Open to the Public

1. Chair’s Opening Remarks

2. Approval of Agenda

3. Approval of Minutes of April 11, 2013

4. REF Applications

5. Governance

   a. Change of REF Process

      **Motion:** The Governance Committee recommends:

      1. That the Capital Region Board rescinds the current REF CAO Subcommittee Delegation of Authority.
      2. That the Capital Region Board approves the Alternative REF Process amendments to the REF Administrative Procedures.
      3. That the Capital Region Board delegates the authority to CRB Administration to approve statutory plans in accordance with the Amended REF Administration Procedures.

   b. Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee

      **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approves the Terms of Reference for a Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee of the Advocacy and Communications Committee as presented.

6. New Business

   a. CRB Committee Structure – City of St. Albert

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

7. Committee Reports

   a. Housing Committee
   b. Governance Committee

8. CEO’s Updates
a. CRP Briefing Update
b. Caucus Meeting May 13, 2013

9. **Motion:** That the CRB move to in camera session

**No In-Camera Items**

10. **Motion:** That the CRB revert to public session.

**Open to the Public**

11. Adjournment
12. Honourable Alison Redford, Premier of Alberta
Minutes of a meeting of the Capital Region Board held at Chateau Louis, St. Michael Room on Thursday, April 11, 2013

Delegates in Attendance:
Mayor Nolan Crouse – St. Albert/Chair
Councillor Larry Goodhope – Beaumont
Mayor Don Rigney - Sturgeon
Mayor Barry Rasch - Thorsby
Mayor Stephen Mandel – Edmonton
Mayor Gale Katchur – Fort Saskatchewan
Mayor William Nimmo - Gibbons
Councillor Dwight Ganske – Stony Plain
Mayor Dawson Kohl - Warburg
Mayor Bill Skinner – Town of Lamont
Councillor Jocelyn MacKay – Leduc County
Mayor Lisa Magera - Legal

Councillor Bonnie Riddell – Strathcona County
Mayor Randy Boyd – Bon Accord
Mayor Greg Krischke – City of Leduc
Councillor Scott Wiancko - Calmar
Councillor Bill Purdy - Wabamun
Councillor Shelley Ross - Bruderheim
Mayor Paul Krauskopf - Morinville
Mayor Anita Fisher - Devon
Councillor Jo Szady - Parkland
Mayor Stuart Houston – Spruce Grove
Mayor Mel Smith - Redwater
Reeve Wayne Woldanski – Lamont County
Ivan Moore – Government of Alberta

Absent:
None.

CRB Administration:
Doug Lagore, Chief Executive Officer
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Kim Wieringa, Project Manager
Brendan Pinches, Project Manager

Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager
Courtney Andrews, Executive Assistant
Allyson Jacques, Administrative Assistant
Open to Public

1. Honourable Doug Griffiths, Minister, Municipal Affairs (9-10am)
The Chair called meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

The Chair welcomed the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Honourable Doug Griffiths, to the meeting and presented him with a framed photo of the members or the Capital Region Board as a token of appreciation from the Board thanking him for the Ministry’s continued support for the CRB.

Honourable Doug Griffiths spoke to the CRB congratulating the Board on their accomplishments to date. He also noted that CRB municipalities need to be mindful of the “big picture” rather than thinking individually; working together and making important decisions to ensure future success of the Capital Region will in turn benefit all municipalities.

10:00 a.m. Councillor Jones replaced Mayor Magera as Legal’s representative.

2. Call to Order and Chair’s opening remarks
Two handouts were provided to members indicating the approval of grant funding by the Province.

The Chair reminded members to submit any reimbursement claims up to March 31st to complete the CRB’s second year-end audit required by the Province.

Mr. Doug Lagore noted that he is in need of a CAO REF Sub-Committee in order to review two new REF applications. If no quorum is reached, the applications will come to the Board for decision.

3. Approval of Agenda

Motion: To approve the agenda of April 11, 2013.

Moved by Mayor Nimmo
Motion carried unanimously.

4. Approval of Minutes of March 14, 2013

Motion: To accept the minutes of March 14, 2013.

Moved by Mayor Boyd
Motion carried unanimously.

5. Representation from the Public

6. REF Applications

7. Land Use
   a. CRGIS Spatial Data Demonstration Project Report.
      Mayor Fisher introduced the item.
**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board accept the CRGIS Spatial Data Demonstration Project Report for information as recommended by the Land Use Committee.

Mayor Krischke put forward an amendment.

**Amendment:** That the Capital Region Board change the word “accept” to “approve” and delete the words “for information as recommended by the Land Use Committee” and add “as resources are available” to the motion.

**Moved by:** Mayor Krischke.

15 in favour, 9 opposed. Not supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. **Amendment failed.**

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board accept the CRGIS Spatial Data Demonstration Project Report for information as recommended by the Land Use Committee.

**Moved by:** Mayor Fisher
**Motion carried unanimously.**

10:27 a.m. Councillor Lumsden replaced Mayor Smith as Redwater’s representative.

8. Governance
   a. Policy #G005 – Board Meeting Procedures
      Reeve Woldanski introduced the item. Mr. Lagore summarized the amendments made to Policy #G005 – Board Meeting Procedures.
      **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the amendments to Policy #G005 – Board Meeting Procedures as recommended by the Governance Committee.
      **Moved by** Reeve Woldanski.
      **Motion carried unanimously.**

      Mayor Rigney requested that the letters from the CRB’s legal counsel dated January 29, 2013 and February 8, 2013 be resent to the Board.

10:32 a.m. Councillor Gibbons replaced Mayor Mandel as Edmonton’s representative.

9. Committee Reports
   a. Land Use Committee
      Mayor Fisher provided an overview of the recent work and future initiatives of the Land Use Committee.

10:35 a.m. Councillor Holmes replaced Mayor Krauskopf as Morinville’s representative.

Councillor Szady asked Mr. Ivan Moore to give clarification to whether or not the CRB has the authority to mandate or direct members to engage in a course of action that may be contemplated in establishing the proposed Integrated Inter-municipal Planning Framework identified in the revised 2013 Land Use Committee Business Plan and budget which was
approved by the Land Use Committee and forwarded to the Governance Committee for approval.

Mr. Ivan Moore will work with CRB Administration to address Parkland County’s question.

Mayor Fisher indicated that no Terms of Reference has been determined for the Integrated Inter-Municipal Planning Framework; therefore, no conclusions have been drawn.

b. Transit Committee

Councillor Iveson provided an overview of the work of the Transit Committee.

c. Governance Committee

Reeve Woldanski stated that there was nothing further to add to the Governance Committee update.

10. CEO’s Update

a. CRB Economic Roadmap Update

Mr. Lagore advised that there is no funding from the Province to do further work on the Economic Roadmap. CRB Administration will be working on how to move forward with it and access funding through other sources.

b. Growth Plan Update

Ms. Shuya advised that the planning has begun and a meeting with the CAO Advisory Committee was held on March 25, 2013. The CAO Advisory Committee & Technical Committee will continue to meet as required. A draft Terms of Reference for the Project will come forward at a Future Board Meeting.

No In-Camera Items

11. Motion: That the CRB move to in camera session.

In Camera

12. Motion: That the CRB revert to public.

Open to Public

13. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:52 a.m.
Alternative Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) Process Delegation of Authority

Motion

The Governance Committee recommends:

1. That the Capital Region Board rescinds the current REF CAO Subcommittee Delegation of Authority.

2. That the Capital Region Board approves the Alternative REF Process amendments to the REF Administrative Procedures.

3. That the Capital Region Board delegates the authority to CRB Administration to approve statutory plans in accordance with the Amended REF Administration Procedures.

Background

- Section 7(1) of the CRB Regulation provides the Board authority to delegate any of its powers, duties, or functions with the exception of those noted under Section 7(2).

- At the July 2, 2008 meeting, the Capital Region Board (CRB) approved the delegation of the approval of statutory plans, under the Transitional Regional Evaluation Framework (TREF), to a Chief Administrative Officers (CAO) Subcommittee. The establishment of a CAO Subcommittee was put in place to expedite application approvals and to relieve the Board of straightforward application approvals.

- On March 31, 2010, the Province approved, along with the Capital Region Growth Plan, a new CRB Regulation and Regional Evaluation Framework (REF). A new CAO Subcommittee Delegation of Authority and REF Administrative Procedures was approved by the CRB on April 8, 2010.

- On June 14, 2012, the Board approved the Report: A Review of the Administration of the Regional Evaluation Framework. The report included 10 recommendations. The report recommended maintaining the current decision model, however, suggested reviewing the selection of the CAO’s and the participation of Acting CAO’s in scheduling Subcommittee meetings.

- Consultation with regional CAOs on the above Report recommendation revealed support for a review of the current REF decision model related to the CAO Subcommittee. More than one CAO suggested elimination of the CAO Subcommittee in favour of an appeal process. Further support was expressed at a meeting of Regional CAOs on February 8, 2013.

- On March 12, 2013, a Draft Alternative REF Process was circulated to all the Region’s CAOs for comment. Eleven CAOs responded and the majority supported the Alternative REF Process with suggestions for revisions to the draft.
Governance Committee Recommendation to the Capital Region Board

- On April 15, 2013, CRB Administration provided an overview of the proposed alternative REF process for the evaluation and approval of REF applications to the Governance Committee. The Governance Committee unanimously supported the recommendation to the CRB.

Rationale

- The Alternative REF Process streamlines the process and reduces the duplication, costs and resources currently required to implement the Regional Evaluation Framework.

- REF records indicate that 98% of Administrative Recommendations are approved by the CAO Subcommittee and/or the CRB.

- CRB Administration proposes to undertake a 6 month review of the implementation of the new process and report back to the Board by the end of 2013.

Attachments:
1. Current REF CAO Subcommittee Delegation of Authority - April 8, 2010
2. Alternative REF Process
3. Existing REF Administrative Procedures
4. Amended REF Administrative Procedures
5. CAO Consultation Summary
Approval of the REF Administrative Procedures and delegation of approval of statutory plans to a CAO Subcommittee

Motion

That the Capital Region Board approves the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) Administrative Procedure and delegates the authority to approve statutory plans submitted in accordance with the REF to a CAO Subcommittee.

That a CRB Administration Recommendation made under section 4.1 of the REF is deemed to be a presentation to the Capital Region Board.

Delegation to a CAO Subcommittee is subject to the condition that if an application does not receive unanimous support or if the Subcommittee rejects the application, the disposition of that application would revert to the Capital Region Board. Additionally, if a CRB Administration Recommendation is to not approve an application, that application would also revert to the Capital Region Board for disposition.

Background

- At the July 2, 2008 meeting, the Capital Region Board (CRB) approved the delegation of the approval of statutory plans, under the Transitional Regional Evaluation Framework (TREF), to a CAO Subcommittee.

- Section 7(1) of the CRB Regulation provides the Board authority to delegate any of its powers, duties or functions with the exception of those noted under Section 7(2).

- A new CRB Regulation was effective March 31, 2010 along with a new Ministerial Order for REF.

- The establishment of a CAO Subcommittee was put in place in 2008 to expedite application approvals and to relieve the Board of straightforward application approvals. In 2009, the Subcommittee reviewed 36 TREF applications and took an average of 18 days to process an application.

- Since the establishment of the CAO Subcommittee, only two applications did not receive unanimous support and were brought to the Board for disposition.

Rationale

- If REF applications were required to come forward to Board meetings, it is estimated that three applications would need to be considered at each meeting. This may not allow for other Board business to be conducted in a timely manner.

- Since 2008, the CAO Subcommittee has been reviewing TREF applications. This process has worked well, and timely responses to applicant municipalities were provided. CRB Administration believes that the CAO Subcommittee is a sound approach to reviewing municipal statutory plans.

- The delegation of this authority to a CAO Subcommittee may be rescinded by the Board at any time.
ALTERNATIVE REF PROCESS
Replace CAO Subcommittee with Appeal Process

1. Introduction

1.1. The purpose of the proposed Alternative Regional Evaluation Framework Process is to streamline the process and reduce the duplication, costs and resources currently required to implement the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF). The proposed process eliminates the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) Subcommittee, resulting in a savings of time and resources spent preparing for and attending meetings by CRB staff, a minimum of 5 CAOs, the applicant municipality staff, and Third Party consultants. Further, consideration of a streamlined process is supported by the REF approval record to date. Of the 43 REF applications recommended for approval by CRB Administration, 38 have been approved by the CAO Subcommittee, an 88% approval rate. It should also be noted that of the 5 applications referred by the CAO Subcommittee to the Board, 4 were subsequently approved, improving the approval rate to 98%.

2. The Alternative REF Process

2.1. The front end of the REF process does not change. Municipalities will continue to submit applicable statutory plans and statutory plan amendments to the CRB for approval pursuant to the REF Ministerial Order.

2.2. As is the current practice, all CRB members and CAOs will continue to be notified by email when an application is deemed to be complete and ready for evaluation by the third party consultant and CRB Administration. The notification email will include a brief overview of the purpose of the application, the timelines, and information on accessing the application documents on the CRB website.

2.3. CRB Administration remains responsible for preparing a recommendation to the Board to approve or reject the submitted statutory plans and statutory plan amendments within 25 working days of deeming the application complete pursuant to the Regional Evaluation Framework Ministerial Order. CRB Administration will continue to engage the services of Third Party consultants to evaluate submitted plans. Further, a CRB Administration recommendation to reject a submitted plan will continue to be automatically scheduled on the next available Board meeting agenda.

2.4. The new process replaces the CAO Subcommittee with an appeal process. The CRB Administration recommendation to approve a submitted plan will stand as the final decision on a REF Application, after a 30 calendar days appeal period, unless a member municipality appeals the recommendation to the Board (See Figure 1).
3. **Appeal Process**

3.1. Any CRB member municipality may appeal the CRB Administration recommendation to approve a REF application.

3.2. An appeal may be commenced by submitting a notice of appeal within 30 calendar days after the CRB Administration recommendation is posted to the CRB website. Note that the date of the recommendation and posting of the recommendation may be different due to the logistics of posting the recommendation to the website.

3.3. The notice of appeal must be accompanied by a resolution of Council in support of the appeal.

3.4. The reasons for the appeal must be included in the resolution and shall reference the section(s) of the CRB Regulation and/or the Capital Region Growth Plan that the submitted statutory plan does not conform.

3.5. All appeals must be submitted by 4:30 pm at the CRB offices on or before the 30th day of the appeal period. If the 30th day falls on a weekend or statutory holiday, the appeal deadline is extended to the end of the next business day at 4:30 pm. A notice of appeal will be accepted by email at info@capitalregionboard.ab.ca provided it includes a record of the Council resolution with the reasons for the appeal.

3.6. If no appeal is received within the appeal period the application is Deemed Approved and CRB Administration will confirm in writing to the applicant municipality, Board members, and CAOs of the disposition of the REF within one week after the appeal period expires.

3.7. If a notice of appeal is received within the appeal period CRB administration shall send the notice of appeal, including the Council resolution, by email to the applicant municipality, CRB members, and CAOs, within one business day of receipt the appeal. Further, the notice of appeal, including the Council resolution, will be posted to the CRB website.

3.8. An appeal period does not end with the submission of a notice of appeal. Appeals will continue to be accepted until the final day of the appeal period.

3.9. If a REF application is appealed and the appeal period ends within 10 working days of an upcoming Board meeting, the REF will be added to the agenda of the following Board meeting.

3.10. CRB Administration will present the appeal(s) at the Board meeting the REF application is presented. The municipality(s) that submitted the appeal will be identified by CRB Administration, however, they are under no obligation to speak to the appeal at the Board meeting.
Regional Evaluation Framework Process

Alternative REF Process

Figure 1 – Alternative REF Process
CRB Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework

**Purpose:** To clarify the CRB’s Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description of CRB Administrative Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Receipt of Application by CRB</strong>&lt;br&gt;An application is received by the CRB. CRB Administration date stamps the documents. If the application is submitted in paper only, CRB Administration requests an electronic copy from the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Preliminary CRB Administration Review</strong>&lt;br&gt;The application is reviewed by CRB Administration to determine if all required documents have been received in accordance with Section 3.5 of the REF. Applications do not proceed until an electronic copy of all required documents have been received.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;  If all required documents have not been received, CRB Administration contacts the Applicant Municipality.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;  CRB Administration reviews the Application to determine whether or not the Application relates to a statutory plan that must be referred to the CRB under Section 3 of the REF. If yes, then the Application is referred for Third Party review.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;  If the Application does not appear to relate to a condition under Section 3 of the REF, then CRB Administration contacts the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Application Deemed Complete</strong>&lt;br&gt;When all required documents are received, and it is determined that the Application meets conditions required for referral to the Board for review under Section 3 of the REF, the Application is assigned a REF number (e.g. REF 2010-000).&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;  An email is sent to the Applicant Municipality noting the date the Application is deemed to be complete and the date by which a CRB Administration Recommendation must be issued (within 25 working days from date Application is deemed complete). This email is copied to Board members, CRB Chair, CRB Chief Officer and CAOs.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;  The Applicant Municipality’s documentation is posted to the CRB website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Referral for Third Party Evaluation</strong>&lt;br&gt;CRB Administration sends an email to the Third Party reviewer asking for an Evaluation to be prepared within 14 working days. The email, which is copied to the CAOs, advises that the Applicant Municipality’s documentation is posted and available on the CRB website. The Third Party Evaluation is prepared with reference to the criteria set out in Section 5.4 of the REF.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If a Third Party reviewer advises that they have a conflict of interest, CRB Administration actions the review with another Third Party reviewer with an Evaluation to be prepared within 14 working days.

On receipt of a Third Party Evaluation, CRB Administration reviews the Evaluation for completeness.

**5 CRB Administration Recommendation**

CRB Administration reviews the Application and the Third Party Evaluation in accordance with the evaluation criteria in Section 5.4 of the REF and prepares a CRB Administration Recommendation on or before the 25 working days. The Third Party Evaluation and CRB Administration Recommendation is posted to the website as soon as available.

If a CRB Administration Recommendation is to approve an Application, a CAO Subcommittee will be arranged. If a CRB Administration Recommendation is to not approve an Application, CRB Administration notifies the Applicant Municipality, Board members, CAOs and indicates that the Application will be brought to the next Board meeting for disposition.

**6 CAO Subcommittee Review**

By email, CRB Administration will notify CAOs that an Application is ready for review, that all documents pertaining to the Application (including the Third Party Evaluation and CRB Administration Recommendation) are posted on the CRB website, and request CAOs availability to participate in a CAO Subcommittee meeting. CAO Subcommittee meetings will take place in a timely fashion following the preparation of a CRB Administration Recommendation to approve an Application.

CAO Subcommittee criteria:
- All CAO’s in the Capital Region will be given the opportunity to have their name placed on the roster for a CAO Subcommittee.
- Participation of CAOs will be by rotation, subject to the availability of the individual.
- Review and approval of Applications is delegated to CAOs only.
- A CAO Subcommittee requires a quorum of five CAOs made up of two cities, two counties and a minimum of one town or village.
- No CAO will participate in the approval of an Application made by that CAO’s municipality, but an Applicant Municipality’s CAO may attend the meeting to present the Application and to respond to questions from the CAO Subcommittee.
- Applicant Municipalities may, at their own discretion, have a representative attend the CAO Subcommittee meeting in which their Application is being reviewed.

**7 CAO Subcommittee Decision**

If a CAO Subcommittee unanimously approves an Application, it is deemed to have been approved by the Board. CRB Administration will prepare a letter indicating approval addressed to the Applicant Municipality, and copied to Board members, CRB Chair, CAOs and the Third Party reviewer.

If a CAO Subcommittee does not approve an Application unanimously, then CRB Administration will prepare a letter to the Applicant Municipality (copied to Board members, CRB Chair, CAOs and the Third Party reviewer) indicating the rejection of the Application and that the Application will be forwarded to the Board for disposition at its next regularly scheduled meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Region Board Review and Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An Application is considered by the Board if a CRB Administration Recommendation is to not approve the Application or if a CAO Subcommittee does not unanimously approve, or rejects an Application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At a Board meeting, the Applicant Municipality and CRB Administration are offered an opportunity to inform the Board (Section 5.3 REF). The Board must, by consensus, approve or reject the Application. If consensus is not reached, a formal vote of the Board must be conducted in accordance with the Capital Region Board Regulation (Section 5.2 REF).

If an Application is reviewed by the Board, following a decision, CRB Administration will issue a letter to the Applicant Municipality indicating approval or rejection of the Application (copied to Board members, CRB Chair, CAOs and the Third Party reviewer).

Decisions of the Board taken under Section 22 of the Capital Region Board Regulation (approval of statutory plans) are final and not subject to appeal.
CRB Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework

Purpose: To clarify the CRB’s Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description of CRB Administrative Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Receipt of Application by CRB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An application is received by the CRB. CRB Administration date stamps the documents. If the application is submitted in paper only, CRB Administration requests an electronic copy from the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Preliminary CRB Administration Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The application is reviewed by CRB Administration to determine if all required documents have been received in accordance with Section 3.5 of the REF. Applications do not proceed until an electronic copy of all required documents have been received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If all required documents have not been received, CRB Administration contacts the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRB Administration reviews the Application to determine whether or not the Application relates to a statutory plan that must be referred to the CRB under Section 3 of the REF. If yes, then the Application is referred for Third Party review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the Application does not appear to relate to a condition under Section 3 of the REF, then CRB Administration contacts the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Application Deemed Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When all required documents are received, and it is determined that the Application meets conditions required for referral to the Board for review under Section 3 of the REF, the Application is assigned a REF number (e.g. REF 2010-000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An email is sent to the Applicant Municipality noting the date the Application is deemed to be complete and the date by which a CRB Administration Recommendation must be issued (within 25 working days from date Application is deemed complete). This email is copied to Board members, CRB Chair, CRB Chief Officer and CAOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Applicant Municipality’s documentation is posted to the CRB website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Referral for Third Party Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRB Administration sends an email to the Third Party reviewer asking for an Evaluation to be prepared within 14 working days. The email, which is copied to the CAOs, advises that the Applicant Municipality’s documentation is posted and available on the CRB website. The Third Party Evaluation is prepared with reference to the criteria set out in Section 5.4 of the REF.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Description of CRB Administrative Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If a Third Party reviewer advises that they have a conflict of interest, CRB Administration actions the review with another Third Party reviewer with an Evaluation to be prepared within 14 working days. On receipt of a Third Party Evaluation, CRB Administration reviews the Evaluation for completeness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>CRB Administration Recommendation</strong>&lt;br&gt;CRB Administration reviews the Application and the Third Party Evaluation in accordance with the evaluation criteria in Section 5.4 of the REF and prepares a CRB Administration Recommendation on or before the 25 working days. The Third Party Evaluation and CRB Administration Recommendation are posted to the website as soon as available and the Applicant Municipality, CRB Members, and CAOs are notified. &lt;br&gt;<strong>Approve Recommendation:</strong>&lt;br&gt;A CRB Administration Recommendation to approve an Application will stand as the final decision on a REF Application after a 30 calendar days appeal period, unless a member municipality appeals the recommendation to the Board. If no appeal is received within the appeal period the application is Deemed Approved and CRB Administration will confirm in writing to the applicant municipality, Board members, and CAOs of the disposition of the REF within one week after the appeal period expires. &lt;br&gt;<strong>Reject Recommendation:</strong>&lt;br&gt;If a CRB Administration Recommendation is to not approve an Application, CRB Administration notifies the Applicant Municipality, Board members, CAOs and indicates that the Application will be brought to the next Board meeting for disposition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6    | **Appeals**<br>1. Any CRB member municipality may appeal the CRB Administration recommendation to approve a REF application.  
2. An appeal may be commenced by submitting a notice of appeal within 30 calendar days after the CRB Administration recommendation is posted to the CRB website. Note that the date of the recommendation and posting of the recommendation may be different due to the logistics of posting the recommendation to the website.  
3. The notice of appeal must be accompanied by a resolution of Council in support of the appeal.  
4. The reasons for the appeal must be included in the resolution and shall reference the section(s) of the CRB Regulation and/or the Capital Region Growth Plan that the submitted statutory plan does not conform.  
5. All appeals must be submitted by 4:30 pm at the CRB offices on or before the 30th day of the appeal period. If the 30th day falls on a weekend or statutory holiday, the appeal deadline is extended to the end of the next business day at 4:30 pm. A notice of appeal will be accepted by email at info@capitalregionboard.ab.ca provided it includes a record of the Council |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description of CRB Administrative Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resolution with the reasons for the appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>If a notice of appeal is received within the appeal period CRB administration shall send the notice of appeal, including the Council resolution, by email to the applicant municipality, CRB members, and CAOs, within one business day of receipt the appeal. Further, the notice of appeal, including the Council resolution, will be posted to the CRB website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>An appeal period does not end with the submission of a notice of appeal. Appeals will continue to be accepted until the final day of the appeal period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>If a REF application is appealed and the appeal period ends within 10 working days of an upcoming Board meeting, the REF will be added to the agenda of the following Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>CRB Administration will present the appeal(s) at the Board meeting the REF application is presented. The municipality(s) that submitted the appeal will be identified by CRB Administration, however, they are under no obligation to speak to the appeal at the Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7 Capital Region Board Review and Decision**

An Application is considered by the Board if a CRB Administration Recommendation is to not approve the Application or if a member municipality appeals the CRB Administration Recommendation to approve an Application.

At a Board meeting, the Applicant Municipality and CRB Administration are offered an opportunity to inform the Board (Section 5.3 REF). The Board must, by consensus, approve or reject the Application. If consensus is not reached, a formal vote of the Board must be conducted in accordance with the Capital Region Board Regulation (Section 5.2 REF).

If an Application is reviewed by the Board, following a decision, CRB Administration will issue a letter to the Applicant Municipality indicating approval or rejection of the Application (copied to Board members, CRB Chair, CAOs and the Third Party reviewer).

Decisions of the Board taken under Section 22 of the Capital Region Board Regulation (approval of statutory plans) are final and not subject to appeal.
ALTERNATIVE REF PROCESS

CAO Comments Summary with CRB Administration Commentary

The following are the comments received in the request for feedback on the Draft Alternative REF Process distributed to Capital Region CAOs on March 12, 2013:

nc = No comment

**Debbie Oyarzun, Town of Morinville**

Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback. In general we are in support of this new approach. Having limited participation in REF process from both ends I am not sure of the value of the CAO Subcommittee (comments below):

- 1 ref process (Spruce Grove application) as a member of the CAO Subcommittee – I struggled to see what the CAO subcommittee could add to the process above the consultant and/CRB admin. The time for me to truly appreciate the file was quite significant in addition to the potential subjectivity in my assessment of how the application aligned with the criteria caused me concern. *nc*

- 1 MDP amendment where we were the applicant – fortunately ours went extremely well, but had there been any concerns from the CAOs I’m not sure that a conference call would have been the best venue to debate alignment with criteria. *Nc*

General process questions/comments:

- Appeal process adds an additional 21 days to the process. Not really a concern. It does lengthen the process, but the process is more transparent. *nc*

- Will you still be sending out an emails to CAOs notifying:
  - When an application has been submitted and available for viewing, and
  - When your decision is posted?

  *Yes. This part of the existing process will not change. A clause has been added to the Process confirming that the REF application will be emailed to CAOs and the documentation posted after the application has been deemed complete.*

- The notifications are important IN CASE we would want to appeal as it would need to go to Council for resolution. *nc*

- Appeal needs to go to Council for resolution is a great idea – fully support. *nc*

- If multiple appeals and each appeal addresses the same criteria, does one have to withdraw or can they both stand? 3.8 indicates they can both stand if their appeal is for different reasons, but what if it is the same reason?

  *The multiple appeals clause in the Process has been removed. All appeals will be shared with the Board.*

- Although it appears we would be using the current process when an application goes to the CRB, you still might want to include what is expected/allowed of the applicant at the CRB during the appeal. *nc*

- Also expand on 3.9 indicating what is allowed/expected of the appealing municipalities. *nc*

Thank you for the work that CRB staff was done at looking how we might streamline the REF approval process. We think generally we are headed in the right direction in the matter.
Pat Vincent, Parkland County

I offer the following thoughts and comments on the draft alternative process:

1. **Introduction Purpose**
   - I think that adding a reference to the matter that over time we have seen the CAO REF Committee approving the vast majority of the applications is additional reason for consideration of an alternative evaluation framework process which leads into supporting the position for streamlining the process and reducing costs and duplication. Agreed. Additional justification has been added to introduction.

2. The notification process of when a REF application has been received by the CRB is not specifically addressed in the process. For clarity, though it may be understood by CRB staff or others, I think it’s important to capture this aspect in the report to the Governance Committee. A clause has been added to the Process confirming that the REF application will be emailed to CAOs and the documentation posted after the application has been deemed complete.

3. Prior to the appeal (as appeals are adversarial by nature) I think an important element would be the opportunity for CRB members to submit comments as part of the evaluation process. Patrick Draper served comment on this previously and picking up on his point I strongly believe that the respective viewpoints from various members offered for consideration during the review process would assist the CRB staff and the independent third party ensure a more thorough and comprehensive review. These additional perspectives would add dimensions which might not have been considered or possibly overlooked given the breadth and width of the planning expertise that exists throughout the region and with each of the respective members.

4. **Section 3.4 Reasons for the Appeal**
   - I strenuously object to this section being a condition and as a requirement forming part of the Council resolution. I do so on the bases that the administration may not have had sufficient time to identify all possibly objections and bases for such an appeal nor had the time and resources to fully develop the bases for those arguments. This is especially true for our smaller municipalities who might need to engage outside assistant to assist them in preparing such an appeal.

   It is important the Board understand the reasons for the appeal and that they are related to the Growth Plan and not some other intermunicipal dispute. The appeal period has been increased to 30 days to allow more time to prepare arguments and receive Council’s input.

5. **Section 3.8 Multiple Appeals**
   - I don’t believe Section 3.8 is required; that is akin to one of our respective Councils advising any party at a public hearing that they should withdraw their appeal because they are the last to be received notwithstanding that they may share similar views or bases for their appeal. It undermines some very basic tenets of an open and fair democratic process. The multiple appeals clause in the Process has been removed. All appeals will be shared with the Board.

6. **Implementation**
   - I would believe and hoping to receive confirmation that once the Governance Committee has reviewed and recommended the process to the CRB that the CRB would be forwarding
this recommendation to the Minister for his review and approval for formal implementation of the proposed changes in adopting an alternative REF process. Ministerial approval is not required for the subject process, just as it was not required for the CAO Subcommittee delegation.

I respectfully submit all of the above for your consideration and would welcome any thoughts and comments from my fellow CAOs on any of the points I have raised in this submission.

Patrick Draper, City of St. Albert

I wanted to provide the following comments on the proposed alternative REF process:

1. This is a positive step in the right direction, kudos to the authors! nc
2. Requiring a Council motion to appeal is the right decision making process nc
3. The 21 day appeal process is too short – 30 working days would be more reasonable given timelines to prepare and report to Council. The appeal period has been increased to 30 days to allow more time to prepare and report to Council.
4. The recommendation should indicate a proposed effective date, subject to board approval of the new process. Some member municipalities may prefer the current system to the proposed system and all should be given adequate notice. This will be addressed in the motion to approve the subject Process when considered by the Board.
5. Improvements need to be made in the content of REF communications from CRB. Specifically, e-mails that require the reader to log in to the website are not always practical (we are out of the office with Blackberry and I Phone devices). The body of the e-mail should contain a brief paragraph on the application details and timelines so we can quickly know if it’s significant or not. This change to the content of the email notification of a REF has been implemented effective March 25, 2013.

Are you planning on sharing the feedback received from CAOS on this matter?
Done.

John Dance, Town of Bruderheim

Not sure with my limited involvement time I have the experience needed to comment fully on this but my two CRB meetings have provided me with perhaps a fresh perspective. The City’s letter that was discussed today spoke of need of reviews to go beyond technical/meeting criteria to the broader intent of and spirit of growth plan and how the proposed plan contributes to the overall success of the capital region. I am not certain where that perspective is brought in (I assume it is brought in at different levels but was it a key function of CAO Subcommittee?) It seems to be key piece of making best decisions possible for community/ies and the region
Elaine Milliken, Bruderheim
This process makes more sense to me. When they initially sent the questionnaire around, I liked this idea. The CAO subcommittee is good, but not all CAOs are versed on the requirements and what the regulations are. Time is another factor, the CRB group reviews the applications now and then put out the call for the subcommittee. The CRB group knows whether or not the application fits the criteria and are fully capable of doing the review. With the option of appealing, it still provides for municipalities to have a voice if the decision is contentious.

Kelly Kloss, City of Fort Saskatchewan
I like the alterations to the model from my original recommendation by making the appeal process through the Councils instead of the CAOs. This keeps the process at the political level where it is the most appropriate.

Diane Goodwin, City of Spruce Grove
The City of Spruce Grove supports the draft alternative REF process.

Tony Kulbisky, Town of Devon
Looks good.

Strathcona County
Further to the input you have received from other municipalities, Strathcona County would like to note the following points:

- the appeal period should be increased - 21 days does not allow the municipality enough time to get their Council's input
  The appeal period has been increased to 30 days to allow more time to prepare and obtain Council's input.
- the notification process should include all municipalities in a timely and easily accessible way (i.e. e-mail to CAO)
  The current REF process includes notification to all CRB members and CAOs of submitted applications. However, to clarify a clause has been added to the Process confirming that the REF application will be emailed to CAOs and the documentation posted after the application has been deemed complete.
- regardless of if it is the existing REF or the alternative REF:
  - "when a CRB recommendation is emerging to 'reject' the application, there should be a mechanism in place that allows the municipality the opportunity to extend/pause the mandatory 25 day CRB response time in order to allow administration to request direction from municipal Council and if necessary the applicant on how to proceed (withdraw, continue to full Board)"
    The 25 working day period is a requirement of the REF Ministerial Order. Amending the Ministerial Order is beyond the scope of the Alternative REF Process.
Peter Tarnawsky, Sturgeon County

- Some “positives” in terms of streamlining process (avoid 10 minute CAO sub-committee calls with – “Call the question”. (I think the savings in conference call costs/CAO time is immaterial) nc
- May harm the important division of roles (Governance vs. Admin) and shift too much governing power to CRB Administration that may lead to questions about independence (Staff both Administer Process and Approve REFs) nc
- May be perceived as expediting vs. slowing down REFs for “sober second thought” nc
- Means up to 23 appealing municipalities with individual interests vs. 5 CAO’s commenting on behalf of Board on a compliant plan nc
- 21 days for appeal may also un-duly delay an application (Ready to go to CRB sooner under current CAO subcommittee process) nc
- May be divisive to the Board (ie: “muni X objects”) vs. “didn’t receive unanimous support of CAOs” nc
- This puts all the control to the veto holder who is now able to appeal all applications vs. those where City of Edmonton CAO participates. nc
  (Conversely a “contrary municipality” could appeal every application (ie: put a stick into the spokes)
I think it is prone to failure and abuse. nc
Current is better. nc

Simon Farbrother, City of Edmonton

Overall comments
The existing REF process is not working in the interests of the CRB nor is it practical for municipalities. The City of Edmonton therefore supports attempts made to overcome the challenges posed by the current approach by exploring an alternative process. Our initial review suggests that the proposed appeal process is a step towards a better model; however, we have a number of comments and questions about the proposed process that we believe are important to consider and discuss before moving forward.

The founding intent of the CRB is to enhance regional collaboration, so processes that focus on solutions and dialogue and provide opportunities to better raise issues of concern and resolve challenges together should be of key interest. This intent should inform the final model.

Specific comments and questions
- Requirement for a Council resolution in 21 days -- the City of Edmonton would be able to accommodate the timeframe on most occasions, but the City will be challenged to meet the timing on a few occasions each year, including Council’s summer and winter recesses and during the FCM and AUMA convention times.
  The appeal period has been increased to 30 days to allow more time to prepare and obtain Council’s input.
● If a Council is not available in the prescribed window of time, what could be the mechanism to ensure a municipality could register its input? Could a CAO issue the appeal? NC

● Clarity on ‘working days’ vs. ‘non working days’ will be helpful.
  Working days are standard municipal administration business days. Non-working days are weekends and statutory holidays.

● With respect to multiple appeals in item 3.8, it is unclear what benefit is derived from advancing a policy whereby the CRB administration would ask the municipality that “submitted the last appeal” if it wishes to “withdraw their appeal.”
  The multiple appeals clause in the Process has been removed. All appeals will be shared with the Board.

● There is a benefit for all CRB members of being aware of multiple appeals in order to understand the various perspectives that regional municipalities may have. Texture and nuance for discussion may be lost through a withdrawal practice.
  The multiple appeals clause in the Process has been removed. All appeals will be shared with the Board.

● One of the potential challenges posed by an appeal process is that it can set up scenarios whereby one municipality (that which submits an appeal) is pitted directly against another (that which is submitting the REF). The suggestion that appealing municipalities present their appeal at a Board may further promote confrontation and strain relationships. If CRB administration presented a summary of the substance of the appeal(s), it could reduce the potential for contentious/inflammatory situations and save time at meetings.
  The clause has been revised to indicate that CRB administration would present the appeal to the Board. However, the municipality(s) appealing the REF would be identified.

● A process that would allow for letters of commentary from regional municipalities to be submitted as part of any application or review package could foster discussion and awareness of concerns; consideration could be given to including such a process.

Conclusion

The comments provided above offer some thoughts around the proposed Alternative REF Process. This feedback is our initial impression and so we look forward to ongoing discussion. Again, we are encouraged that the CRB is exploring alternatives to the existing REF process.

Marc Landry, Town of Beaumont

The following are my observations / comments:

- 3.3 – Notice of Appeal - I believe having a Council resolution is preferable, but in times that this would not be possible – example: summer meeting schedule (the CAO should be able to send the appeal and in the letter indicate when it will be considered by Council). This would reduce the concern on the appeal period timeline.
  The appeal period has been increased to 30 days to allow more time to prepare and obtain Council’s input.
- 3.8 – Multiple Appeals – I don’t see any value of having the municipality that submitted the last appeal an additional opportunity to withdraw appeals.

The multiple appeals clause in the Process has been removed. All appeals will be shared with the Board.

Thanks again for moving the process forward and the opportunity to comment. I believe this process will be a great improvement to the current process.
Terms of Reference - Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee

Motion

That the Capital Region Board approves the Terms of Reference for a Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee of the Advocacy and Communications Committee as presented.

Background

- In November 2011, the Capital Region Board approved the Terms of Reference to establish the Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee. This Ad hoc Committee was tasked to develop strategies to advocate for initiatives that would support the future growth of the Region through the development of:
  - Pipeline infrastructure such as the Northern Gateway Pipeline project;
  - Diversification in markets for Canadian oil exports;
  - Upgrading and value-added opportunities; and
  - Use of the Government of Alberta’s ‘Bitumen Royalty in Kind’ program.

- During 2012, the Committee completed various face-to-face advocacy activities at FCM, AUMA, AAMDC, and the British Columbia communities of 100 Mile House to attend the North Central Local Government Association Convention (NCLGA), Prince George, Terrace and Kitimat. Each activity provided the CRB with an opportunity to communicate its support for the Northern Gateway Pipeline project, and other key messages to influential governments and stakeholders.

- Since December 2011, the Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee met eleven times, utilizing a total budget of $60,700. This amount represents the Board allocation of $53,000 supplemented by the Advocacy & Communications Committee to cover travel expenses to the NCLGA convention in the amount of $2,700 and an additional $5,000 from Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Association to share trade booth expenses for the FCM and AUMA conventions.

- Leveraging the experience and feedback of the previous year, at the Committee’s last meeting held on January 10th, 2013, the Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee recommended that the Committee enhance and broaden its scope focusing Regional Energy Infrastructure priorities. At that time, the Committee also:
  - Recommended that the Committee retain its current membership until after the municipal election when the Board will re-evaluate all Committees and their membership; and
  - Developed a proposed three-year business plan and budget which is attached for information.

Rationale

- The attached Terms of Reference was informed by the previous work of the Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee, drafted by CRB Administration, and further refined under the direction of the Governance Committee.
  - The proposed Sub-Committee members will not be eligible for per diems, travel and expenses paid by the Capital Region Board for their participation on or behalf of the Sub-Committee. Sub-Committee travel outside the region must be pre-approved by the Advocacy and Communications Committee.
Financial Implications for the Board would include an annual budget allocation to Advocacy and Communications Committee to support the approved Sub-Committee budget and business plan, and any indirect costs associated with the facilities, hosting and CRB Administration staff efforts.

- On January 24, 2013 the Federal Minister of Finance, Minister Flaherty began floating ideas for alternative pipeline routes north to Churchill and/or Alaska in addition to pipelines east as previously discussed. These north-facing pipelines could flow bitumen directly from the oil sands potentially removing the Capital Region as an industry and transportation hub.

- Also on January 24, 2013, Premier Redford warned of a looming $6 billion shortfall in projected provincial revenues due to increased markdowns of the price Alberta’s landlocked bitumen and the increased oil production that is occurring in the United States. “The gap has grown considerably and the trend is getting worse for the foreseeable future."

- It is recognized that access to the global market will not entirely eliminate the differential Alberta experiences and that more diversification and value add industry within the Capital Region is the ultimate goal which includes pipelines to tidewaters remain a critical milestone.

- While Alberta’s Industrial Heartland has more than $20 billion in potential projects that are expected to move forward in the next five years, we cannot take this for granted: “Every region in the world is competing with us, trying to get their hands on our natural resources so they can get the value of the resources.” Neil Shelly, Executive Director of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Association January 23, 2013.

Next Steps

- The Governance Committee will be preparing and recommending an update to the Interim 2013 Business Plan and budget. Support for the activities of the Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee may be included. The Motion to approve the updated 2013 Budget is targeted for the June 13, 2013 Board meeting.

Attachments

1. Terms of Reference - Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee
2. Proposed Three-Year Business Plan
BACKGROUND

The Capital Region Board identified a role to form a Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee to provide guidance to the Advocacy & Communications Committee and undertake advocacy on its behalf regarding development of value-add industry and of pipeline linkages to tide water for expansion of Alberta’s oil, gas, and biofuel resources at world pricing.

The Capital Region is the beneficiary of an incredible economic base that has allowed our Region significant fiscal advantage through the responsible development of our resource sector, supporting growth and opportunity for Capital Region municipalities.

A growing national and global discussion is taking shape around the need for infrastructure to enable the processing of our energy resources and the transportation of those resources to global markets. Potential exists to take advantage of changing energy markets and conditions to grow the ‘value-add’ industry in the Capital Region and Alberta. Further processing, for example bitumen to diesel, can increase value by 300 percent.

Currently, limitations to pipeline networks prevent our resource sector from diversifying the market for Canadian oil exports – impacting the ability of our sector to achieve fair market pricing for our products. The opening of new markets positions Alberta to be a truly global energy supplier and represents as much as a $270 billion boost to our national GDP over the next 30 years. Alternatively, should the United States remain Canada’s only customer because of our country’s inability to access the global market, lost opportunity for the Canadian industry and government is estimated at $26 billion annually for Alberta crude oil alone.

The Capital Region stands to gain significantly from additional direct benefits by taking our oil and gas resources and processing them into petro-chemical and consumer products, supporting the Region’s emerging biofuel industry, and with new pipelines through direct construction, engineering and design and long-term operational support. In turn, as a Region that is a logistic, manufacturing and service hub for the resource sector, we are well positioned to facilitate and absorb the impacts of this growth. As municipal leaders of the Capital Region, we therefore have a role to play in shaping and facilitating the efforts of this industry and achieving the Region’s full potential.

RATIONALE

This Sub-Committee can provide targeted advocacy efforts on behalf of the Advocacy and Communications Committee on specific issues affecting regional economic development: the regulation, investment and enhancement of new and existing pipeline linkages, value-added industry, biofuel and activities which enable the enhanced and more globally oriented expansion of oil and gas industries. This initiative could help to increase overall revenues, open new markets, provide new jobs, and secure energy production in the Capital Region. This Sub-Committee will work in conjunction with the Advocacy and Communications Committee.
Mandate

This Sub-Committee of the Advocacy & Communications Committee exists to support the government of Alberta in their long-term efforts to add value to our oil, gas and biofuel resources; the development of higher value petroleum products and consumer goods, and associated facilities to build Alberta’s and Canada’s energy value chain economy in the Capital Region.

Reporting to the Advocacy & Communications Committee, the Sub-Committee has the following mandate:

- Development of a positioning and advocacy and communications strategy that represents the voices of all municipal leaders in the Capital Region in support of transportation, petroleum processing and biofuel infrastructure that enables more diversity in markets for Canadian oil exports, optimally connected through the Capital Region hub.
- Development of a positioning strategy for participation in priority regulatory processes that supports the expansion of infrastructure that transports Alberta’s oil, gas and biofuel products to tidal waters and processes oil, gas and biofuel resources into higher value petroleum products and consumer goods.
- Strategies that enhance existing economic development strategies in support of partnerships and investment that provide for enhanced transportation of oil, gas and biofuel in and through the Capital Region and growth of value-add industries.
- Strategy to support and enhance the desired program outcomes of the Government of Alberta’s ‘Bitumen Royalty in Kind’ Program as a basis for facilitating increased upgrading, higher value petroleum and biofuel products, and consumer goods within Alberta’s economic regions.

In carrying out its mandate, the Sub-Committee will seek opportunities to:

- Support the Capital Region Board, participating municipalities, other orders of government, residents, and key stakeholders in Alberta and elsewhere in creating a common understanding of the benefits of making the development, processing and transportation of oil, gas and biofuel a priority.
- Build relationships and, where appropriate, partnerships with other municipalities, other orders of government, associations, industry (such as the Canadian Energy Pipeline Association (CEPA), the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (CAPP), the Alberta Industrial Heartland Association (AIHA), Chamber of Commerce (provincially and nationally)), and others that would help to build and reinforce support for priority oil, gas and biofuel, transportation and processing sector infrastructure.
- Promote the benefits of oil, gas and biofuel, transportation and processing sector infrastructure for the Capital Region and encourage environmental stewardship with its development.
- Consider future opportunities for emerging trends and technology in energy as time progresses.

Out of scope: In carrying out its mandate, the Sub-Committee will exclude at this time any matters related to the generation, regulation, location, transportation and delivery of energy through coal, hydro, wind, solar and other related resources. The Sub-Committee will focus exclusively at this time on infrastructure needed to support the upgrading, value-add processing and transportation (for export) of Alberta’s oil, gas and biofuel resources, higher value petroleum products, and consumer goods.

This Terms of Reference defines the current mandate of the Sub-Committee. The roles and responsibilities of the Sub-Committee may evolve as the legislative/regulatory requirements of the Board change and as the
Advocacy & Communications Committee’s rolling three-year Business Plan is developed, approved and implemented.

**COMMITTEE COMPOSITION**

This Sub-Committee is accountable to the Advocacy and Communications Committee. The Advocacy and Communications Committee will review and recommend municipal membership of up to eight municipalities, including the Chair of the Advocacy and Communications Committee or an appointed Committee representative, to the Board.

All elected official Sub-Committee members are voting members. This will ensure that community and regional priorities guide decision making and implementation. A CRB administrative leader provides support to the Committee to ensure coordination with Land Use, Housing, Geographic Information Services (GIS) and Regional Transit priorities, other potential regional priorities as identified by the Capital Region Board.

The Chair of the Board and the Chief Executive Officer may attend Committee meetings as non-voting members.

See Appendix 1 for list of Committee members.

**COMMITTEE COMPENSATION**

The elected officials who are members of the Committee are not eligible for per diems, travel and expenses paid by the Capital Region Board for their participation on or behalf of the Sub-Committee. Sub-Committee travel outside the region must be pre-approved by the Advocacy and Communications Committee.

**SUPPORT/RESOURCES**

The Committee will be supported by the Chief Executive Officer, Capital Region Board staff, consultant resources, and others as determined through the Board’s annual Business Plan and budget as recommended by the Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee, supported the Advocacy & Communications Committee, and approved and allocated by the Capital Region Board.

**LEADERSHIP**

Established practice will be used for the appointment and/or confirmation of the Chair, Vice-Chair and member municipalities of the Sub-Committee.

*Representation to CRB and/or other CRB Committees*

The Chair of the Sub-Committee will be responsible for representing the views of the Sub-Committee at Advocacy & Communication Committee, Board meetings and to CRB Committees as appropriate. In the absence of the Chair, the Committee’s Vice Chair will represent the Sub-Committee. Other Sub-Committee members may be asked to represent the Sub-Committee at the request of the Chair.
MEETINGS

Schedule of Meetings
Meetings will be scheduled as required and convened by the Chair. Efforts will be taken to coordinate Sub-Committee meeting schedules with the Advocacy & Communications Committee meeting schedule to ensure timely review and action of Sub-Committee Motions. Quorum is required in order to hold a Sub-Committee meeting. Meetings may be called or rescheduled by the Sub-Committee Chair as required.

Content of Meeting Agenda
In general, Sub-Committee meeting agendas will be determined by the Sub-Committee Chair based on delegation of the Board, Advocacy and Communications Committee, outstanding Sub-Committee motions, decisions, bring forward items as well as the relevance of potential topics to the Sub-Committee mandate, Capital Region Board Business Plan, and consistent with intent of the overall mandate identified for the Sub-Committee.

Meeting Agendas
In general, meeting agendas and pre-read materials, where available, are provided one week in advance of a scheduled Sub-Committee meeting.

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

Status of Meetings
Sub-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 Sub-Committee may invite individuals from the Province, industry, the general public or other Board/Committee members to participate in specific agenda items. Matters emerging from the Sub-Committee and voted on will become a matter of public record.

Section 602.08 (1) of the Municipal Government Act (MGA) states that the Sub-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.

Representations from the Public
The Chair of the Sub-Committee will approve requests to make representations to the Sub-Committee if they believe the presentation content will assist the Committee in its deliberations.

Quorum
A quorum of voting members (fifty percent plus one) which includes designated Sub-Committee alternates is required for a valid vote by the Committee.
Voting
Only elected officials that are designated as voting members of the Sub-Committee, or their designated alternate may vote. Voting by conference call or by prior notification to Sub-Committee Chair or Vice Chair are acceptable alternative methods of voting. Motions require a majority (fifty percent plus one of the members in attendance) vote to pass.

Motions
Motions can be brought forward to the Sub-Committee at any time. They can be used to begin the process of achieving understanding and support from Sub-Committee members. All motions must be moved by a voting member of the Sub-Committee. Where the Sub-Committee is not prepared to vote on a matter, it can be postponed to a subsequent or special Sub-Committee meeting.

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

ACCOUNTABILITY TO CAPITAL REGION BOARD

Recommendations to CRB
Capital Region Board Committees and this Sub-Committee do not have final decision making power. All policy decisions arising from the Sub-Committee must be reviewed and recommended to the Board by the Advocacy and Communications Committee. The Capital Region Board will make all policy decisions. Advocacy and Communications Committee motions will be brought forward to the Capital Region Board on behalf of the Sub-Committee where there is a majority of Committee members in support, or where there is consensus that broader Board involvement in a decision is required.

Amendments to the Terms of Reference
The Sub-Committee may consider changes to the Terms of Reference and recommend the proposed changes to the Advocacy and Communications Committee at any time. Where there is a majority of Advocacy and Communications members in support, a motion will be brought forward to the Capital Region Board for review and decision.

Reporting
The Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee will advise the Advocacy & Communications Committee of all communications and advocacy activities, key messages as well as report on its progress regularly, primarily at Advocacy & Communications Committee meetings.

Dispute Resolution
The Sub-Committee Chair is accountable for ensuring effective and collaborative Sub-Committee operations and decision making. Where the Chair’s efforts are unable to resolve a dispute, the matter will be brought to the Advocacy & Communications Committee for discussion and resolution.
APPENDIX 1: COMPOSITION

The proposed Sub-Committee municipal membership is consistent with the previous ad hoc committee, the Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee, which was originally approved by the Board in December 2011.

Voting members:

- Member – City of Edmonton
- Member – City of Fort Saskatchewan
- Member – City of Spruce Grove
- Member – Strathcona County
- Member – Town of Bruderheim
- Member – Village of Wabamun
- Member – Chair of CRB Advocacy and Communications Committee

Ex-officio – Capital Region Board Chair

As elected by the ad hoc Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee:

- Committee Chair – City of Spruce Grove, Mayor Houston
- Committee Vice-Chair – City of Fort Saskatchewan, Mayor Katchur

Non-Voting member:

Capital Region Board Chief Executive Officer

Notes

Capital Region Board staff support/resources as designated by the Chief Executive Officer

Resource: Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Association
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expected Project Outcomes</th>
<th>Contribution to CRB Value Proposition</th>
<th>Resource Requirements</th>
<th>Proposed Timelines</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develop 2013 Committee Strategy</td>
<td>Enhance and increase the depth of the 2012 strategy, refresh expected outcomes, aligning target audience(s), key messages, research and communication tools, events and media activities to achieve objectives.</td>
<td>A structured and documented plan focuses the work of the Committee on the activities that can achieve the most progress and value towards its mandate and within the resources allocated. Increased understanding and technical depth of the initiatives and factors of initiatives and stakeholders will increase CRB effectiveness, manage media and communications to CRB goals.</td>
<td>Timing is critical for raising awareness to public and elected officials from all orders of government on the importance of pipelines in getting Alberta’s oil products to the global market &amp; Alberta’s industry. -Developing higher value products increases the economic benefits and spin-off opportunities for the Capital Region. -Raising awareness to public and elected officials from all orders of government on accruing the benefits of higher value products from Alberta’s oil and gas resources is critical for the region. -Raising awareness of the opportunity and benefits of value-added industry to regional stakeholders.</td>
<td>Committee Members &amp; support, CRB Administration, technical researcher/advisor, and strategy consultant</td>
<td>Developed 1st quarter of fiscal year and maintained throughout the year</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Design, develop and implement communications materials</td>
<td>This would involve developing, designing and printing (if applicable) approved communications materials and web content.</td>
<td>Communications materials are well researched, well written, defensible and presented in a manner that captures the target audience’s interest and understanding of the key messages.</td>
<td>Effective communication with targeted audiences are critical for raising awareness and influencing support.</td>
<td>Committee Members &amp; support, CRB Administration, technical advisor &amp; researcher, communications &amp; design consultants (web &amp; print), printer</td>
<td>Implemented based on approved strategy</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trade Shows</td>
<td>Prepare for and host AUMA, UBCM, AAMDC &amp; FCM trade shows &amp;/or presentations at these conferences. Includes registration, preparation of materials, and other related trade booth fees. Excludes travel.</td>
<td>Elected officials from all orders of government are a key targeted audience in the Committee’s strategy</td>
<td>Conferences and conventions provide a venue for the CRB to be visible and able to engage key audiences at events that bring them together.</td>
<td>Committee Members, CRB Administration</td>
<td>Throughout the Year</td>
<td>$10,000*</td>
<td>$20,000*</td>
<td>$20,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stakeholder Consultation</td>
<td>Meetings with key stakeholders who have been identified as a targeted audience in the strategy (ie First Nations). Includes travel for Committee members when approved by the PLS and Advocacy &amp; Communications Committees.</td>
<td>Engage key stakeholders in the value and importance of pipelines, etc.</td>
<td>Effective communication with targeted audiences are critical for raising awareness and influencing support.</td>
<td>Committee Members, CRB Administration, specialized consulting as required</td>
<td>Throughout the Year</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Media &amp; Issue Management Support</td>
<td>Media and issue management advice and support.</td>
<td>Issues based responsiveness: effectively &amp; positively engage with public in a timely manner.</td>
<td>Respond to media and public in a manner that positively influences the public and elevates the Board and the Region with the public.</td>
<td>Committee Members, CRB Administration, Communications &amp; Issues Management Expert</td>
<td>Throughout the Year</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Will seek potential grants/sponsorship support  
** Excludes per diem, expense and travel budget for Committee members

$42,000** $75,000** $75,000**
Presented by the City of St. Albert

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

Committee Report #20
May 9th, 2013

1. Committee Meeting Dates
   - Last Meeting: April 18th, 2013
   - Next Committee Meeting: May 16th, 2013

2. 2013 Housing Committee Project Updates

   **Sub-Regional Planning Model**
   Project consultant Kent Fletcher, of Arrow Consulting, presented an overview of report findings from the Environmental Scan work, which commenced in October 2012. The Environmental Scan report was circulated to Housing Committee members prior to the meeting. The scan serves as an investigation of the Capital Region Housing Plan’s stated need for the development of a regional planning framework (and ultimately a 10-year regional housing plan) for Non-Market Housing based on sub-regions. The findings and recommendations of the Environmental Scan confirm that Provincial funding and Regional planning/prioritization should be guided by sub-regional planning efforts – which in turn would benefit from the use of standardized planning and assessment tools.

   Due to time constraints, Chair Gibbons deferred the extended discussion of the report findings and potential next steps until the next Housing Committee meeting on May 16, 2013.

   **Integrated Land Use and Affordable Housing Advisory Committee**
   Following the approval of the Our Affordable Future report at the December 13 CRB meeting, CRB Administration provided an implementation planning update. The Committee was informed of the interest expressed by the professional associations of the development and homebuilding industries. CRB Administration described the process of consensus-building with potential Industry partners for the communication and implementation of the recommendations of the Our Affordable Future report. Discussions with Industry groups, including the Urban Development Institute (UDI), Canadian Home Builders Association (CHBA), and the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) have started to build support for this initiative, although further efforts are required to engage the CHBA.

________________________________________
Mel Smith, Vice-chair, Regional Housing Committee
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Committee Report #38

May 9, 2013

1. Committee Meeting – April 15, 2013

   • Next Meeting: June 17, 2013

2. 2013 Governance Committee Priorities

   Alternative REF Process
   The Committee passed a motion to present the Alternative REF Process to the Board for approval.

   Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee
   Based on the draft Terms of Reference prepared by the Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee, CRB Administration suggested a modified terms of reference that proposed the following changes:

   • That it become a sub-committee of the Advocacy & Communications Committee to coordinate a common voice for all Board advocacy and communications activities, and

   • That it be supported by CRB Administration however the sub-committee project budget be funded entirely by the sub-committee members.

   The Committee asked that the Terms of Reference be amended to reflect that the sub-committee budget is allocated by the Board using Board funds and passed a motion to present the Terms of Reference for the Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee to the Board for approval. The Committee voted that this remain a Sub-Committee of the Advocacy & Communications Committee. Discussion about required funding will be part of the overall discussions regarding budget at the May Committee meeting.

   Revised 2013 Budget and Business Plan
   CRB Administration will review the CRB 2013 Budget and Business Plan and update as required prior to presenting to the Committee at the May meeting.

______________________________
Camille Berube, Chair, Governance Committee
CRP Briefing Note

Background

- On Friday, April 19, 2013 Doug Lagore, CEO and I met with the Calgary Regional Partnership.

  We met with the Chair and the Executive Director for dinner on Thursday evening, April 18th and discussed our mutual current work plans.

  On Friday we were able to join the CRP for their Executive meeting and would like to note the following:
  
  - The CRP is ahead of the CRB on some issues and the CRB is ahead of the CRP on some issues.
  - The CRP is actively pursuing policy development with a view to working together rather than being legislated by the Province.
  - The CRP had a private meeting with Minister Griffiths and basically received the same message that the Minister presented to the CRB – regional collaboration.
  - The CRP will be embarking on mediation with the rural municipalities very shortly in an effort to bring them to the CRP table.
  - The CRP is much further ahead on GIS and economic development and the smaller communities are very support of these initiatives.

  It is imperative that we continue to work closely with the CRP and foster this relationship.

______________________________
Chair, Mayor Crouse

cc: Calgary Regional Partnership