50% of income). Thus, the two different methods corroborate the extent of unmet need.
- The high volume of food bank hampers also confirms the level of unmet needs.

* Almost 5% of all households (8.5% of renters) in the Region pay over 100% of their income for housing. This is a statistical anomaly caused in part by change in household composition or status in prior years. It occurs because NHS collected shelter cost in April 2011, but income data is for the prior year. While included here, this data should be treated with caution.
### 3.3 Non-Market Housing Portfolio

#### Description

The Sturgeon Non-Market Housing portfolio (Table 5) is assessed to determine who and how many households are being served in comparison to the households that are in need.

#### Findings

- There are 742 Non-Market Housing units in Sturgeon, representing 2.5% of the portfolio in the Region.
- The various programs have different subsidy provisions:
  - Programs 1 – 7 are deep subsidy programs;
  - Programs 5 – 7 are rent-geread-to-income (30%);
  - Program 8 consists of RGI and fixed rate (below market) subsidies;
  - Programs 9, 10, and 12 are 10 – 15% below market;
  - Program 11 is homeownership.

#### Assessment

- The Non-Market Housing portfolio consists of a variety of different types of accommodations with different subsidy levels.
- The deep subsidy programs were funded in the mid 1970’s to early 1990’s. The majority of the portfolio developed since 1995 are shallow subsidy programs like Affordable Housing (10 – 15% below market rental rates).

#### T5: Sturgeon Non-Market Housing Portfolio by Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Housing/Program</th>
<th>Number of Units/Beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Emergency Shelters</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transitional Accommodation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Permanent Supportive Housing (Lodge)</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supported Housing - Semi-independent</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-Profit Housing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Community Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Seniors’ Self- Contained Housing</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rent Supplements</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Affordable Housing</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Co-op Housing</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Secondary Suites</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Other (Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>742</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sturgeon Foundation and Alberta Seniors

* There is a wide range of supportive living facilities designed to serve health and related accommodation and nutritional needs. SL2 (Lodge level accommodation) is included in the Non-Market Housing portfolio, but the SL-3 (Assisted Living), SL-4 (Enhanced Assisted Living), SL-4d (Dementia Care) and Continuing Care accommodation are not included mainly because they are health (not income) related and must qualify through Alberta Health Services for entry. Also, the majority of beds/units are not subsidized at any given point in time and should not be included in Non-Market Housing portfolio.
### 3.3 Non-Market Housing Portfolio (continued)

#### Description
The number of units in the Non-Market Housing portfolio and relative level of access to those units by different household types is an important component of determining the priority for addressing the current households in need. Here the existing portfolio is compared to the need.

#### Findings
- 56% of the Non-Market Housing Portfolio is for seniors, compared to 33% for the Region.
- 28% of the portfolio is for families, compared to 34% for the Region.
- 16% of the portfolio is for non-elderly singles compared to 33% regionally.
- The average level of service is 43% and varies from a low of 31% for non-elderly singles to a high of 56% for seniors.

#### Assessment
- The first priority for any new Non-Market Housing initiatives is bringing services levels in line with core housing need by household type.
- A priority for the future is to provide Non-Market Housing for single persons and lone-parent families.

---

#### T6: Non-Market Housing Portfolio by Household Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Families</th>
<th></th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs</td>
<td>HHs</td>
<td>HHs</td>
<td>HHs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>10,355</td>
<td>9,929</td>
<td>9,901</td>
<td>30,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### T7: Non-Market Housing Portfolio Service Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Families</th>
<th></th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs</td>
<td>HHs</td>
<td>HHs</td>
<td>HHs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMH Portfolio (1)</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs in Need</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (2)</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>1,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Level (1/2)*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Service Level (SL) refers to the proportion of the households in need that are served by the existing Non-Market Housing portfolio. The SL is calculated for the main household types and is useful for establishing priorities and ensuring a balanced portfolio.
** While totals may not add up exactly due to rounding, there is no material change to the service level percentages.
4.0 Future Housing Market

How housing requirements and needs change over time draws on population and household projections for the Region. The method used to generate the projections include historic fertility, mortality and household formation rates within each Sub-Region. Population projections include the number of households by age cohort from the growth.

The high projection is used in this assessment to estimate the housing requirements resulting from population and employment growth sorted by Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing need and demand. This future need assessment assumes that each Sub-Region continues to maintain its current share of the Region’s population and households. It also assumes that the 2011 incidence of core housing need remains constant.

Total household growth under the low and high projection for the Region was examined to assess the implications for future growth in housing requirements. It revealed that across the Region, household growth over the next six years (2015-2021) is anticipated to average between 10,200-12,800 households per year. This section examines how this affects growth and need in the Sturgeon Sub-Region.

| T8: Projected Annual Growth in Housing Requirements – Low and High Scenarios² |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| LOW GROWTH SCENARIO         |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |                              |
| New Housing Requirements    | 10,743 | 10,599 | 10,205 | 10,040 | 9,973 | 9,911 | 9,985 | 10,208                      |
| HIGH GROWTH SCENARIO        |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |                              |
| New Housing Requirements    | 13,116 | 13,093 | 12,747 | 12,622 | 12,660 | 12,598 | 12,699 | 12,791                      |

Note: Projecting long-term population and household growth cannot predict economic downturns and the impact on the number of households in need.

² The population projections used here do not include the adjustment made from the Capital Region Board Growth Plan Update with 2014 municipal census results as this needs assessment requires detailed projections by age and year to project annual housing requirements. The adjustment made for the Growth Plan Update included the total population in 2014 and 2044 only.
4.1 Future Non-Market Housing Needs

**Description**

Projecting the annual growth in housing requirements and needs over the next six years is required for future housing planning. The data presented here draws on an allocation of overall growth from the CRH high projection scenario and uses the incidence of core need by age cohort from 2011.

**Findings**

- The number of renters in core housing need in Sturgeon is projected to grow on average by 81 households annually, over the next six years. During the same time period, growth by age cohort varies considerably, as evidenced below:
  - The 15-24 age cohort will decrease on average by one household every year;
  - The 25-44 age cohort will increase on average by 24 households every year, which is 30% of the growth in households in need;
  - The 45-64 age cohort will increase on average by 11 households or 13% of the total every year;
  - The 65-74 age cohort will increase on average by 36 households every year, which is 45% of the growth in households in need;
  - Those 75 and over will increase more slowly, by 10 per year (13% of total growth).
- Over the next six years, the 65 and over age cohort will rapidly expand as a share of the total (Figure 31). All other age groups will decline.

**Assessment**

- 58% of the future growth of households in need will be from households 65 years of age and over.
- Affordable housing units, such as bachelor and one-bedroom units, will be required to meet the needs of this age cohort.
- Family rental units will be required to address needs of family households, including lone parent families.
4.2 Future Market Housing Requirements

Description

Future Market Affordable Housing requirements are calculated using the overall share of households with incomes above the eligible range for Non-Market Housing but unable to access ownership. These requirements should be compared to earlier data on the form and type of new homes being constructed.

Findings

- On average, 127 new Market Affordable Housing units are required annually to accommodate future growth, representing 13% of new homes required. The breakdown of housing requirements by age are:
  - The 15-24 age cohort will decline until 2019 with minimal growth thereafter;
  - The 25-44 age cohort will increase by 50 households (40% of the growth);
  - The 45-64 age cohort will increase by 33 households (26% of the growth);
  - The 65-74 age cohort will increase by 36 households (28% of the growth);
  - The 75 and over age cohort will increase by 10 households (8% of the growth).
- Over the next six years, the 65 and over age cohort will grow quickly and expand as a share of the total.

Assessment

- The decline of the 15-24 and 25-44 age cohorts may be influenced by the housing options available. The younger cohort may be declining, in part due to a lack of smaller rental options.
- Given the growth of the 45 years of age and over households requiring Market Affordable Housing, there is a need to examine the changing needs and housing preferences of an aging population, including more small sized rental options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T10: Projected Annual Growth of Market Affordable Demand by Age, 2015-21

F32: Projected Annual Growth in Market Affordable Demand by Age, 2015-21
5.0 Gap Analysis

This section summarizes the gaps and potential implications for the housing continuum in the Sturgeon Housing Sub-Region. The data and information from the needs assessment is the foundation for developing a Sub-Regional Housing Plan.
5.1 Non-Market Housing Gaps

Description
Non-Market Housing gaps include both the existing and the future growth of households in core need. The prioritization of these gaps, based on age and household type, will form the basis for allocating any funding for new Non-Market Housing. As before, this considers only renters, for whom need is much higher.

Findings
- Renter households with the highest incidence of need (Figure 28) are:
  - Lone-parent renters 15-29 years of age (69%);
  - Lone-parent renters 45-64 years of age (39%);
  - Single-person renters, especially 65 and over (56%).
- Renter households with the highest number in need are:
  - 320 senior singles 65+;
  - 260 non-senior single-persons;
  - 240 lone-parent families.
- Over the next 6 years, 30% of the growth in need will be from households between 30 and 44 years of age and 58% will come from households 65 years and older, especially households between 65 and 74 years of age.

Assessment
- Lone-parent families and seniors rank high in terms of numbers and incidence of need, now and into the future.
- The 65 and over age cohort will continue to grow and increase its share of the total number of households in need over the next six years.
- All other age cohorts will continue to grow (except the 15-24 age cohort), but will decrease their share of need related to growth.
- The 30-44 age cohorts are first-time homebuyers and a slowing of growth will have implications for ownership demand.
- The existing needs of non-elderly singles and low-income families must also be priority in the near term to ensure a balance between needs and service levels (supply of Non-Market Housing).

T11: Renters in Core Housing Need by Household Type and Age, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Non-senior</th>
<th>15 to 29 years</th>
<th>30 to 44 years</th>
<th>45 to 64 years</th>
<th>65 years &amp; over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone-Parent</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals do not add up due to rounding.

T12: Growth of Renters in Core Housing Need by Age, 2015-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohorts</th>
<th>Core Housing Need, 2015-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of New Households (Annual Average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 24</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 44</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 64</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 74</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Market Housing Gaps

Description
Market Housing gaps include both the existing and future gaps in the supply and need/demand mismatch related to household incomes and housing costs in Sturgeon. Understanding existing and future gaps in the housing market is important for developing policy and program responses to address both Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing requirements.

Findings
- Market Housing Requirements (Table 13) shows whether there is a surplus or shortage of both Market Affordable and Pure Market Housing. The 2011 data indicates a surplus of Market Affordable and Pure Market Housing (based on rent and price). However, these surplus units are occupied by lower income households who need some assistance.
- Separating out renter households reveals a surplus of Market Affordable rental units. These units are similarly occupied by lower income households.
- There is a projected need to add 990 homes each year. At least 127 of these homes should be modest in form and price to target moderate income households, including newly forming families, singles and seniors seeking to downsize.

Assessment
- The Sturgeon Sub-Region appears to have a sufficient volume of dwellings, however, they are skewed in size and price in favour of larger higher rent/price homes.
- There are surpluses of single and family dwellings in the Market Affordable and Pure Market ranges. With the absence of lower rent/price options, lower income households are occupying the higher cost units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T13: Market Housing Requirements, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market Affordable Housing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pure Market Housing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Households</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (Shortage)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renter Households Only</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (Shortage)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(384)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T14: Annual Growth in Market Affordable/Market Housing, 2015-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Housing Requirements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market Affordable Housing</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Summary

Non-Market Housing Gaps
- In 2011 (NHS), 975 renter households in Sturgeon were in core housing need. This represents a backlog of unmet need. Population and household growth must be considered in prioritizing future housing initiatives to address Non-Market Housing needs.
- The 975 renter households in need are distributed among families, singles, and seniors households. Couples are the smallest category, lone parents and singles each account for one-fifth while seniors are just over one-third of renter households.
- Future Non-Market Housing needs for seniors will continue to grow as a share of the total need. All other age groups will decline as a share of the total. Future need for lone-parent renter households that require larger family units will continue to be acute.
- The existing Non-Market Housing portfolio in Sturgeon consists of 58% seniors housing, 31% for families and 11% for singles.
- Priority, in the short term, should be given to non-elderly singles and lone parents to address the backlog of need.

Market Affordable Housing Gaps
- The current supply of housing units is sufficient with a theoretical surplus of just over 2,000 units (Table 13, previous page). If owners are removed, the surplus is 584 rental units in this rent range. However, the surplus is theoretical because households from the other income ranges occupy many of these homes.
- There is a requirement for 127 units of Market Affordable rental housing for families, in particular three and four bedroom units.

Pure Market Housing Gaps
- The main gaps in Pure Market Housing are the lack of multi-family housing and traditional rental housing. These gaps result in higher housing costs compared to a more diversified and balanced housing stock of structure types and tenures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Number of Households in Need</th>
<th>Share of Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family (Singles)</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Non-Market Housing Need (renters)</th>
<th>Annual Future Housing Needs and Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household Growth</td>
<td>Non-Market Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>30,720</td>
<td>12,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Where To From Here

- Both existing unmet needs, and future housing need and demand, are used in the development of public policy and planning for Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing across the Capital Region. The development of long-range plans and land use policies can ensure the housing market is balanced and functioning in an inclusive manner, as well as support initiatives to improve housing affordability, specifically Market Affordable Housing.

- The next step in implementing the Capital Region Housing Plan is development of a Regional Planning Framework that would incorporate both Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing, and build upon the results of the Housing Needs Assessments.

- The result will be a Regional Housing Plan with a 5-10 year timeframe that (1) incorporates changing trends and gaps in the existing supply of housing with future housing need and demand, and (2) directs the supply of Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing throughout the Capital Region.
Appendix A: Data Sources and Limitations

Data Sources
The following housing data sources are used to develop this report:

- 2011 Canada Census - National Household Survey (NHS)
- 2011 Core Need Estimates - National Household Survey (NHS)
- Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) housing market reports (new starts, rents and prices and rental vacancies)
- Edmonton Real Estate Board (EREB) sales data on existing house prices from the Multiple List Service (MLS)
- Administrative data related to existing supportive and social housing inventories, provided by the CRB municipalities and Housing Management Bodies in each Sub-region, the Housing Division of the Alberta Government, the City of Edmonton, and CMHC.

Data Limitations
As with any data, there are limitations. This may include accuracy of the data, when it was collected, the variables collected, and how the data can be disaggregated.

CMHC Core Housing Need Estimates
CMHC uses the census/NHS to generate estimates of core housing need. In this assessment, the 2011 NHS data are used to develop estimates of core need (2011). These are augmented with additional analysis: households paying over 50% of income as a separate measure of acute need.

Canada Census National Household Survey (NHS)
The census provides a rich data set, but is limited by frequency (every 5 years) and a delay in publication (2-3 years). Data can become 8 years out of date by the end of the census cycle. Other data sources are needed to supplement the census/NHS and to provide inter-censual updates.

Statistics Canada Tax Filer Data
Income data is available from Statistics Canada using Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) tax files data and is updated annually, with an 18-month lag. (2011 tax year data currently available; 2012 data will be available in October 2014.) This disaggregates by family type (i.e. two parent and lone parent), as well as non-family households, but does not provide tenure.

Statistics Canada also updates population estimates and components of population change (natural versus immigration) annually. Some data used to create tables and graphs has missing or blank cells. This is due to Statistics Canada’s data suppression policy, which ensures that individuals and households cannot be identified through the data. The details can be found in the Disclosure Control at http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/12-539-x/steps-ettes/4058325-eng.htm.

CMHC Monthly Market Surveys
Rental data (rents and vacancies) are surveyed and published semiannually by CMHC providing regular updates on the state of the market. The data covers privately owned rental apartment buildings containing 3 or more units. Smaller buildings and condominiums are not surveyed, nor is the secondary rental market, such as single detached houses, and basement suites. Due to the lack of a traditional rental market in the Sub-regions, the survey only covers a small portion of the housing that most renters occupy (less than 25% in some cases) and is therefore not a very reliable indicator of vacancy and rental rates in these areas. Data from the 2011 NHS...
provides an estimate (based on occupant assessed values in 2011) of the current rental rates of rented accommodation in the Sub-region.

**Market Affordable Housing Supply and Demand Analysis**

Market Affordable Housing is modest-sized, entry-level, family-oriented housing capable of being produced without upfront or on-going direct subsidies from any order of government for households earning moderate incomes (see Glossary). There is no available source of data that clearly articulates the type and amount of supply and demand for Market Affordable Housing. A methodology was developed to show how the existing supply of housing (ownership and rental) matches with household incomes (demand). The method is explained in detail in Appendix C.
Appendix B: The Housing Continuum Demand and Supply Gaps and Mismatch - Methodology and Assumptions

A continuum is a useful way to review the full range of housing options and assess both current supply and requirements based on incomes and household demographics. The concept of a housing continuum is widely adopted across Canadian municipalities as a way to set the broader context, as well as to help identify where gaps exist between need and demand versus supply. It presents an overview of the housing continuum from homelessness to the Pure Market response. This separates Market and Non-Market aspects of the housing system and includes the important category of Market Affordable Housing referenced in the Capital Region Housing Mandate.  

3 Figure 1, extracted from the Capital Region Housing Plan, uses reference income bands that vary from those used in this guide. As described below, these have been calculated as a way to quantify the continuum.

The Non-Market side (Figure 1, left side) of the continuum includes services that represent an add-on to housing (accommodation). They provide varying levels of support services reflecting the special needs of the sub-population. This includes emergency shelters and housing in which support services are incorporated or delivered separately via community social service agencies.

The important element from the perspective of quantifying housing need and requirements is that affordable housing stock to facilitate the delivery of such support services is available. This speaks to requirements for subsidized or low rent options where low-income persons transitioning from homelessness or living with mental health challenges, or with restricted ability to perform activities of daily living can afford to live while receiving additional supports.

The Capital Region Housing Plan includes a preliminary income related quantum based on percentage of median income. It is possible to refine the income categories (as percentage of median or average income)
accurately using eligibility income thresholds for social/affordable housing. This can then be used to align each part of the continuum against the price/rent of housing availability. This does not need to be done for each Sub-region. A Region-wide benchmark can be created, as this is a regional market in which consumers make locational choices. While using a Region benchmark, the existing requirements and availability in each Sub-region should be determined with local data (i.e. how many units exist within each band of the continuum in that Sub-region).

The standard measures, used in Canada as eligibility for Social Housing, have an income threshold called Housing Income Limits (HILs). These are derived from median market rents, which are updated annually from CMHC rental surveys. HILs determine the income required to afford the median rent at 30% of income. These are calculated by household size (number of persons) and rounded to the nearest $1,000. HILs are calculated and applied at the CMA scale (i.e. not calculated at any sub-regional level).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Rent (2011)</th>
<th>Derived HIL*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Single - Bachelor</td>
<td>$713</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Person - One-bed</td>
<td>$857</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Person - Two-bed</td>
<td>$1034</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Person - Three-bed</td>
<td>$1191</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (e.g. 2 bed = #1,034 divided by 30% times 12 months = $41,360 rounded to $41,000)

Because median rents are not readily available, a proxy based on average rents is used here. For consistency with the 2011 NHS data used in assessment, the following HILs are calculated against the Oct 2011 Edmonton (CMA) average rents.

The 2010 NHS reports median and average incomes for Edmonton (CMA) as $79,090 and $97,516 respectively. Tax filer data for 2010 reports an average of $82,603 blended across all household types. This had increased to $85,414 in 2011. In the assessment, the average of $85,000 is used.

The average (or median) income of $85,000 for all households is too high to use as a threshold to assess Non-Market need. A household with an income of $80,000 can afford a rent of $2,000 and a home purchase price of $400,000 and cannot be used as a measure of need.

In targeting programs, the United States of America uses 50-60% of area median family income. Separate analysis in Canada has found that 60% of median income roughly approximates the income calculated under the HIL method based on average rent for two-bed units. In our case, 50% of average 2011 income would translate to an income of $42,500 with affordable rent and house price of roughly $1,000 per month and $200,000, respectively.

---

4 In developing HILs CMHC generates a data set of median rents based on units that include heat; however, these rents are not published. This tends to be slightly different from the published average rent data. Here the average rent is used to estimate HILs for purpose of quantifying the continuum.
When comparing the derived HILs, which reflect the upper limit for eligibility for social housing, to the average 2011 income (tax data) of $85,400, it is clear that, as a benchmark against median or average household income, an adjustment is required. The upper limits should be closer to 50% for families and 30-35% for non-family (mainly singles) for whom smaller units with lower rents are appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B2: Edmonton 2011 Derived HIL’s and Average Household Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Single - Bachelor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Person - One-bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Person - Two-bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Person - Three-bed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing these CMA HILs to the CMA Regional median income the continuum can be quantified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B3: The Housing Continuum Income Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE INCOME EDMONTON CMA 2011 = $85,000 (= BASE FOR BENCHMARKS)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (Income as % Benchmark =)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (Income as % Benchmark =)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Households (Incomes as % Benchmark =)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum affordable price and rent for threshold income can be readily calculated based on paying 30% of income for rent or mortgage. These rent and price ranges can then be compared against the rent and price distribution in each jurisdiction as a way to identify gaps in the continuum.

The continuum can be refined to include an intermediate market category as a transition between Non-Market and Pure Market. Given the incomes and distribution of households (families and singles separately), the affordable rent price for each income band can be calculated. This can then be compared against the existing rents and prices in the stock in a Sub-region or municipality, as well as against the rents and prices of recently constructed housing.

Unfortunately, the census (NHS) data does not distinguish between smaller sized units for singles (bachelor/one-bedroom) and larger family sized units (2-3+ bedroom). However, the National Household Survey custom data file obtained for this work provides reasonable proxies. For owners, the file provides dwelling values by structure type. Larger dwelling types (single-detached, semi, row and mobiles) are assigned as family housing; apartments and attached units are assigned to non-family (singles) housing.
The data files for renters include rent ranges with household type; family and non-family households can be extracted. The incomes of both family and non-family households are also available separately. Counting the number of households within each income range provides a way to quantify demand and to compare this with supply (availability by rent or price).

The results for the Sturgeon Sub-Region are included in Table B4. The continuum shows a shortfall of housing options (either to rent or to buy) against the lower income need.

| Average income (= base for benchmarks) - $85,000 |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Non-Market                  | Market Affordable | Pure Market     |
| Income as % Benchmark =)*     | 0 -35%/50%       | 35/50% - 50/80% |
| Max Income benchmark         | 29,500/42,500    | 42,500/68,000   |
| Max afford rent              | 744 (S)/1063 (F) | $1,063 (S)/$1,700 (F) |
| Max afford buy               | 134k S)/192K (F) | $192K(S)/307K (F) |
| Rent units available         | 1,160            | 2,033           |
| Homes priced in range        | 1,197            | 4,442           |
| Total dwellings in range     | 2,357            | 6,475           |
| Households in income range   | 4,491            | 4,413           |
| Shortfall                    | (2,134)          | 2,062           |

* The income benchmark is different for singles and families, e.g. for non-market it is 35% singles and 50% family so two values are used in each part of the continuum.

The results show a shortage of 2,134 units (owned and rented) of Non-Market Housing for households earning less than $29,500 for singles and $42,500 for families. The Affordable and Full Market categories each show a theoretical surplus. These households can access housing in lower categories without being in need. However, this does exclude lower income households because they cannot afford to compete with higher income households.

Given that the focus of the needs assessment is on renter households, due to the high incidence and magnitude of need, this approach can be adapted to focus only on renter family and non-family households. Table B5 and Graph B2 show the results for all renter households and rental units in each category.
Table B5: Quantifying the Continuum for All Renter Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average income (= base for benchmarks) - $85,000*</th>
<th>Non-Market</th>
<th>Market Affordable</th>
<th>Pure Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Income as % Benchmark =)</td>
<td>0 -35%/50%</td>
<td>35/50% - 50/80%</td>
<td>&gt;50/80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Income benchmark</td>
<td>29,500 (S)/42,500 (F)</td>
<td>42,500 (S)/68,000 (F)</td>
<td>&gt; 42,500 (S)/68,000 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max afford rent</td>
<td>744 (S)/1063 (F)</td>
<td>1,063 (S)/1,700 (F)</td>
<td>&gt;1,063 (S)/1,700 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent units available</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>1,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental HHs in income range</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>1,449</td>
<td>1,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(Shortfall)</td>
<td>(209)</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>(384)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from Table B5 and Figure B2 show a shortage of 209 units of Non-Market Housing and a theoretical shortage of 384 units of Full Market Housing. To gain greater insight, the family and non-family renter households and rental units can be assessed separately. The following two sets of tables and graphs provide this breakdown.
Table B6 and Figure B3 show a deficit of 416 rental housing options for single renters earning less than 35% of median income ($29,500). For single renters earning between 35% and 50% ($29,500 - $42,500) of median income, there is a surplus of 367 rental units. Above 80% (>42,500) of median income, there is a small surplus of 39 rental housing units. Higher income households access housing in the lower cost categories and crowd out lower income households. Affordable rental housing options for singles are limited and in short supply.
In the case of families (Table B7 and Figure B4)), there is generally a surplus, mainly because most developers are building family units, and some older ones are still relatively affordable. There is a surplus across all ranges above 80% of median income (>\$85,000) and a theoretical shortage of 424 rental housing units. This suggests that the real gap for many renter families is the lack of any rental housing, especially rental housing designed for families (e.g. three and four bedroom units).
Appendix C: Glossary and Acronyms

Affordable Housing Program
The Province of Alberta’s Affordable Housing Program provides one-time capital grants for the construction/acquisition of rental housing units. Grant recipients are required to provide rents that are at least 10% below market. Units are targeted at households with incomes at or below HILs. There are no operating subsidies for these units.

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC)
CMHC is Canada’s national housing agency. Established as a government-owned corporation in 1946 to address Canada’s post-war housing shortage, the agency has grown into a major national institution. CMHC is Canada’s premier provider of mortgage loan insurance, mortgage-backed securities, housing policy and programs, and housing research.

Capital Region
The Capital Region includes lands lying within the boundaries of the participating municipalities: Beaumont, Bon Accord, Bruderheim, Calmar, Devon, Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, Gibbons, Lamont, Lamont County, Leduc, Leduc County, Legal, Morinville, Sturgeon County, Redwater, St. Albert, Spruce Grove, Stony Plain, Strathcona County, Sturgeon County, Thorsby, Wabamun, and Warburg.

Capital Region Board
The Capital Region Board was established in 2008, under Capital Region Board Regulation 38/2012, of the Municipal Government Act. The Capital Region Board is a non-profit corporation comprised of 24 member municipalities from within the Region.

Co-Operative Housing (Co-Op)
Co-op housing is collectively owned and managed by its members who live in the housing. Co-op members actively participate in decision-making and share the work involved in managing the building and housing community.

Community Amenities
Community amenities are capital facilities or improvements needed to service a growing population or to create a more complete community such as leisure centres, police buildings, cultural centres, libraries, parks, and playgrounds. Some definitions also include the natural amenities of rivers, lakes, and walking trails. Other definitions include access to commercial amenities such as shopping centres, medical facilities, and restaurants.

Community Housing Program
The Province of Alberta’s Community Housing Program provides subsidized rental housing to low-income households who cannot afford private sector accommodation. Applicants whose income falls below CNITS are eligible to apply. Management and tenant selection is delegated to the local housing operators (usually a Management Body). Applicants are given priority based on need, as determined by income, assets, and current housing condition. A tenant's rent, which includes heat, water and sewer expenses, is based on 30 percent of a household's adjusted income. The tenant is responsible for electricity, telephone and cable television, as well as any additional services they may request (such as parking). Operating deficits are cost-shared with Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. One of the orders of government owns the units.
Core Housing Need
This is a concept developed in the 1980’s to define housing need and involves a two-step assessment. First, does a household experience any one or combination of housing problems covering suitability (crowding), adequacy (building condition) or affordability (paying greater than 30% for shelter)? Second, is their income below a defined income threshold that varies by market/city and by household size?

CMA
Census Metropolitan Area.

CNITS (Core Need Income Thresholds)
Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation establish local income limits each year. Households with annual incomes equal to or less than the HIL are said to have insufficient income to afford the on-going costs of suitable and adequate rental units in their area. Incomes below this level may be eligible for various rental subsidy programs.

Condominium (Condo)
This is a form of tenure that creates title and ownership rights in virtual three dimensions, as opposed to land title. The term refers to a legal ownership structure and should not be confused with built form. For example, an apartment that is owned may be a condominium, but an apartment may also be rented.

Diversification of Housing Types
This is a range of housing types, including single-family dwellings, duplex, townhome, condominium and apartment types, mixed throughout neighborhoods to serve a broad range of residents of varied age and income.

EREB
The Edmonton Real Estate Board is an Association of realtors and provides data and statistics on home sales and prices in the Edmonton area.

Garage Suites
A garage suite is a self-contained dwelling located above a rear attached garage which is accessory to a single detached dwelling. It must have an entrance separate from the vehicle entrance, either from the interior or exterior of the structure, and include cooking facilities, a bathroom and bedroom(s).

Habitat for Humanity Homes
Housing units are built with voluntary labour, using cash and material donations. When completed the units are sold to qualifying, working, low and moderate income households. The household is provided an interest free mortgage and the mortgage is amortized to 25% of the household’s income. When the recipient household decides to sell the unit, it is sold back to Habitat for Humanity and another qualifying household receives a place to live.

HAT
Housing Assessment Tool. The HAT is the tool developed for the Capital Region to assess housing need across all Sub-Regions.

HICO
Housing In Canada Online. A CMHC interactive data file providing historic data and core need estimates for a wide geography of cities and census areas.
HIL
Housing Income Limits (new label for former CNITs, as above).

Home Program
Through education, financial assistance and one-on-one counselling, the HOME Program helps low income people become homeowners. Education sessions are available to anyone interested in owning a home. Participants do not have to be first time buyers or low-income buyers. Low-income buyers (below CNITS) who have completed education sessions can apply for down payment assistance.

Household
Refers to a person or a group of persons (other than foreign residents) who occupy the same dwelling and do not have a usual place of residence elsewhere in Canada. It may consist of a family group (census family) with or without other persons, of two or more families sharing a dwelling, of a group of unrelated persons, or of one person living alone. When age is cross-tabulated with households, this uses the reported age of the household maintainer.

Housing Allowance
This is housing assistance to help households manage high shelter cost burden and is distinct from the Rent Supplement. Payments are made to the household, not to the property owner, and the Housing Allowance is therefore portable. A Housing Allowance may be structured to pay a fixed monthly allowance or can pay based on the RGI-market rent difference.

Housing Continuum
This is a conceptual framework used to describe a range of housing options from homeless supports to independent market rate housing.

Incidence of Need
The frequency (or incidence) of need refers to the tendency that a particular household will experience housing need. For example, if 60 lone-parent households out of 100 lone-parent households experience affordability problems, the incidence (or chance) of need among lone-parents is 60%. In the assessment, incidence refers to affordability need only.

Inclusive Communities
Inclusive communities have a variety of housing, commerce, recreational, institutional, social, and public amenities within their boundary. Inclusive communities provide a physical and social environment where residents can live, learn, work, and play without having to travel beyond the community boundary.

Infill Development
Development or redevelopment in existing developed areas includes building on vacant or underutilized lands, or re-development of a developed site to a higher density.

Intensification
This is the development of a property, site or area at a higher density than currently exists. For example, this includes redevelopment (including the reuse of Brownfield sites), development of vacant and/or underutilized lots, the conversion or expansion of existing buildings, and infill development, and may include Greenfield sites with development densities higher than historical norms.
Major Repairs Needed
This includes dwellings needing major repairs such as defective plumbing, electrical wiring, and structural repairs to walls, floors, or ceilings.

Market Housing
Market Housing is defined as housing supplied by the private market, without direct government subsidies. Under Market Housing, one sub category, Market Affordable Housing, has been further delineated:

Market Affordable Housing
Market Affordable Housing is defined as rental or ownership housing that is modest in form and specification and is capable of being produced for moderate income households without upfront or ongoing direct government subsidies (such as through regulatory relaxations, efficient design, or tax incentives). This applies to households earning moderate incomes between 100% and 150% of median income.

Pure Market is used to further delineate housing that is affordable to those with incomes greater than median income.

Minor Repairs Needed
This includes dwellings needing minor repairs such as missing or loose floor tiles, bricks, or shingles and defective steps, railing, or siding.

Mixed-Income Development
This is a type of development that includes families at various income levels. Mixed-income developments are intended to promote de-concentration of poverty and give lower-income households access to improved amenities.

Mixed-Use Development
This development mixes compatible residential, commercial, institutional and recreational land uses. The development may exist within an area of land, and/or within buildings, in order to increase density, reduce development footprint through intensification of land use, and to improve public accessibility to the range of mixed land uses.

Multi-family Housing
A building constructed for residential purposes for use by two or more families, such as duplexes, townhomes, and row house developments, multistory, and high-rise apartments.

NHS
National Household Survey (the replacement for the Statistics Canada long form census), administered in May 2011.

Non-Market Housing
Non-Market Housing is defined as housing that is operated and funded, or created, through direct government subsidies. It includes categories of housing based on the associated services needed by the clients. Non-Market Housing is further segmented into the categories of Affordable Housing and Subsidized Housing:

Affordable Housing is rental or ownership housing that generally does not require on-going (operating) subsidies. It is both affordable and targeted for long-term occupancy to households with incomes between 100% and 80% of the median renter income for their household size.
Social Housing is rental housing that requires on-going operating subsidies to make it affordable on a long-term basis to households with incomes between 80% and 65% or less of the median renter income for their household size\(^5\).

Other Non-profit
These are non-profit organizations providing rental housing at rents below market rates who do not receive housing subsidies from government.

Provincial Private Non-profit Program
This program provides monthly subsidies to non-profit organizations to cover operating deficits, including a reserve allocation and the mortgage principal and interest payment based on eligible capital costs. Individuals who currently occupy a crowded or inadequate dwelling would be eligible for housing in these units owned by private non-profit groups. The operating deficits are cost-shared with Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Rents are based on 30 percent of a household’s adjusted income.

RGI
Rent Geared to Income.

Rent Supplement Program
A subsidy is provided to reduce the market rent for a household with income below CNITS. There is a variety of rent supplement programs, some providing subsidies directly to the property owner, others directly to the tenant. The subsidy can be a fixed rate or based on the income of the household. Typically, these subsidies are funded by the province and administered by a management body.

Rural and Native Housing Program
This provincial program funds the construction of a small number of housing units throughout Alberta. Management bodies typically rent out the units in the same manner as the Community Housing Program defined above.

Secondary Suites
A secondary suite is a separate and subordinate dwelling unit contained within a detached dwelling. A secondary suite must have a separate entrance from the entrance to the principal dwelling and include a cooking facility, bathroom and bedroom(s) that are separate from those of the principal dwelling.

Seniors Self-Contained Program
The Alberta Government provides apartment style accommodation to low and moderate income seniors who are functionally independent with or without assistance from existing community services. Rent, which includes water, heat and sewer expenses, is based on 30% of a household’s adjusted income. The Province owns most of the apartments funded under this program and any operating deficits are fully funded by the Alberta Government. Household income must be below the CNITs to qualify for the program.

\(^5\) “Non-Market Housing” also includes “Emergency Shelters”, “Transitional Housing” and “Supportive Housing”, and requires deeper capital and operating subsidies provided under government programs to enable affordability to households with considerably lower incomes or no incomes at all.
Emergency Shelters
These are temporary places for people to live until housing that is more permanent is found. An emergency shelter supports people fleeing a specific situation, such as natural or man-made disasters, domestic violence or sexual abuse. Emergency shelters sometimes facilitate support groups, and provide meals.

Special Needs Housing
Special needs housing are dwellings that have been modified with special features to help people live independently in the community. For example, a unit may be adapted for wheelchair access.

Supportive Housing
Supportive housing offers support services onsite to assist tenants to live independently. For example, some providers will offer support for youth or people with substance abuse problems.

Support Services
Housing support services help people live independently in the community, regardless of their tenure. They support people who want to stay in their own home. A wide range of people with particular needs can receive housing support services, including homeless people, refugees, women escaping domestic violence, people with a chronic illness, people with a physical impairment or learning disability, seniors, ex-offenders, people with drug and alcohol related problems, and others who need support. They may use these services when their accommodation is temporary (for example, in a crisis) or when they are being re-housed.

A wide range of supported accommodation models exist and some examples include:
- Sheltered housing with 30 or 40 self-contained units of accommodation with on-site support
- Communal facilities and call systems
- Homeless hostels
- Group homes where people share accommodation supported by residential or visiting housing support workers
- Individual scattered or clustered dwellings with floating (flexible) support
- Wet houses for people with substance misuse problems

Supported Housing
Rental Housing for less than median income households for whom outreach services are accessed from an off-site source (e.g. homecare, aids to daily living, etc.).

Supportive Living Lodge
Supportive living settings are operated under the Alberta Housing Act (usually by a Management Body) and are designed to provide room and board for seniors who are functionally independent with or without the assistance of community-based services.
This addendum to the Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment provides an updated analysis of core housing needs based on the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation Core Need Data from the 2011 National Household Survey.

2016 Update to the Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment

Headwater Group
with
Focus Consulting and
Gordon & Associates
Summary

The Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment identifies housing need and demand to support planning for a diverse range of housing options within the Capital Region. In 2014, a Housing Needs Assessment Report was generated for the Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan Sub-Region as a pilot. At that time, estimates of core need by the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation, based on the 2011 National Household Survey, had not yet been published. The data is now available and this update provides an analysis of core need as an addendum to the Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan Sub-Region Housing Need Assessment. Note: Data may not add due to rounding by Statistics Canada.

Household Core Need Analysis

The primary problem associated with core housing need is affordability, especially among lone-parents and non-family households, including seniors. The incidence of need among renters is five times higher than that of owner households. Across different age cohorts, seniors have the highest incidence of core need at 51% and are three times as likely to be in need as someone less than 65 years of age. In part, the high levels of need among seniors and lone-parents reflect the low numbers of small sized, lower cost housing starts, and limited numbers of existing rental stock available for smaller households.

66% of the future growth of households in need will be from households 65 years of age and over. Affordable housing units, such as bachelor and one-bedroom units, will be required to meet the needs of this age cohort. Family rental units will be required to address needs of family households (including lone-parent families).
Households in Need

Determining need and demand for Non-Market Housing and Market Affordable Housing is one of several reasons for undertaking a housing needs assessment. Comparing the distribution of the households in Non-Market Housing need and Market Affordable Housing demand across the Region will point to current and future gaps. Consistent and reliable data is required to develop integrated plans to address housing imbalances in the Sub-Region and Region. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) has developed a Core Housing Need measure, which uses a two-step process to identify the number and incidence of households in need of housing:

- Does a household experience any one of or a combination of problems based on three standard measures of suitability (number of bedrooms compared to household composition), condition (need for major repair) and affordability (paying greater than 30% of income)? And,
- Is the household’s gross income below a specified threshold (which is calculated separately for each Census Metropolitan Area [CMA] and for each household size)?
Core Housing Need Estimates (2011)

Description
The absolute number of households in core need, along with the incidence rate of different household types reveals which subgroups (by tenure, age and family type) experience challenges.

Findings
- Affordability is the most serious issue in Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan, far outweighing problems of crowding and condition.
- Affordability problems are slightly more prominent in Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan than the Region.
- Crowding and condition problems record a much lower proportion than the Region, with 4% of the problems due to crowding and 6% to condition, compared to 13% in each of these categories across the Region.
- 4% (1,260) of owner households are in core need. Owners also have an asset in their property that provides financial security not available to renters.
- Core housing need is more acute for renters, who have low average incomes. In the Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan Sub-Region. 22% (just under 1,000) renter households are in core need. This represents a smaller number than owners, but the incidence of need is far higher for renters.
- Renters are five times more likely than owners to be in core housing need.

Assessment
- The incidence and severity of need is much higher among renter households than for owner households.
- Actions to address core need should focus on renter households.
Core Housing Need Estimates (2011)

**Description**
Renters have a high incidence of core need. The charts focus on renter households to identify those in greatest need.

**Findings**
- Although a small group in absolute size (250), lone-parents (predominantly female) experience a high prevalence of core need. 39% of all lone-parent families are in core need.
- The largest group in core need are non-family, mainly single person households. The non-family group total just over 500 households representing 29% of all non-family households.
- 11% of couple families experience core need.
- Many non–family (singles) households in core need are over 65 years of age and have low income.
- 50% of seniors are in core need and are the largest group of all the age cohorts in core need.
- Seniors are two-to-three times as likely to be in need compared to households less than 65 years of age.
- Non-senior renters account for 65% of all renters in need, but the incidence of need (14% - 20%) is much lower than for senior renters (50%).

**Assessment**
- See next page.
Core Housing Need Estimates (2011)

Description
Combining incidence of need by age and household type indicates who is in core need.

Findings
- The age groups and household types with the highest incidence of core need are:
  - Single renters 65 and over years of age (66%);
  - Lone-parent renters 15-29 years of age (47%), as well as those in next age cohort 30-44 years of age (51%);
  - Lone-parents 45-64 years of age (26%)
- Core need is lower for couple family households because many have two incomes, and for non-family (singles) under 65 years of age.

Assessment
- Lone-parents and single renters aged 65 years and older have the highest need of all households in Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan.
- In part, the high levels of need among seniors and lone-parents reflect the low numbers of small sized, lower cost housing starts and limited numbers of existing rental stock available for smaller households.

Renters in Core Need by Household Type and Age of Maintainer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>15 to 29 years</th>
<th>30 to 44 years</th>
<th>45 to 64 years</th>
<th>65+ years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone-Parent</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data may not add due to rounding by Statistics Canada
Future Non-Market Housing Needs

Description
Projecting the annual growth in housing needs over the next six years is required for future housing planning. The growth in need, presented here, draws on an allocation of overall growth from the Region’s high projection scenario and uses the incidence of core need by age cohort from 2011.

Findings
- The number of renters in core housing need in Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan is projected to grow on average by 82 annually over the next six years. During the same time period, growth by age cohorts varies considerably:
  - 15-24 age cohort will decrease marginally;
  - 25-44 age cohort will increase on average by 20 households every year, which is 24% of the growth in households in need;
  - 45-64 age cohort will increase on average by 10 households or 13% of the total every year;
  - 65-74 age cohort will increase on average by 41 households or 51% of the growth in households in need;
  - Those 75 and over will increase more slowly, by 12 per year or 15% of total growth every year.
- Over the next six years, household maintainers 65 years of age and over will dramatically expand their share of the total need and all other age groups will decline.

Assessment
- 66% of the future growth of households in need will be from households 65 years of age and over. Affordable housing units, such as bachelor and one-bedroom units, will be required to meet the needs of this age cohort.
- Family rental units will be required to address needs of family households, including lone-parent families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohorts</th>
<th>Core Housing Need, 2015-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of New Households (Annual Average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 24</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 44</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 64</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 74</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected Annual Growth of Households in Need, by Age
Where To From Here

- Both existing unmet needs, and future housing need and demand, are used in the development of public policy and planning for Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing in the Capital Region. The development of long-range plans and land use policies can ensure the housing market is balanced and functioning in an inclusive manner, as well as support initiatives to improve housing affordability.

- The next step in implementing the Capital Region Housing Plan is development of a Regional Planning Framework that would incorporate both Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing.

- The result will be a Regional Housing Plan with a 5-10 year timeframe that (1) incorporates changing trends and gaps in the existing supply of housing with future housing need and demand, and (2) directs the supply of Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing throughout the Capital Region.
This addendum to the Leduc Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment provides an updated analysis of core housing need based on the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation Core Need Data from the 2011 National Household Survey.

2016 Update to the Leduc Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment

Headwater Group
with
Focus Consulting and
Gordon & Associates
Summary

The Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment identifies housing need and demand to support planning for a diverse range of housing options within the Capital Region. In 2014, a Housing Needs Assessment Report was generated for the Leduc Sub-Region as a pilot. At that time, estimates of core need by the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation, based on the 2011 National Household Survey, had not yet been published. The data is now available and this update provides an analysis of core need as an addendum to the Leduc Sub-Region Housing Need Assessment.

Housing Core Need Analysis

The primary problem associated with core housing need is affordability, especially among seniors and young lone-parent family households. The incidence of need among renters is five times higher than that of owner households. Across different age cohorts, seniors aged 65 years and over have the highest incidence of core need at 56% and are three times as likely to be in need as household maintainers less than 65 years of age. In part, the high levels of need among seniors reflect the low numbers of small sized, lower cost housing starts and limited numbers of existing rental stock available for smaller households.

63% of the future growth of households in need will be from households 65 years of age and over. Affordable housing units, such as bachelor and one-bedroom units, will be required to meet the needs of this age cohort. Some affordable family rental units will be required to address needs of family households, including lone-parent families.
Determined need and demand for Non-Market Housing and Market Affordable Housing is one of several reasons for undertaking a housing needs assessment. Comparing the distribution of the households in Non-Market Housing need and Market Affordable Housing demand across the Region will point to current and future gaps. Consistent and reliable data is required to develop integrated plans to address housing imbalances in the Sub-Region and Region. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) has developed a Core Housing Need measure, which uses a two-step process to identify the number and incidence of households in need of housing:

- Does a household experience any one of or a combination of problems based on three standard measures of suitability (number of bedrooms compared to household composition), condition (need for major repair) and affordability (paying greater than 30% of income)? And,
- Is the household’s gross income below a specified threshold (which is calculated separately for each Census Metropolitan Area [CMA] and for each household size)?
Core Housing Need Estimates (2011)

Description
The absolute number of households in core need, along with the incidence rate of different household types reveals which subgroups (by tenure, age and family type) experience challenges.

Findings
- Affordability is the most serious issue in Leduc Sub-Region, far outweighing problems of crowding and condition.
- Only 3% of the problems are crowding, compared to 13% for Region.
- 19% of households live in homes that are in poor condition, compared to 13% in the Region.
- 6% of owner households are in core need, although in terms of numbers, there are slightly more owner than renter households in need.
- Core housing need is more acute for renters, who have much lower average incomes.
- 21% of renter households (800) are in core need. In the Leduc Sub-Region, the incidence of need is more than three times higher for renters than for owners (975).

Assessment
- The high number of households in need living in homes that are in poor physical condition suggests a renovation assistance program and/or redevelopment of some of the older housing stock is required.
- The incidence of need is much higher among renter households than owner households. Owners also have an asset in their property that provides financial security not available to renters.
- Actions to address core need should focus on renter households.
Core Housing Need Estimates (2011)

**Description**
Renters have a high incidence of core need. The charts focus on renter households to identify those in greatest need.

**Findings**
- Although a small group in absolute size (250), lone-parents (predominantly female) experience a high prevalence of core need. 42% of all lone-parent families are in need.
- The largest group in core need are non-family, mainly single person households. The non-family group total 440 households representing 29% of all non-family households.
- 8% of couple families (140) experience core need.
- Many non-family (singles) households in core need are over 65 years of age and have low income.
- Across different age cohorts, seniors make up the largest group. 56% of seniors are in core need.
- Seniors are two-to-three times as likely to be in need compared to households less than 65 years of age (500).
- Non-senior renters (500) account for 65% of all renters in need, but their incidence of need (13% - 16%) is much lower than for senior renters (56%).

**Assessment**
- See next page.
Core Housing Need Estimates (2011)

Description
Combining incidence of need by age and household type indicates who is in core need.

Findings
- The age groups and household types with the highest incidence of core need are:
  - Single renters 65 years of age and over (68%);
  - Lone-parent renters 15-29 years of age (57%) as well as those in next age cohort 30-44 years of age (40%);
  - Lone-parents 45-64 years of age (25%);
- Core need is quite low for couple families because many have two incomes, but is notable for older couples (23%).

Assessment
- Lone-parents and senior single renters have the highest need of all households in Leduc.
- In part, the high levels of need among seniors and lone-parents reflect the low numbers of small sized, lower cost housing starts and limited numbers of existing rental stock available for smaller households.

Renters in Core Need by Household Type and Age of Maintainer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>15 to 29 years</th>
<th>30 to 44 years</th>
<th>45 to 64 years</th>
<th>65+ years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone-Parent</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data may not add due to rounding by Statistics Canada
Future Non-Market Housing Needs

Description
Projecting the annual growth in housing needs over the next six years is required for future planning. The growth in need, presented here, draws on an allocation of overall growth from the Region’s high projection scenario and uses the incidence of core need by age cohort from 2011.

Findings
- The number of renters in core housing need in Leduc is projected to grow on average by 74 annually over the next six years. During the same time period, growth by age cohorts varies considerably:
  - 15-24 age cohort will decrease marginally;
  - 25-44 age cohort will increase on average by 18 households every year, which is 25% of the growth in households in need;
  - 45-64 age cohort will increase on average by 9 households or 12% of the total every year;
  - 65-74 age cohort will increase on average by 37 households or 49% of the growth in households in need;
  - Those 75 and over will increase more slowly, by 10 per year or 14% of total growth every year.
- Over the next six years, household maintainers 65 years of age and over will dramatically expand their share of the total need and all other age groups will decline.

Assessment
- 63% of the future growth of households in need will be from households 65 years of age and over. Affordable housing units, such as bachelor and one-bedroom units, will be required to meet the needs of this age cohort.
- Family rental units will be required to address needs of family households, including lone-parent families.
Where To From Here

- Both existing unmet needs, and future housing need and demand, are used in the development of public policy and planning for Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing in the Capital Region. The development of long-range plans and land use policies can ensure the housing market is balanced and functioning in an inclusive manner, as well as support initiatives to improve housing affordability.

- The next step in implementing the Capital Region Housing Plan is development of a Regional Planning Framework that would incorporate both Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing.

- The result will be a Regional Housing Plan with a 5 -10 year timeframe that (1) incorporates changing trends and gaps in the existing supply of housing with future housing need and demand, and (2) directs the supply of Non-Market and Market Affordable Housing throughout the Capital Region.
AIHA re: Minister’s Comments

Recommended Motion

That Capital Region Board approve the Chair sending a letter to the Province seeking re-affirmation of its commitment to the CRB Transportation Prioritization List.

Rationale

The CRB Prioritization of Regional Transportation Projects was sent to the Province August 19, 2015 and with subsequent indications that the Province supports the list as input to its annual three year transportation planning process.

However, at the March 10, 2016 Board meeting, following receipt of a March 7, 2016 letter from the Chair of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Association (AIHA) expressing concerns that this support may be in doubt, the Board determined that a letter to seek reaffirmation of the Government of Alberta’s commitment to respect the Region’s priorities and aligning them with provincial capital infrastructure plans was in order.

Further it was decided that the AIHA Chair would officially present these concerns to the Board at its April 14, 2016 meeting.

A draft response letter from the CRB Chair has been attached for the Board review.

Attachments:

1) March 7, 2016 letter from AIHA to the CRB
2) Draft response letter to the Province from CRB
March 7, 2016

Mr. Nolan Crouse  
Chair  
Capital Region Board  
#1100 Bell Tower, 10104 — 103 Avenue  
Edmonton AB T5J 0H8

Dear Nolan:

At a recent meeting with Transportation Minister Brian Mason, he indicated that as a new government, they will be looking at all regional and provincial transportation priorities and commitments. We are particularly concerned about two major projects in our area that were identified in the Capital Regions Board’s (CRB’s) Integrated Regional Traffic Systems Study (IRTSS) and priority listing. We previously had agreement with the government to move forward on these projects; however, they are now up for consideration.

This creates concern not only for these two projects themselves, but how they tie into the overall IRTSS plan as well as the status of other projects assumed to be confirmed by Alberta Transportation. There is now significant uncertainty for our members as they plan for development in our area and, potentially, the greater CRB region itself.

At our AIHA Board meeting on February 12, you offered that the CRB would be willing to inquire with Alberta Transportation on the status of CRB priority transportation projects in Alberta’s Industrial Heartland. We believe it is timely for your action on this.

We kindly request that the CRB address this matter to determine the status of the overall transportation planning network for the region, as well as the status of the individual projects that are part of this plan.

We would be happy to meet with you to provide an update on our recent meeting with Minister Mason and our path forward regarding transportation.

Sincerely,

Chair, Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Association

cc. AIHA Board of Directors  
AIHA Secretariat
April 14, 2016

Honourable Brian Mason
Minister of Transportation
324 Legislature Building
10800 - 97 Avenue
Edmonton, AB T5K 2B6

Dear Minister Mason,

Re: Regional Transportation Prioritization

On behalf of the Capital Region Board (CRB), I am asking for confirmation of your government’s recognition of, and commitment to, the CRB’s regional input to the three year capital planning process in the form of CRB Prioritization of Regional Transportation Projects reports.

It has come to my attention in the letter enclosed from the Chair of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Association that you recently suggested provincial commitment may be in doubt.

To that end I also request an update of the status of CRB transportation priorities provided to you in a letter of August 19, 2015 as input to the 2016 Three Year Capital Plan. The list reflects transit and roadway related transportation priorities that the Board’s 24 municipalities agreed would contribute to the region as a whole. As noted, there is some concern that critical projects may be in jeopardy if a full provincial review of transportation is undertaken.

Provincial support of these annually updated Prioritization Reports is key to the development of a truly integrated Edmonton Metropolitan Region that is sustainable well into the future. As manifestations of the Capital Region Growth Plan, these priorities represent significant research, analysis, and regional political collaboration with the goal of improving and enhancing the Region’s transportation infrastructure as a substantial component of Alberta’s prosperity.

I thank you for your support to date of CRB’s work in identifying optimal regional transportation infrastructure and look forward to hearing from you on these two matters noted.

Sincerely,

Nolan Crouse
Chair, Capital Region Board

Encl. Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Association Letter of March 7, 2016
2015 Update to the Prioritization of Regional Transportation Projects Report

cc: Honourable Daniel Larivee, Minister, Municipal Affairs
Mr. Greg Bass, Deputy Minister, Transportation
Mr. Brad Pickering, Deputy Minister, Municipal Affairs
Capital Region Board Members
Capital Region CAOs
Mr. Malcolm Bruce, CEO, Capital Region Board
Growth Plan 2.0 Table of Contents

Recommended Motion

*That the Capital Region Board approve the direction of draft Table of Contents as the basis for preparing the Growth Plan 2.0, as recommended by the Growth Plan Update Task Force.*

Background

- July 13, 2013, the Capital Region Board, approved the Project Charter initiating the project to prepare the first five year comprehensive review of the Capital Region Board Growth Plan.
- The Project Charter identified key policy gaps and shortcomings of the Plan and recommended that the Plan be one integrated document making it accessible and easier to communicate to key stakeholders.
- September 4, 2014, the Capital Region Board received the draft final report for the Plan Review and Policy Evaluation (Project 1A) and endorsed it as a basis for undertaking the Growth Plan Update.
- Finding #6 identified "(that) The Growth Plan consists of a large “family” of eleven documents that are difficult to navigate, understand and interpret."
- Under the Recommendations of “What the Growth Plan should look like, recommendation #13. Create a concise, clear, and compelling Growth Plan document.

Rationale

- In keeping with the recommendations of the Project Charter and the Review and Policy Evaluation Report, the renewed Growth Plan 2.0 should be prepared as one integrated plan that is accessible and easy to understand by key stakeholders.
- The Growth Plan Update Task Force would like the Board’s approval on the direction of the Growth Plan 2.0 document, prior to the development of the final Plan.

Attachment:

1. Draft Table of Contents
CRB Growth Plan Update | Draft Table of Contents
February 18, 2016

i. Acknowledgments
ii. Executive Summary
iii. Table of Contents
iv. How to read the Plan - single page
v. Key Terms in the Plan (or Glossary)

1.0 First chapter should create the forward looking view of Region and creates the high level context for the Plan with emphasis on setting the region up for success in an increasingly Globally Economic Competitive marketplace. Includes 2064 Vision, Guiding Principles, and the priority issues the Plan will address.

2.0 Second chapter contains the Context and background to inform the Plan - Challenges facing the region and Opportunities for the future supported by our history, forecasts for growth, regional assets etc. (The details to support this chapter should be included in a separate Technical Document). We will introduce challenges created by population and job growth, responsible growth, economic diversification, housing deficit and infrastructure gap to service growth, and cost of growth, etc. The reader will fully appreciate why the plan is needed.

3.0 Third chapter contains the Framework for Growth needs to establish the foundation for the plan that puts emphasis on a strategic, spatial and integrated approach to managing growth & infrastructure investment in the region. Includes the Edmonton Metropolitan Structure, Policy Tiers, Structure Components including relationships of corridors, centers, rural, urban, servicing population/employment nodes, etc.

4.0 Fourth chapter contains the Policy Areas will include the suite of integrated policies from the 6 policy areas. This chapter must be highly referenceable and easy to navigate by all regional stakeholders. Includes some context, objectives and the policies.

5.0 Fifth chapter- Implementation - includes Monitoring and Reporting of the Growth Plan and changes to the Regional Evaluation Framework. This chapter must be highly referenceable and easy to navigate by all regional stakeholders. Should include recommendations for future work to support the implementation of the Plan, transition policies, resource considerations and a communication strategy. Identify areas for further collaboration with other
stakeholders such as the Province. Governance considerations and additional partnerships required to ensure the success of the Plan. Areas of integration from the current plan to the Growth Plan 2.0

6.0 Appendices

6.1 Glossary

6.2 Maps, Charts, and Schedules (may be integrated with the plan)

   Includes Population & Employment Forecast and explanation for how the information will be used.

   Land Need Analysis – explanation of the analysis, key assumptions and how the information was used.

6.3 Regulation, CRB Mandate and Legislative Requirements

6.4 Process for preparing the Plan – include the details and scope of consultations

6.5 Resource Requirements – (Additional detail to support Plan Implementation)

6.6 Communications Plan – promotion of the Plan

6.7 Matrix of how the Growth Plan 2.0 applies to the Region

6.8 Member Municipalities and Acknowledgements including the major contributing entities (Task Force, Regional Technical Advisory Committee, CAO’s, CRB Administration, etc.) should be last Appendix

6.9 Alignment to Provincial Plans, and other Regional Plans (Matrix with explanatory text)

TECHNICAL Appendix