**1. Opening**

| 1.1 Quorum | Action: Confirmation  
| Lead: Chair Frank |
| --- | --- |
| prs - SISB Task Force - June 11, 2020 |

| 1.2 Call to Order | Action: Declaration  
| Lead: Chair Frank |
| --- | --- |

| 1.3 Chair’s Opening Remarks | Action: Information  
| Lead: Chair Frank |
| --- | --- |

**2. Approval of Agenda**

| Action: Approval  
| Lead: Chair Frank |
| --- | --- |

**Recommended Motion:** That the Shared Investment for Shared Benefit Task Force approve the June 11, 2020 meeting agenda.

**3. Approval of Minutes**

| Action: Approval  
| Lead: Chair Frank |
| --- | --- |

**Recommended Motion:** That the Shared Investment for Shared Benefit Task Force approve the February 20, 2020 meeting minutes.

mts - SISB Task Force - February 20, 2020 - Draft

**4. Update of Project Progress to Date**

| Action: Information  
| Lead: Dalibor Petrovic, Deloitte |
| --- | --- |

**5. SISB Model Features**

| Action: Information  
| Lead: Stewart Young, Deloitte |
| --- | --- |

a) Overview of potential SISB model features  
b) Discussion and feedback on features for EMRB SISB model
6. Initiative Selection Framework
   Action: Information
   Lead: Dalibor Petrovic, Deloitte

   a) Overview of high-level process for selecting initiatives to be analyzed using the EMRB SISB model
   b) Discussion and feedback on initiative selection process for EMRB SISB model

7. Next Steps/Questions
   Action: Information
   Lead: Dalibor Petrovic, Deloitte

8. Next Meeting
   Action: Information
   Lead: Chair Frank

   September 4, 2020
   9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.
   Format TBD

9. Adjournment
   Action: Declaration
   Lead: Chair Frank
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 1:10</td>
<td>Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Call to Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chair’s Opening Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 – 1:15</td>
<td>Approval of Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 1:20</td>
<td>Approval of February 20 EMRB Task Force Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:20 – 1:40</td>
<td>Update on project progress to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:40 – 2:30</td>
<td>SISB Model Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:40 – 3:45</td>
<td>Initiative Selection Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 – 3:55</td>
<td>Next Steps / Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:55 – 4:00</td>
<td>Next Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjournment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approval of Agenda

**Recommended Motion:**
That the Shared Investment for Shared Benefit Task Force approve the June 11, 2020 meeting agenda.
Approval of Minutes

Recommended Motion:
That the Shared Investment for Shared Benefit Task Force approve the February 20, 2020 meeting minutes.
Opening Remarks
Objectives of Today

1. Update Task Force members on SISB project progress
2. Review and decide on potential model features to include
3. Present draft framework for selecting initiatives and receive Task Force feedback
4. Understand next steps and how Task Force Members’ input will be used
5. Others???
Update on Project Progress to Date
EMRB SISB – Revised Schedule

The revised schedule below is significantly shorter than the original schedule, in response to stakeholder feedback and COVID-19 related challenges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<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>1. Project Initiation, Documents Review, Stakeholder Surveys, Stakeholder Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Environmental Scan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>April 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>April 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SISB Framework Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SISB Investment Model Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SISB Model Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Group Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<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>1. Project Initiation, Documents Review, Stakeholder Surveys, Stakeholder Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Environmental Scan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SISB Framework Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SISB Investment Model Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SISB Model Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Group Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Progress Since Last Task Force meeting (Feb 20th)

**Conducted Second Working Group Workshop**
- Discussion of potential model features selected from Environmental Scan
- Discussion of draft framework for selecting potential initiatives

**Individual Task Force member interviews**
- 30-minute meetings with each member (optional)
- All interviews completed by April 6

**Environmental Scan continues**
- Working Group selected 6 models from different jurisdictions for further study
- Challenges with contacting jurisdictions due to COVID19-related concerns

**Working Group Surveys**
- Working Group members surveyed on potential model features and criteria for selecting initiatives
- Survey results (and workshop input) used to inform today’s discussion
Task Force Member Interviews - Summary

Task Force members are supportive of the SISB initiative. The model should apply to regionally significant and sub-regional investment opportunities.

Common Suggestions:

• **Regional Significance:** a challenge is collectively agreeing on how to define this

• **Pace:** Accelerate the project timeline

• **Sub-regional investment opportunities:** the SISB model should be flexible such that some initiatives involve all 13 municipalities, but also lends itself to sub-regional opportunities

• **“Opt outs”:** during evaluations of proposed initiatives, so that municipalities not willing/able to be involved can step back (effectively making that proposed initiative “sub regional”)

• **Initial “deposit” payment:** as a disincentive to municipalities, “opting out” once initiatives are underway, and could be collected from participating municipalities at the outset of an initiative. The loss of this “deposit” would serve as a penalty if support is withdrawn by a participating municipality at later steps of the process.

Other considerations/concerns:

• Ability to achieve the necessary support/buy-in from local residents/councils

• The SISB model should be forward looking (rather than retroactive) in terms of how initiatives are funded
Emerging Issues

Key issues have been identified as critical to the success of SISB, and will be addressed later in the SISB project (or outside of the SISB project):

**Governance and Administration of the SISB Model**

Developing processes and procedures for administration of the SISB model (e.g. making decisions, managing updates, quality assurance, management of investments, distribution of benefits, training, onboarding of new members after elections, etc.) are critical to ensuring effective use of the model.

**Addressing differences in affordability among municipalities**

Each municipality in the region has a unique financial and economic profile, affecting its relative ability to invest in large initiatives. A mechanism for addressing this is needed to ensure all municipalities have opportunities to participate equitably in important initiatives.

**Defining ‘Regional Significance’**

The Strategic Guidance Document notes that municipalities (through EMRB) are responsible for developing a process to determine whether an initiative is regionally significant. Defining significance to the region will also assist in selecting initiatives for investment.

**Determining Regional Economic Development Priorities**

Defining priorities for economic development in the region (e.g. target industries, populations, geographic areas) will assist in selecting initiatives for investment.
SISB Model – Potential Features
Conceptual SISB Models

We have constructed two models to demonstrate several possible features. All models have common components to which features can be added:

- **Municipal Partners** *(participants in the investment)*
- **Contributions** *(what each Municipal Partner gives, and how this is divided among Partners)*
- **Investment** *(where the contributions are directed)*
- **Benefits** *(revenues from the investment shared back to Municipal Partners)*
Conceptual SISB Model #1

This model features a mixed cost-sharing mechanism, a revenue pool, and revenues shared in proportion to each partner’s total investment.

A: Contributions are split equally up to a threshold, then split based on another variable above the threshold.

This feature is a mixed cost-sharing mechanism (it combines equal cost-sharing with a formula that accounts for differences in financial capacity among partners).

B: A portion of the direct revenues are first allocated to a revenue sharing pool.

This feature is a proportionate revenue sharing mechanism – it allocates revenues to partners in direct proportion their costs incurred.

C: The remaining revenues are allocated back to the partners in proportion to their total investment.

Contributions
- Equal Cost-Sharing
  - Based on Population AND/OR Assessed Value AND/OR Usage AND/OR Land Size

Investment

Benefits
- Direct Revenues

Revenue Sharing Pool
Conceptual SISB Model #2

This model splits costs based on one or more measures, allows for non-monetary contributions, and shares revenues proportionally based on each partner’s contribution after a portion of total revenues is allocated to the municipality hosting the investment.

A. Contributions are split based on one measure (or a combination of measures) that captures key differences between the partners.

B. The provision of services or land is counted towards a partner’s contribution.

C. A portion of the revenues are allocated to the host jurisdiction.

D. The remaining revenues are allocated back to the partners in proportion to their total investment.

This feature illustrated is a single or multiple variable sharing mechanism.

In addition, this model incorporates a services as contributions sharing mechanism allows Municipal Partners to make non-financial contributions.

This feature is a host jurisdiction compensation mechanism – it sets a portion of total revenues aside to compensate the host member for any additional costs it may incur to provide services to the investment.

© Deloitte LLP and affiliated entities.
Summary of Model Features

How should costs be shared?

- Based on assessed value
- Based on population
- Based on expected usage
- On an equal basis across municipalities
- Based on a mixed formula incorporating any of the above

How should revenues be shared?

- In direct proportion to contributions
- A portion is allocated to a shared revenue pool
- A portion is allocated to compensate the host municipality

What do contributions look like?

- Financial contributions only
- The provision of key services
- Other contributions such as land, technical expertise, etc.

Other features

- External partners involvement (e.g., private sector, other government partners)
How do you think **COSTS COULD BE SHARED** among municipalities in the SISB model?

- **Based on a mixed formula incorporating any of the below**
  - 75%
- **Based on Assessed Value**
  - 50%
- **Based on Expected Usage**
  - 50%
- **Based on Population**
  - 50%
- **Equally across all partners**
  - 0%
- **Other**
  - 20%

Working Group member responses (out of 12 total)
Model Features – Sharing Costs

Surveying the Task Force – Zoom poll 1

How do you think **COSTS COULD BE SHARED** among municipalities in the SISB model?

*(Zoom Poll 1 – select all that apply)*
Model Features – Working Group Survey Results

Data below shows preferences of the Working Group for Model Features

How do you think REVENUES COULD BE SHARED among municipalities the SISB model?

- In direct proportion to contributions: 92%
- A portion is allocated to a shared revenue pool: 75%
- A portion is allocated to compensate the host municipality: 75%

Working Group member responses (out of 12 total)
Model Features – Sharing Revenues

Surveying the Task Force – Zoom poll 2

How do you think **REVENUES COULD BE SHARED** among municipalities in the SISB model?

(Zoom Poll 2 – select all that apply)
Data below shows preferences of the Working Group for Model Features

What do you think **CONTRIBUTIONS FROM MUNICIPALITIES** could look like?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Feature</th>
<th>Working Group member responses (out of 12 total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Contributions</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of Key Services</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Expertise</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What do you think **CONTRIBUTIONS FROM MUNICIPALITIES** could look like?

(Zoom Poll 3 – select all that apply)
Break (10 mins)
Initiative Selection Framework
Overview of a high-level potential process for selecting initiatives to be analyzed using the EMRB SISB model – including options for members opting out

Identify Candidate Initiatives

EMRB members are responsible for identifying, sponsoring and gathering information for potential initiatives

Initial Screen

Initiatives are screened for inclusion in the EMRB SISB model using an initial set of criteria. The screening analysis involves all (or a subset of) municipalities, with potential assistance from a third party.

Ranking Initiatives

Initiatives that meet the assessment criteria are short-listed for the SISB model and prioritized using ranking analysis (e.g., cost-benefit analysis). The ranking is performed by all (or a subset of) municipalities with potential assistance from a third party.

Execute in accordance with SISB model

The benefits and costs of selected initiatives are shared according to the EMRB SISB model

Sub-Regional Initiatives

Initiatives that do not meet the screening criteria may be pursued at the sub-regional level, potentially using a similar or the same SISB model

Abandoned Initiatives

Initiatives that do not meet the screening criteria may be abandoned

Member Opt-Out (with no penalty)

A municipality may opt out without penalty

Member Opt-Out (with penalty)

A municipality may opt out of an initiative that has already been selected for the model, but they may be subject to a penalty
### Initial Screen of Initiatives

The following items were identified by the Working Group as useful criteria for the **Initial Screen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Assessment Components</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Alignment to Priorities**      | • Alignment with economic development opportunities in the region (e.g. priority sectors, priority populations, geographic priorities, other economic development initiatives underway)  
• Regional significance |
| **Feasibility**                  | • Land availability / restrictions  
• Regulatory / statutory constraints  
• Delivery risk (cost, schedule, scope, etc.)  
• No duplication with the work of other regional agencies (e.g. Edmonton Global) |
| **Affordability**                | • Sufficient resources available  
• Ability to attract external funding |
| **Magnitude and Regional Dispersion of Economic Impact** | • The nature and anticipated magnitude of the potential contributions of the project to the regional economy (e.g. GDP, employment, government revenue, long-term "structuring" benefits or socio-economic benefits)  
• Distribution/spread of the economic impact across the municipalities in the region (evidence and reasoning behind this would be provided) |
The following items were identified by the Working Group as useful for ranking short-listed initiatives for inclusion in the SISB model.

### Potential Assessment Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Costs and Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader Societal/Public Costs/Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Direct Costs and Benefits
- Capital costs
- Operating costs
- Revenue streams

#### Broader Societal/Public Costs/Benefits
- Cost / time savings
- Productivity improvements
- Safety improvements
- Environmental benefits

#### Other
- Estimate of direct benefit to municipalities (that can be directly measured and monetized)
- Long-term, “structuring” economic benefits, such as stimulating follow-on third party investments, local supply chain development, human capital attraction and development, innovation and technological capacity development, engagement of vulnerable/underrepresented populations and others
Next Steps
## Next Steps

1. **Design the conceptual SISB model based on Working Group / Task Force input**

2. **Construct the working SISB model in Excel (including a hypothetical ‘test case’ initiative for use in the model)**

3. **Update the Initiative Selection Framework based on Working Group / Task Force input**

4. **Next Task Force meeting – Sept 4 (9am)**

5. **Others??**
Next Meeting – September 4
Thank you!
Adjournment
## Task Force Members:
- Cathy Heron, City of St. Albert (Vice Chair)
- John Stewart, City of Beaumont
- Ray Ralph, Town of Devon
- Don Iveson, City of Edmonton
- Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
- Tanni Dobranko, Leduc County
- Barry Turner, Town of Morinville
- Rod Shaigec, Parkland County
- Stuart Houston, City of Spruce Grove
- Linda Matties, Town of Stony Plain (Alternate)
- Katie Berghofer, Strathcona County (Alternate)
- Alanna Hnatiw, Sturgeon County

## Guests:
- Grant Bain, Leduc County
- Teaka Broughm, City of Beaumont
- John Dance, City of Fort Saskatchewan
- Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
- Simon Farbrother, City of Spruce Grove
- Ian Gallagher, City of Edmonton
- Sarah Hall, Town of Morinville
- Gordon Harris, City of Fort Saskatchewan
- Brandy Kelly, City of Leduc
- Stephane Labonne, Town of Morinville
- Larissa Lindmark, Parkland County
- Ken MacKay, City of St. Albert
- Avril McCalla, City of Edmonton
- Reegan McCullough, Sturgeon County
- Brenda Otto, Town of Stony Plain
- Jackie Porayko, Strathcona County
- Kendra Raymond, City of Beaumont
- Paul Ross, City of Edmonton
- Tanis Sawatsky, Sturgeon County
- Kevin Scoble, City of St. Albert
- Martin Stout, City of Beaumont
- Laura Swain, Parkland County
- Patrick D. Tighe, Sturgeon County

## Regrets:
- Rod Frank, Strathcona County (Chair)
- Bob Young, City of Leduc
- William Choy, Town of Stony Plain

## EMRB Staff:
- Karen Wichuk, CEO
- Sharon Shuya, Director of Regional Growth Planning
- Alex Bonokoski, Project Manager
- Dan Rose, Senior Communications Advisor
- Carol Moreno, Project Coordinator

## Consultants:
- Slavi Diamandiev, Deloitte
- Dalibor Petrovic, Deloitte
- Sabrina Reschny, Deloitte
- Karen Gilchrist, Karen Gilchrist and Associates
1. Opening

1.1 Quorum

Quorum achieved; 10 of 13 voting members present.

1.2 Call to Order

Vice Chair Heron called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.

1.3 Chair’s Opening Remarks

Vice Chair Heron welcomed members of the Task Force and regional stakeholders. Opening remarks included encouraging a willingness to take off ‘municipal hats’, consider the broader picture, be open to new ideas, share thoughts, and be brave about approaching opportunities.

2. Approval of Agenda

Chair Heron amended the agenda to include announcements from the Town of Stony Plain and CEO Wichuk prior to adjournment.

**Motion:** That the Shared Investment for Shared Benefit Task Force approve the February 20, 2020 meeting agenda as amended.

**Moved by:** Mayor Ralph

**Accepted by:** Vice Chair

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

3. Approval of Minutes

**Motion:** That the Shared Investment for Shared Benefit Task Force approve the December 6, 2019 meeting minutes.

**Moved by:** Mayor Katchur

**Accepted by:** Vice Chair

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

*Mayor Hnatiw joined the meeting at 1:08 p.m.*

4. Update of Project Progress to date

Mr. Petrovic reviewed the work completed since the last Task Force meeting including facilitating the first Working Group meeting with representation from all 13 municipalities, as well as ongoing work towards the Environmental Scan and interviews with each Task Force member.
5. **Refresh on SISB Models – Interjurisdictional Accord example**

Mr. Diamandiev reviewed the Interjurisdictional Accord with the Task Force as a more complex example of an SISB model than the Spokane model example presented in December. He highlighted features such as flexibility in the type and scale of investments, inclusion of non-financial contributions, cost-sharing and benefit sharing arrangements, consideration of broader socio-economic benefits in the project selection process, and the creation of a revenue pool, generated from project revenues, to allow for sustainability of the model.

_Mayor Iveson joined the meeting at 1:24 p.m._

Comments from the Task Force included the timeline required to arrive at the current Accord arrangement, interest in examples of Accord projects and contribution thresholds, timing of allocations to the benefits pool, ensuring participation of the appropriate partners, potential to use a regional model as a template for sub-regional application, feasibility of weighting non-financial benefits due to proximity of development, and consideration for indirect social and community benefits.

6. **Research to date – early observations**

Mr. Diamandiev shared observations around the differences among municipalities in the Region resulting from their unique realities. Nevertheless, there are many common themes and strategic alignment in priority economic sectors, core values, and areas for investment.

Ms. Reschny outlined some of the key themes resulting from Working Group conversations around opportunities and challenges. Exploring ideas for possible SISB projects, Working Group members brainstormed a variety of initiatives, long-term regional economic opportunities, and opportunities to address constituents’ current concerns.

_Break 2:06 p.m. to 2:29 p.m._

7. **Exercise – Discussing Long-term Opportunities vs. Solving Current Problems**

Mr. Petrovic invited members of the Task Force to share their position along a continuum to answer the question: Should the SISB initiative be focused on realizing long-term future opportunities, be focused on solving problems that exist today, or balanced somewhere along the continuum? Members discussed their desire to demonstrate the value of regional collaboration to their constituents in the short-term but also to be a more strategic, forward-thinking Board that tackles long-term, transformational legacy work.

8. **Small Group Discussion – Strategic Questions**

Mr. Petrovic split the Task Force and Working Group into three groups to discuss and report back on topics such as short- vs. long-term focus, determining SISB project success criteria, future long-term outcomes of SISB in the Region, identification of ‘quick wins’, and transformational opportunities.
Task Force members shared that short-term success may include defined project selection criteria, agreement on what is regionally significant, successful completion of a project, productive provincial and municipal partnerships, a borderless approach, and unanimous participation. Twenty years from now, success may include a strong regional reputation and brand, the ability to measure and communicate successes, less inter-regional competition, removal of barriers to large investment, and an environmentally credible region known for its resilient economy.

*Mayor Doblanko left the meeting at 3:30 p.m.*

*Mayor Ralph stepped out of the meeting from 3:35 p.m. to 3:45 p.m.*

Brainstorming opportunities for ‘quick wins’ in the SISB initiative, the Task Force mentioned regional transit, broadband, IT procurement, waste management, stormwater management, and the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan (IRTMP) Priorities List.

The Task Force generated ideas for transformational opportunities including regional servicing districts, bringing balance to fiscal disparities, waste to energy and green technologies, and support for a robust agri-food sector.

9. **Next Steps / Questions**

CEO Wichuk conveyed that meeting notes would be circulated to the Task Force shortly followed by the bulletin for distribution more broadly among stakeholders. Vice Chair Heron encouraged members to follow up on briefing notes and other communication pieces to ensure municipal councils are kept apprised of progress on SISB.

Mr. Petrovic advised the Task Force that the Project Team will proceed with a second workshop with the Working Group, continue research towards the Environmental Scan, conduct the remaining interviews with mayors, and prepare for the next Task Force meeting in April.

Vice Chair Heron reminded members to respond to the Project Team’s initial information request for existing collaborative cost-sharing or co-investment agreements or initiatives as soon as possible.

10. **Announcements**

Councillor Matties provided the Task Force with an executive summary related to waste management in the Town of Stony Plain as an example of a possible regional opportunity.

Canadian Homebuilders Association would like to host Council members and CAOs to look at opportunities around infill. One evening and one afternoon session available in Edmonton with 60 spots on buses for a 3-hour tour. EMRB Administration will circulate the details as they become available.
11. Adjournment

Vice Chair Heron declared the meeting adjourned at 4:04 p.m.

12. Next Meeting

Next Meeting:
SISB Task Force
April 16, 2020, 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Location TBC

Task Force Chair, Rod Frank