Meeting Agenda
June 13, 2013 – 9:00 a.m. – Noon
Chateau Louis, Grand Ballroom
11727 Kingsway, Edmonton

Open to the Public

1. Chair’s Opening Remarks
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes of May 9, 2013
4. REF Applications
5. Land Use
   a. Cluster Country Residential Areas Policy Clarification - Strathcona County
      **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approves the Cluster Country Residential Areas Policy Clarification in the review of Regional Evaluation Framework submissions as recommended by the Land Use Committee.
6. Housing
   a. Sub-regional Planning Framework: Environmental Scan Report
      **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board receives the Sub-Regional Planning Framework: Environmental Scan Report for information as recommended by the Housing Committee.
7. Advocacy & Communications Committee
   a. Advocacy & Communications Committee Membership
      **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approves that the membership of the Advocacy & Communications Committee’s be updated to include the Chair of the Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee.
8. 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).
   b. Planning Session to Review CRB Voting Structure – Village of Warburg
      **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board hold a planning session of all board members to review the current voting structure (Section 5 subsections (2) and (3)) of the Capital Region Regulations and bring back recommendations to the Capital Region Board, regarding the Regulation’s functionality.
c. CRB Unaudited Financial Statements

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approves the Financial Statements for the year ended March 31, 2013.

d. REF Process – Parkland County

i. **Motion:** That The REF process voted on by the Board on May 9, 2013, be amended as follows:

- For Applications which the CRB Administration and the CRB’s third party consultant have recommended APPROVAL, the Application will be approved unless one or more participating municipalities appeal to the Board within a defined time limit. To overturn an Administrative approval, an appeal must be supported by not fewer than 17 representatives from participating municipalities that collectively have at least 75% of the population in the Capital Region or the Administrative approval of the application will stand; and

- For Applications which the CRB Administration and third party consultant have recommended to REJECT: The Application will be dismissed unless one or more participating municipalities appeal to the Board within a defined time limit. To overturn an Administrative rejection, an appeal must be supported by not fewer than 17 representatives from participating municipalities that collectively have at least 75% of the population in the Capital Region.

ii. **Motion:** That upon the passing of Motion #1, the Board will request the Minister of Municipal Affairs to endorse the amended REF process by passing a Ministerial Order signed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

iii. **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board waive the requirement for the Parkland County REF Application 2012-019 – Acheson ASP and MDP Amendment to wait twelve (12) months after date of decision before coming before the Board for reconsideration.

9. Other Business

a. Strathcona County Media Release- Canadian municipalities rally for nation-wide energy value

10. Committee Reports

a. Land Use Committee
b. Housing Committee
c. Advocacy & Communications Committee

11. CEO’s update

a. CRP Briefing update
b. Summary of Meeting with Towns (population under 3,500)

12. **Motion:** That the CRB move to in camera session. *(if required)*
In Camera Items *(if required)*

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

Open to the Public

14. Adjournment
Minutes of a meeting of the Capital Region Board held at Chateau Louis, St. Michael Room on Thursday, May 9, 2013

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

Mayor Linda Osinchuk – Strathcona County
Mayor Randy Boyd – Bon Accord
Mayor Greg Krischke – City of Leduc
Mayor Don Faulkner - Calmar
Councillor Bill Purdy - Wabamun
Councillor Shelley Ross - Bruderheim
Mayor Paul Krauskopf - Morinville
Mayor Anita Fisher - Devon
Mayor Rodney Shaigec - 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
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Brendan Pinches, Project Manager

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

1. Call to Order and Chair's opening remarks
   Meeting Called to order at 9:00a.m.
   
   Two handouts were provided to members, one being an Executive Summary of the Environmental Scan Report corresponding with the Housing Committee Report; second being the City of Edmonton Motion (Item 8a). A copy of the CRB 2012 Annual Report was provided to each Board Member.
   
   The Chair mentioned that the July Board Meeting may be cancelled and at this point there are no REF’s to be dealt with. He asked members to hold the date in their calendars as tentative for REF purposes.
   
   A CRB municipality had previously asked the reasoning for another municipality’s vote. The Chair stated that no member has any obligation to give reason as to why they voted the way they did.
   
   The Chair reminded members that Premier Redford as well as Minister Griffiths would be joining the meeting at 11:00a.m. until 11:45a.m. at which time the Premier’s Office has requested a photo be taken of all Board Members with Premier Redford and Minister Griffiths.

2. Approval of Agenda (as originally distributed)
   
   Moved by Mayor Boyd.
   
   Motion: That the agenda of May 9, 2013 be approved as originally distributed.
   
   Motion carried unanimously.

3. Regional Collaboration Grant

   Moved by Councillor MacKay.
   
   Motion: To waive the seven day notice period for a motion being proposed for May 9, 2013 (as per Section 9(a)(i) of Policy #G005).
   
   19 in favour, 4 opposed. Supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. Motion carried.

4. Approval of Agenda as amended

   Moved by Mayor Krischke.
   
   Motion: That the agenda be approved as amended.
   
   Motion carried unanimously.

5. Approval of Minutes of April 11, 2013

   Moved by Mayor Boyd.
Motion: To accept the minutes of April 11, 2013.

Motion carried unanimously.

6. REF Applications (none)

7. Governance
   a. Change of REF Process
      
      Moved by Mayor Berube.

      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.

      Moved by Mayor Krischke.

      That the Capital Region Board’s Alternative REF Process be amended by changing the appeal process from 30 calendar days to 14 calendar days.

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

      Moved by Mayor Shaigec.

      To postpone the motion to change the REF Process until the June 2013 Board Meeting.

      13 in favour, 11 opposed. Not supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. Postponement motion failed.

      Moved by Mayor Choy.

      That the change of the REF Process be tabled until the end of the meeting.

      10 in favour, 14 opposed. Not supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. Tabling motion failed.

      Vote on amended motion.

      19 in favour, 5 opposed. Supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. Motions carried.

   b. Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee
      
      Moved by Mayor Berube.
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.

Moved by Mayor Osinchuk.

That the Capital Region Board amend the Terms of Reference of the Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee to a Committee that reports directly to the Capital Region Board rather than to the Advocacy and Communications Committee.

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

Motion as originally presented.
Motion carried unanimously.

8. New Business
   a. Edmonton’s Regional Collaboration Proposal

   Moved by Mayor Mandel.

   That the Capital Region Board supports the City of Edmonton for a grant application of $25 million over 3 years under the Regional Collaboration Program.

   Moved by Councillor MacKay.

   That this matter be postponed until the June 2013 Board Meeting.

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

   Mayor Katchur asked for a friendly amendment by adding “in principle” to which the mover agreed.

   New motion: That the Capital Region Board supports the City of Edmonton in principle for a grant application of $25 million over 3 years under the Regional Collaboration Program.

   16 in favour, 8 opposed.

   Chair stated twice that the vote was carried 17-7, however, the vote was 16-8 as per CRB administration recording. Staff recorded the vote as follows:

   Opposed: Bon Accord, Bruderheim, Town of Lamont, Leduc County, Legal, Parkland, Redwater, Warburg.

   In favor: Beaumont, Sturgeon County, Thorsby, Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, Gibbons, Stony Plain, Strathcona County, Leduc, Calmar, Wabamun, Morinville, Devon, Spruce Grove, Lamont County, St. Albert.
Not supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. **Motion failed.**

9. **Adjournment**
   
   Meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

11:00 – 11:45 a.m.

   Honourable Alison Redford, Premier of Alberta  
   Honourable Doug Griffiths, Minister, Municipal Affairs

______________________________

CRB Chair, Nolan Crouse

______________________________

CRB CEO, Doug Lagore
Cluster Country Residential Areas Policy Clarification

Motion

*That the Capital Region Board approves the Cluster Country Residential Areas Policy Clarification in the review of Regional Evaluation Framework submissions as recommended by the Land Use Committee.*

Background

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

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

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

- One of the evaluation criteria in REF is consistency of a Statutory Plan or Statutory Plan amendment with the Land Use Principles, Policies, and density targets as outlined in Capital Region Growth Plan.

- On September 13, 2012, the Board approved the following motion by Strathcona County:

  *That the Capital Region Board directs the Land Use Committee and Planning Advisory Group to give priority to developing an interpretive guide to the policies in the Growth Plan and criteria in the Regional Evaluation Framework related to Cluster Country Residential Areas and Areas Outside of Priority Growth Areas as part of the current REF Administration Review Implementation project.*

- In the background document provided with the motion, Strathcona County requested clarification with regard to the intent of density targets for CCRAs: were they a minimum, maximum or approximate?; what is the scale that density is to be measured...over the entire CCRA, by quarter section or plan boundary?; And clarification of the Country Residential principles referenced in the Growth Plan.

- The matter was referred to the Planning Advisory Group (PAG) for review and recommendations. PAG created a CCRA Subcommittee to consider the motion and prepare recommendations for the Land Use Committee.

- At its meeting of May 23, 2013, the Land Use Committee approved the PAG recommended Cluster Country Residential Areas Policy Clarification (Attachment 1).
Rationale

- The CCRA Subcommittee established an approach to reviewing the policies that were the subject of the Strathcona County motion. The approach included four components: research; issue identification; recommendation; and 5 year update issues. Based on this approach the issues identified included Density Target – Minimum or Maximum?; Distribution of Density; and Flexibility.

- The Subcommittee confirmed that the Density Target for CCRAs is a maximum as defined in the Growth Plan. Second, a three tier review process for statutory plans within CCRA areas was developed which addresses the distribution of density. And finally, with regard to flexibility, it was agreed that while the Growth Plan does not expressly support flexibility in the review of REF applications, the three tier review process gives the applicant municipality flexibility in the preparation of statutory plans for CCRAs.

Attachments:
1. REF Interpretation Guide: Cluster Country Residential Areas Policy Clarification
**REF Interpretation Guide**  
*Cluster Country Residential Areas Policy Clarification*

**Introduction**

On June 14, 2012, the Capital Region Board approved the Report: A Review of the Administration of the Regional Evaluation Framework. The Report included the following recommendation regarding interpretation of the Capital Region Growth Plan and the evaluation criteria in the REF:

| 7. | Develop a comprehensive guide that will assist municipalities, Third Party Consultants, and CRB administration in the interpretation of the principles and policies of the Growth Plan and the evaluation criteria in the Regional Evaluation Framework. |

Work on the development of the guide was still in the preparation stages when Strathcona County introduced a notice of motion at the August 9, 2012 Board meeting that would direct the Capital Region Board to prioritize a process to clarify the criterion, principles and policies used to evaluate planning documents through the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF).

The motion was put forward as a result of 2 REF applications that were considered and rejected at the August 9, 2012 Board meeting. One application was for a cluster country residential development and the other for an expansion to an existing Hamlet.

A backgrounder provided by Strathcona County indicated that “there is an urgent need for clarification of interpretation of the Capital Region Growth Plan’s principles and policies that are used to evaluate planning proposals submitted by member municipalities.” Strathcona County provided three areas of prioritization:

1. Cluster Country Residential
2. Growth outside the Priority Growth Areas
3. Industrial and commercial development

On September 13, 2012, an amended motion, that aligned Strathcona’s motion with the REF Administration Report recommendations work, was presented and approved by the Board.

Amended Motion: That the Capital Region Board directs the Land Use Committee and Planning Advisory Group to give priority to developing an interpretive guide to the policies in the Growth Plan and criteria in the Regional Evaluation Framework related to Cluster Country Residential Areas and Areas Outside of Priority Growth Areas as part of the current REF Administration Review Implementation project.
Cluster County Residential

This particular policy clarification document is focused on the Cluster Country Residential Areas (CCRA) part of the motion.

Strathcona County’s backgrounder included the following examples of the interpretive issues facing municipalities when preparing planning documents that are subject to CRB approval:

1. The intent of the density targets in Cluster Country Residential Areas needs clarification. Table 3 – Capital Region Density Targets in Section 2 of the Growth Plan October 2009 Addendum indicates a target of 2.0 dwelling units per gross hectare. Is this density average intended to indicate a minimum, a maximum or an approximate target to be achieved? Also, what is the intended scale for this target? It is unclear if the scale of this density target to be achieved at:
   a. a Quarter section scale;
   b. area defined by the plan area; or
   c. the averaged across the total area of the Cluster Country Residential Area?

2. Cluster country residential principles are not defined in the plan, yet following ‘cluster country residential principles’ are heavily referenced throughout the Growth Plan and are engrained in the land use principles and policies that are the fundamental basis for regional evaluation of country residential development.

Planning Advisory Group

Pursuant to the direction in the Motion the Planning Advisory Group (PAG) members discussed the challenges of applying the CCRA policies at their September 17, 2012 meeting. The uniqueness of each of the four CCRAs makes consistent application of the policies across the region difficult. A CCRA Subcommittee of PAG, comprised of the four Counties with CCRA areas, was established to review the matter further and report back to the rest of the Group in October.

On October 15th the CCRA Subcommittee advised that they had held one meeting wherein they had developed a common framework to compile information about each of the CCRA’s. Each of the Counties was to compile the information respecting their CCRA for review at their next meeting with the intent of reporting back to PAG at the November meeting.
The CCRA Subcommittee met again on December 6, 2012 and January 14, 2013. The CCRA Subcommittee, together with the Non-PGA Subcommittee, established the following approach to reviewing the policies that were the subject of the Strathcona County Motion:

Subcommittee Approach

a. **Research** - Research legislative context and decision making process resulting in existing policies in the Growth Plan for CCRAs and Growth Areas Outside PGAs
b. **Issue Identification** - Identify current “Red Flag” issues relating to interpretation of existing CCRA and Growth Areas Outside of PGAs policies
c. **Policy Clarification Recommendations** - Recommend clarifications to be included in an interpretive guide to the policies in the Growth Plan and criteria in the Regional Evaluation Framework
d. **5 Year Update Issues** - Identify implementation issues related to CCRA and Growth Areas Outside of PGAs policies for consideration in the 5 Year Land Use Plan Review

a. Research

With the assistance of ISL Consulting, the Subcommittees researched the establishment of the current growth plan policies related to CCRAs and Non-PGA areas. The Subcommittees’ research is summarized in Appendix 1.

b. Issue Identification

Following the review of the research and the backgrounder provided by Strathcona County the CCRA Subcommittee identified the two issues related to the application of the assigned density target in the Growth Plan:

1.a. **Density Target – Minimum or Maximum?** - Is it to be implemented as a maximum or an average density target? Current interpretations of the 2 u/gross ha density target in recent REF applications for development plans in CCRAs have treated the target as a maximum.

1.b. **Distribution of Density** - Is it to apply to each development plan or as a total across the entire CCRA?

2. **Flexibility** - Recent REF decisions for development plans in CCRAs have not considered flexibility depending on the development characteristics of individual quarter sections of land as was intended in the application of the density target.
c. Policy Clarification Recommendations

1.a. Density Target – Minimum or Maximum?

The 2009 October Addendum to the Growth Plan defines Density Target:

“Means a minimum to a maximum density target assigned to PGAs; a maximum density target assigned to CRAs, and a maximum density target assigned to Traditional Country Residential development outside of PGAs and urban municipalities.”

The above definition clearly addresses the first density question posed by Strathcona County – the Density Target for CCRA is a maximum, and has been interpreted as such in the implementation of REF.

In this regard, the Density Target for CCRAs is a maximum of 2 dwelling units/gross hectare (u/gha)

1.b. Distribution of Density

The Growth Plan is not clear on whether the Density Target is to be applied to each proposed development plan area or as a target across an entire CCRA to be achieved over the lifetime of the Growth Plan.

In the absence of this policy clarification, CRB Administration has taken the position, since the Growth Plan was approved, that all statutory plans considered through the REF process must be comply with the density target of 2 u/gha.

This was further articulated in the Municipal Planning Toolkit:

3. DOES EVERY DEVELOPMENT PLAN WITHIN A CCRA HAVE TO MEET THE DENSITY TARGET ASSIGNED TO THAT CCRA?

It is the intent of the Capital Region Growth Plan that every development plan will over time achieve the density target assigned to CCRAs. Each plan must demonstrate how it will achieve the density target.

However, the general application of this density in certain areas of CCRAs has been described as uneconomical and does not effectively contribute to reducing the regional development footprint.
2. Flexibility

The concern regarding flexibility in reviews by CRB administration is due to a lack of direction within the REF and the Growth Plan as demonstrated above. The policy clarification recommendation below suggests a tiered plan system that introduces flexibility depending on the approach that a municipality takes when planning within their CCRA.

Policy Clarification Recommendation

To address the distribution of density and flexibility, a three tier review process has been prepared for consideration by PAG and the Land Use Committee. Plans would be reviewed based on the highest order of statutory plan, below an MDP, approved by the municipality within the subject CCRA:

Order of Plans

1. **CCRA Plan** - Allows for the Density Target to be averaged over entire CCRA subject to the municipality preparing a Statutory Plan for the CCRA that addresses the distribution of density over the entire CCRA.
2. **Quarter Section Plan** - Each statutory plan within a CCRA must be inclusive of the quarter section boundaries within which it is located and address the density over the entire quarter section.
3. **Plan Boundary** - Maintain current interpretation that each statutory plan must demonstrate how it will achieve the density target within the plan boundaries.

Implementation examples:

1. **CCRA Plan**

   In this example, the Density Target for the CCRA would be averaged over the entire CCRA.

   **CCRA “O”**
   Gross Hectares = 4439 ha
   Density Target = 2 u/gha
   Target Units = 8878
   Existing Units = ±1750
   Capacity available = ±7128

   The municipality would prepare a Statutory Plan for the entire CCRA that addresses the distribution of density over the entire CCRA. Development plans consistent with the distribution of units in the Statutory Plan would not require approval by the CRB, however, any time the distribution pattern was amended the plan would require Board approval.
2. **Quarter Section Plan**

For a Quarter Section Plan the density is distributed over the entire quarter section. In the example below the planned northerly 30 ha development is combined with the previously developed 32 ha on the southern half of the quarter section. The proposed density of 79 lots on the 30 ha site combined with the 26 lots on the southern half becomes a total of 105 units on the quarter section which would equal a density of 1.69 units per gross ha, well within the maximum target of 2 u/ha.

![Quarter Section Plan Diagram]

However, since the 2 u/ha density is a target, the Quarter Section Plan would also include policies that support attaining the target over the life of the Growth Plan.

3. **Plan Boundary**

For developments in CCRAs that do not have a CCRA Plan or Quarter Section Plan, the proposed plan boundary would constitute the area that Growth Plan policy pertains.

![Plan Boundary Diagram]

The example above proposes a density of 79 lots on 30 ha which equals 2.64 dwelling units per gross hectare. The development exceeds the maximum density target for CCRAs of 2.0 dwelling units per
gross hectare and is therefore inconsistent with the Growth Plan. To be consistent the maximum number of units would need to be reduced to 60.

d. 5 Year Update Issues

Both the CCRA and Non-PGA Subcommittees indicated that further work with PAG was necessary to identify and confirm the broader planning issues that needed to be addressed as part of the 5 Year Land Use Plan Review.
Sub-Regional Planning Framework: Environmental Scan Report

Motion

That the Capital Region Board receives the Sub-Regional Planning Framework: Environmental Scan Report for information as recommended by the Housing Committee.

Background

- On April 15, 2008, the Government of Alberta established the Capital Region Board (CRB) by promulgating the Capital Region Board Regulation AR 49/2008.

- The Regulation required that the Board complete a Growth Plan with four key components: land use, inter-municipal transit, housing, and geographic information services (GIS).

- The Growth Plan (i.e., the Capital Region Housing Plan) provides direction to develop a 10-year regional housing plan based on sub-regional planning that is responsive to housing need.

- The development of a “Sub-regional Planning Process” was an approved Housing Committee project in CRB’s 2012-2014 Business Plan.

- The Environmental Scan is the first phase of this sub-regional planning initiative, serving 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 integrated sub-regional planning.

- The Capital Region contains six housing sub-regions, established for planning purposes. The sub-regions follow the municipal boundaries of the Capital Region’s five counties and are inclusive of all municipalities within. The City of Edmonton is the sixth sub-region.

- The Edmonton sub-region was not included in the Environmental Scan, as the existing Edmonton Area Community Plan (2012) was considered to contain sufficient equivalent information.

- The Environmental Scan commenced in October 2012, with a consulting team, led by Kent Fletcher of Arrow Consulting, engaged to undertake the work.

- The Housing Committee received project support from a steering committee that included members from various sub-regions, as well as representation from the Province of Alberta.

- On May 16, 2013, the Housing Committee unanimously approved a motion to refer the Environmental Scan Report to the Capital Region Board for information.
Rationale

- The Environmental Scan describes the roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders currently involved with the provision of non-market housing, and suggests how those roles might evolve as an enhanced approach to planning for non-market housing is implemented.

- The Environmental Scan affirms that a planning framework based on integrated sub-regional and regional planning will result in a system of delivery for non-market housing that is more equitable and responsive to need than is currently achieved in our Region.

- The findings and recommendations of the Environmental Scan confirm that Provincial funding and regional planning priorities should be guided by sub-regional planning efforts – which in turn would benefit from the use of standardized planning and assessment tools.
Regional Housing Plan –
Sub-Regional Planning Framework
Phase 1: Environmental Scan
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1 Executive Summary

On April 15, 2008 the Government of Alberta created the Capital Region Board Regulation bringing the Capital Region Board into existence. The Regulation called for the creation of a Capital Region Growth Plan that would:

- Provide an integrated and strategic approach to planning for future growth in the Capital Region;
- Identify the overall development patterns and key future infrastructure investments that would best complement existing infrastructure, services and land uses in the Capital Region, and which would also maximize benefits to the Capital Region; and;
- Co-ordinate decisions in the Capital Region to sustain economic growth and ensure strong communities and a healthy environment

The Regulation required the Growth Plan to include Four Principal Components: a Land Use Plan; a Housing Plan; an inter-municipal Transit Plan; and a Geographic Information Services (GIS) Plan.

Through the work of a number of communities and a variety of consultations the Growth Plan was developed with a priority on the integration of the various components. The Growth Plan received approval from the Government of Alberta on March 11, 2010.

In approving the Capital Region Growth Plan, the twenty-four (24) member municipalities and the Province of Alberta made a commitment to work in partnership to address the challenges the region is and will face associated with present and future growth pressures. An integrated and strategic approach to planning for the future was developed and includes the four principle components mentioned above.

The Housing Plan recognized that housing plays an important role in building strong communities and defining the social fabric of places. It recognized that to achieve the economic potential of the region requires the municipalities to ensure all residents have choice and diversity of housing with access to employment opportunities, transportation options, and accessible amenities. It outlined the challenges facing the region’s municipalities, namely their high growth rates, escalating land and housing prices, and reduced availability and affordability of housing.

The Housing Plan identified existing housing gaps and projected housing needs over the next thirty-five (35) years relating to two categories of housing: Non-Market Housing and Market Affordable Housing. Non-Market Housing is defined as housing operated, funded, or created through direct government subsidies. Market Affordable Housing is rental or ownership housing that is provided by the private market for moderate-income households without upfront or on-going direct government subsidies.

The vision of the Housing Plan is:

“There is a sufficient supply, choice and diversity of housing within the Capital Region”
It was identified in the Housing Plan that the City of Edmonton had approximately seventy (70%) percent of the region’s population, but had eighty-eight (88%) percent of the region’s Non-Market Housing. Past methods of planning, priority setting and supply delivery had not achieved the desired vision.

The Housing Plan suggested a need for change and therefore advocated for:

- An approach that would move planning and prioritization on non-market and market affordable housing towards a model based on need and conceived at a sub-regional level;
- The location of future non-market and market affordable housing to be based on general criteria derived from the principle that a more equitable distribution of this housing should allow citizens to remain in their community, close to friends and family and close to employment opportunities, support services and transit; and
- The implementation of the desired change to be done through the creation of a Regional Ten (10) Year Rolling Housing Plan based on sub-regional planning models.

The plan created six Sub-Regions for planning purposes and identified short-term and long-term targets for delivery of Non-Market Housing in each Sub-Region.

The CRB Regional Housing Committee is now determining how to begin working towards the change needed to realize the vision of the Housing Plan. In order to move forward it was determined that an environmental scan should be carried out to evaluate the current non-market and market affordable landscape and the challenges and opportunities it presents to the development of the desired regional rolling plan. The City of Edmonton had recently completed a study called “The Edmonton Community Plan on Housing and Supports: 2011-2015” providing insight into its current housing landscape, but more information was needed on the other twenty-three (23) regional municipalities.

Consultants were engaged to carry out the environmental scan. They worked in collaboration with CRB Staff and a Steering Committee (see Appendix J). Through a number of data and information collection processes (see Appendix G) relevant information was gathered on each municipality and then evaluated for the challenges and opportunities presented.

The environmental scan is not a housing plan, nor is it a need and demand assessment. It is a snapshot in time, in this case of the non-market and market affordable housing planning and delivery in the Capital Region. It identified as far as possible what has changed in the Capital Region since the housing work on the Growth Plan, and the challenges and opportunities that the existing landscape presents for in the creation of a rolling plan and the integrated planning associated with it.

The citizens and communities they live in are diverse, and the objective of sufficient, quality, affordable and appropriately located housing options does not happen without integrated and strategic planning. Current growth is bringing greater diversity in both citizens and communities and as a result demands greater diversity in how and where to provide solutions.
Many households (estimated to be 80%) in the region are fortunate enough to have sufficient income to afford\(^1\) housing provided by the private sector, either through ownership or rental. This is called Market Housing. Municipalities spend a great deal of time on encouraging and regulating the development of market housing options within their boundaries to ensure it is appropriately located, of sufficient supply, and that needed community amenities are provided to accommodate planned growth.

Keeping Market Housing options affordable for those whose incomes are at or just above median income is a growing challenge in the region’s municipalities. Builders face rising development and construction costs; higher demand for available units means rising purchase prices; low vacancy rates translate into higher rents.

Recognizing this affordability challenge, the CRB member municipalities in partnership with industry and community experts recently developed the *Our Affordable Future* policy framework. The framework calls for strategic collaboration and partnerships to be formed by municipalities, industry and the community in planning for and delivery of housing to meet the affordability needs of households whose incomes are in the range of 100% to 150% of median income. Such strategies and the housing options created are called Market Affordable Housing. The framework will allow municipalities and industry to build on existing strategies and introduce greater innovation and collaboration. The end result will be healthy communities that are able to attract and retain citizens who will want to remain and contribute to their neighbourhoods and communities.

Little information on current Market Affordable Housing strategies and the units produced was provided by municipalities during this environmental scan. Some of the strategies mentioned were: land donations; property tax reductions; zoning changes, and a willingness on the part of municipalities to work with developers towards this goal. The presence of secondary suites is the only quantifiable indicator of market affordable housing activity in many of the region’s municipalities. Beyond the 613 units that were identified in this scan, it is assumed that there are additional units in a number of communities that were delivered through one or more market affordable strategies, but the number, location and enabling strategy are currently unknown.

We encourage the CRB member municipal councils to implement the recommendations in the *Our Affordable Future* framework, beginning with the appointment of Ambassadors (Council Member) and Champions (Municipal Administration Member). These individuals can work with those from other municipalities and Industry to share best practises, and to explore collaborative, flexible and innovative approaches within their sub-Regions and regionally. Regional resources can be put to work in every sub-Region and municipality producing Market Affordable Housing options.

Integrated and strategic planning to address housing supply, quality, location and affordability cannot stop at those with household incomes at or above median income. There is an increasing awareness in the Capital Region municipalities of a growing number and diversity of households with below median incomes living or wanting to live within their boundaries. There is an insufficient supply of affordable

\(^1\) Affordability is defined as shelter cost being at or below 30% of pre-tax household income
housing in the region to meet the need (estimated at over 51,593² households). A portfolio of government-subsidized housing options (called Non-Market Housing) has been created in the region over a number of decades, providing affordability to a portion of those in need (currently 30,493).

How does a municipality prepare to address its challenges in an environment of limited government funding for additional options, limited flexibility in existing regional resources, possible gaps in support services and increasing demand? The answer is integrated and strategic planning on a sub-regional and regional basis.

Past need, demand and planning exercises by individual municipalities produced a variety of documents and information often focused on available funding rather than an assessment of the comprehensive needs of the community. These plans and documents were produced by different consultants, using different definitions and collection processes and done at different times. They often failed to consider how existing resources in regions might be leveraged in their plans or how plans of other jurisdictions might impact theirs.

A regional planning framework for Non-Market Housing based on sub-regional planning is needed. The framework should provide the opportunity and tools necessary for municipalities to participate in a collaborative assessment of need, demand, supply delivery, capacity building, etc. The objective would be a planning document that can be presented to government and other funders in order to demonstrate how effective existing resources are in meeting current need, how their effectiveness might be enhanced to meet future need, and how best to allocate new funding to produce additional options of the right type in the right location throughout the region.

The Province has expressed its interest in being more involved with the municipalities, key delivery agents such as Management Bodies and other community stakeholders in long-term strategy development. Sub-Regional models for planning will allow participation by a broad range of key stakeholders whose input is most needed. Having input into planning develops greater buy-in when implementation and delivery need to be done. An integrated and strategic regional plan, built from the grassroots up, will have a significant influence on government funders and their willingness to support the initiatives identified as best serving the region. Through the framework, existing Sub-Regional planning models can be enhanced or new models developed to achieve the desired results.

The Province is on board, municipalities have expressed the need for and interest in more effective planning. Some have indicated they are waiting for the regional framework before they proceed with future planning. They see a regional process as a way to share costs, produce comparable data and information and to have a greater influence on achieving the distribution of resources in the region. The challenges include determining who will lead the sub-regional planning efforts and where to find the resources for the process.

The local Management Body would appear to be a logical consideration as the entity to lead sub-regional planning. They are existing agencies, established by the Province, through which funding can

² 2009 Figure from CRB Housing Plan. Assumed to have increased along with population growth in Region.
easily be channeled. In most cases their membership is representative of the sub-region’s municipalities. They have established working relationships and industry connections locally, nationally, and internationally. Some currently limit their mandate to housing for seniors, but the Province is encouraging them to expand that mandate.

This “Management Body as Lead” model has existed in the Leduc Sub-Region for a number of years with the Leduc Foundation as lead. It is viewed as a best practice model. After a study to determine an appropriate model for the Strathcona Sub-Region, the two municipalities amalgamated three management bodies into one and mandated the new Heartland Housing Foundation to lead their Non-Market Housing planning. They are currently developing their sub-regional planning process. This could present a pilot program opportunity for the CRB in development of a regional framework.

Summary

The complexity of housing challenges is growing daily. In order to meet the housing challenges future growth will present, there must be an equal emphasis on planning for Market Housing, Market Affordable Housing and Non-Market Housing. Ambassadors and Champions must come forward from the Province, Municipal Councils, communities, delivery agents, and industry ready to build healthy communities by planning for future housing challenges. Those ambassadors and champions must be prepared to engage in the difficult process of assessing the effectiveness of existing programs, setting priorities for enhancing effectiveness, guiding implementation and delivery and developing community acceptance of housing diversity as a contributor to community health.

Adoption of the recommendations in the Our Affordable Future framework and moving forward on the following recommendations will go a long way to realizing the vision of the CRB Housing Plan.
Recommendations:

1. The Capital Region Board should lead the development and implementation of a Regional Planning Framework for Market Affordable and Non-Market Housing.

   The Framework should inform the creation of a regional ten (10) year rolling housing plan based on sub-regional rolling housing plans created by sub-regional planning committees.

2. A Standardized Sub-Regional Planning Tool should be developed and adopted for reporting purposes by each sub-region.

   This will allow for sub-regional plans to be in similar formats providing for effective integration into a regional plan. This could be as part of the Framework development in recommendation #1.

3. Regularly Scheduled, Standardized Needs Assessments should be carried out.

   Need, demand and supply studies are the foundation of planning. It is recommended that these studies be carried out at least every five (5) years. They should be done at the same time in all sub-regions. This will enhance compatibility and comparison of findings on a regional basis. Consideration should be given to carrying these out at times when needed census and other data become available. They should also be carried out using standardized assessment tools and formats that will feed appropriately into the standardized planning format suggested in recommendation #2 above.

4. The “Our Affordable Future” Marketing & Communications Plan should be implemented.

   As planning for the future delivery of Market Affordable and Non-Market Housing is implemented there will be an even greater need to educate and communicate in an effort to gain support for innovative approaches. Development of the Marketing and Communications Plan has been initiated and needs to be launched as soon as possible.
2 Scope of Environmental Scan

In the implementation plan of the Regional Housing Strategy section of the CRB Housing Plan there is a recommendation that six sub-regions be established for non-market and market affordable housing planning purposes. The diagram below provides a visual of the geographic boundaries of the Capital Region Board and the six sub-regions.

NB: The following names will be used throughout this document to refer to the individual sub-regions. The Sub-Region Name should be interpreted to be inclusive of all municipalities in that sub-region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Region Name</th>
<th>Municipalities in Sub-Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leduc Sub-Region</td>
<td>Leduc County, City of Leduc, Beaumont, Devon, Calmar, Thorsby, Warburg,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland Sub-Region</td>
<td>Parkland County, Wabamun, Stony Plain, Spruce Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon Sub-Region</td>
<td>Sturgeon County, St. Albert, Morinville, Legal, Bon Accord, Redwater, Gibbons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona Sub-Region</td>
<td>Strathcona County, Fort Saskatchewan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont Sub-Region³</td>
<td>Lamont County, Bruderheim, Town of Lamont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton Sub-Region</td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ The municipalities of Mundare, Andrew, Chipman are not part of the CRB and are not included in Lamont Sub-Region defined herein and were not included in the scan.
In January 2012, the “Edmonton Area Community Plan on Housing and Supports: 2011-2015” (hereinafter referred to as the “Edmonton Housing Plan”) was released through Homeward Trust. The CRB considers the Edmonton Housing Plan to contain sufficient information for its purposes on the Edmonton Sub-Region.

Therefore the focus of the work done on this environmental scan was to gather information on the other five sub-regions. The detailed findings on each of the five sub-regions are found in Appendices B through F to this document. The Edmonton Housing Plan may be viewed at www.homewardtrust.ca. Various sections of this environmental scan have drawn on information from the Edmonton Housing Plan as required.

The environmental scan was to give consideration to the following areas as they affect non-market and market affordable housing planning and delivery: housing policy; housing plans; legal agreements; mandate/authority of delivery agents; client groups served and how; nature of support services provided across the housing delivery organizations and gaps; supply of housing to meet household size needs and income affordability; challenges and opportunities in the development a regional 10-year rolling housing plan.

3 Current Housing Landscape

The environmental scan process provided the following insights into the existing non-market and market affordable housing landscape. For more detailed information on what the scan identified please see the sub-regional profiles in Appendices B through F of this document.

3.1 Regional Growth

If one compares the 2006 federal census figures with those of the 2011 census, it is evident that the type of population growth projected in the 2009 CRB Housing Plan has been occurring in the region. The average annual growth rate for the municipalities in the subject sub-regions is 2.4% as shown in the table below.

Table #1 - Change in Population since 2006 – Federal Census Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Regions</th>
<th>Census 2006</th>
<th>Census 2011</th>
<th>Average Annual Rate of Growth since 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leduc Sub-Region</td>
<td>48,430</td>
<td>61,130</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland Sub-Region</td>
<td>61,775</td>
<td>72,495</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon Sub-Region</td>
<td>90,690</td>
<td>97,720</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona Sub-Region</td>
<td>97,465</td>
<td>111,540</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont Sub-Region</td>
<td>6,825</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton Sub-Region</td>
<td>730,372</td>
<td>812,201</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals All Sub-Regions</td>
<td>1,035,557</td>
<td>1,161,886</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CRB Housing Plan predicated that the population number for the region would be 1,218,231 by the end of 2014. If one applies the average annual growth rate of 2.44% to the 2011 census numbers and projects to 2014 you reach a population number of 1,309,599, well in excess of the CRB Housing Plan projection.

There is going to be continued growth in the Capital Region and it will probably exceed the projections of the CRB Housing Plan. Municipalities must recognize that this growth will continue to present opportunities and challenges going forward to the economic viability and health of their communities. Demand for diversity of housing and related support services will be felt throughout the region. Planning for non-market and market affordable housing must be done so as to take advantage of the opportunities and find solutions to the challenges that will arise.

3.2 Stakeholders
Planning for and delivery of non-market and market affordable housing requires strong partnerships involving government, industry, non-profit organizations and the private sector. Working together on affordable housing makes the Alberta Capital Region a better place to live, work and grow. Sections 4.2.1 through 4.2.7 provide an overview of the key stakeholders in the Capital Region identified through the scan.

3.2.1 Federal and Provincial Governments
Non-market housing is defined as housing operated, funded, or created through direct government subsidies. The Federal and Provincial orders of government have been the primary sources of those subsidies, through a variety of programs and funding agreements. There is Federal/Provincial ownership or unilateral Provincial ownership of most of the Community Housing units and Seniors Self-Contained units in the region. The Province owns some of the Supportive Living (Lodge) facilities in the region as well. Capital grants are provided for construction of Affordable Housing units. Funds have been allocated to municipalities for housing purposes through such programs as the Municipal Sustainability Initiative. Operating, rent and other subsidies are provided to a number of non-profit organizations to make rents more affordable and for the provision of related support services in some facilities.

These orders of government are the source of funding that makes it possible for housing providers to address the affordability issues and some of the support needs of lower income households in the region. Current funding agreements will expire and could pose a significant risk to the non-market housing portfolio in the region. Negotiations are currently underway regarding devolution of more housing responsibility to the Province from the Federal Government. The outcome could have a significant effect on the delivery of non-market housing in Alberta.

The Provincial government sees the municipal government as the order of government that will be most familiar with local housing needs. There is a current interest in having integrated planning at the municipal and regional levels to help identify housing priorities in the province. The Province is facing a period of “expense-reduction” budgeting. They will be seeking innovative approaches for allocation of available resources.
The Province established the Capital Region Board, approved the CRB Housing Plan and supports that Plan’s efforts towards regional planning on housing. They see regional planning as a way to help them continue to provide needed funding in the most effective way.

The Province establishes Management Bodies (by Ministerial Order) to operate government-owned housing and administer other programs such as rent supplement.

### 3.2.2 Municipal Governments

The housing role of most municipal governments has historically been limited to regulatory and zoning functions (i.e. leasing of land, property tax exemptions, zoning incentives, density bonuses, etc.). Those with Community Housing units in their municipalities have in the past contributed up to ten percent (10%) towards the capital construction costs and operating deficits. Those with Supportive Living (Lodge) facilities are subject to requisitions for lodge operating deficits.

Growth in the Capital Region has resulted in housing issues being a regular item on many municipal council agendas.

Municipalities are being challenged to promote Market Affordable Housing in their communities as an economic driver. The CRB recently released its “Our Affordable Future” framework document which encourages and shows how Market Affordable Housing can be provided.

There are examples of municipal ownership of lodges, community housing, affordable housing, etc. Some are direct ownership by the municipalities; others are through municipally-owned non-profit corporations. The City of Edmonton will become the owner of most of the Community Housing units within their boundaries as the land leases they granted the Province expire a number of years from now.

Municipalities are being challenged to expand their non-market housing role. The Province has allocated funding for housing to some municipalities and requested that the determination of how to allocate that funding be made at the municipal level. The CRB Housing Plan proposes that municipalities participate in sub-regional planning, then in regional priority setting.

The municipalities in the region are at different points in their readiness and capacity to respond to these challenges. Common barriers identified in the scan, especially by smaller municipalities were:

- Lack of resources (funding, staffing, etc.) to carry out need and demand analysis
- Lack of services (medical/dental, shopping, transportation, etc.) needed by low income households or even to attract new households to the community

### 3.2.3 Capital Region Board

The Capital Region Board is a regional partnership of twenty-four (24) municipalities in Alberta’s Capital Region. The CRB’s Growth Plan promotes the member municipalities to establish regional partnerships in key priority areas for growth, recognizing the positive benefits of shared development, infrastructure

---

4 A number of years ago the Province forgave this contribution for many of the Community Housing units in the Province. Some municipalities decided to continue their contributions and directed the funding towards other non-market housing options.
and policy frameworks. One of those key priority areas for growth is housing and a CRB Housing Plan has been developed and approved by the Province. The Plan suggests the implementation of a new approach to planning for non-market housing and that a concerted effort is made to distribute non-market housing more equitably throughout the region. The Housing Plan works towards accomplishing its vision through its Regional Housing Committee.

Initiatives arising from the CRB Housing Plan to date include:

- **A Market Affordable Housing Policy Framework, “Our Affordable Future – Building Stronger Communities in the Capital Region”** – this report is the platform from which the CRB will base efforts to encourage the development of more Market Affordable housing in the Region.

- **A Marketing & Communications Program “Our Affordable Future” – the foundations of a region-wide public relations program** was developed with the aim of encouraging public acceptance of the need for a broader range of affordable housing types and tenure to support population and employment growth in the Region. The program targets a common objection to development NIMBY-ism (Not in My Backyard-ism). The funding required to launch and sustain this program has not yet been secured.

- **ReEnvision Housing Symposium** – the CRB plans and organizes a yearly education and development session focusing on current housing topics to support the goals of the Growth Plan.

- **Development of a sub-regional planning framework** - Working with the Province, this project is exploring the development and implementation of a planning model framework to support the identification and prioritization of housing needs and supply issues within the Capital Region for non-market and market affordable housing.

This environmental scan is the first phase in the development of the sub-regional planning framework initiative.

### 3.2.4 Management Bodies

Management Bodies are established by Provincial ministerial order. The ministerial order identifies the members of the management body and defines the housing facilities it is to manage and programs it is to administer on behalf of the orders of government. They operate under authority of the Alberta Housing Act and the regulations thereto.

There are currently twenty (20) Management Bodies in the region, fourteen (14) within the City of Edmonton alone. Many of those in the City of Edmonton only manage Seniors Self-Contained Housing units. Seniors Self-Contained units are fully funded by the Province and therefore municipalities are not typically members of those management bodies.

There are seven (7) Management Bodies in the region that have one or more municipalities as members or with the right to appoint board members. If a Management Body’s portfolio includes a Supportive Living (Lodge) facility it is granted authority by the Province to requisition its member municipalities for any lodge operating deficit. Therefore the Province appoints the municipalities subject to requisition as members of the Management Body.
The Capital Region Housing Corporation is a Management Body and the Corporation is the sole member of the Management Body. Although the City of Edmonton is not a member it has been given the mandate to appoint two individuals to sit on the board of the Corporation. It does not manage a lodge and has no requisitioning authority. Its programs are focused on a variety of client groups. Some of the programs delivered by the Corporation, like rent supplement serve multiple sub-regions.

The Management Bodies in the region that have one or more lodges as part of their portfolio are:

- Greater Edmonton Foundation - Edmonton Sub-Region, current focus is seniors
- Leduc Foundation – Edmonton Sub-Region, current focus multiple client groups
- Meridian Foundation – Parkland Sub-Region, current focus seniors
- Sturgeon Foundation – Sturgeon Sub-Region, current focus seniors
- Heartland Housing Foundation – Strathcona Sub-Region, current focus multiple client groups
- Lamont Foundation – Lamont Sub-Region, current focus seniors

The Management Body is an example of how municipalities are already partnering on a sub-regional basis. As members of the management body, the municipalities are planning and delivering housing sub-regionally.

The Province is encouraging Management Bodies to consider consolidation of operations where this would provide more efficient and effective management and administration of its housing and programs. They are also encouraging Management Bodies to explore expansion of their mandates to address multiple client group needs. The Heartland Housing Foundation is the most recent example of this, where three existing Management Bodies consolidated into one with a mandate to address multiple client group needs.

Management Bodies have become the lead agencies in the sub-regional planning models already in place in the Leduc and Strathcona Sub-Regions. With their focus on housing and their connections with the Province, it seemed logical to have these Management Bodies ensure that planning occurs. They do not become the sole planners and delivery agents, but rather facilitate planning by key stakeholders who determine who best to deliver.

Some Management Bodies in the region have expanded their mandates from that of property and program managers for government-owned housing to that of owning their own housing facilities. Having been successful in applications for affordable housing grants, some Management Bodies now own rental housing units.

3.2.5 Not-for-Profit Sector
Non-profit companies are organizations formed to promote art, science, religion, charity or other similar endeavors, or they may be formed solely for the purpose of promoting recreation for their members. Non-profit housing organizations promote charity by serving lower income households. A common misconception is that not-for-profit organization cannot make a profit. Not-for-profit organizations can generate profits from their operations, but those profits must be re-invested in the objectives of the organization. No member or shareholder can benefit personally from the profits generated and when
the organization is dissolved, the proceeds must be directed to another organization with similar objectives.

There are a large number of not-for-profit organizations serving the housing and support needs in the Capital Region. They typically address the needs of a specific client group, often with a special need. They often have support funding as well as housing subsidies to meet the needs of their target clients.

This sector includes groups like:

- Habitat for Humanity, providing ownership opportunities to lower income families
- E4C – providing housing and a number of programs to address a variety of needs in the inner city neighbourhoods of Edmonton and some rural communities
- Strathcona Schizophrenia Housing Foundation – serving persons with disabilities
- CTD Housing Solutions Edmonton Ltd. – The HOME Program, providing homeownership education and down payment assistance to lower income households

The scan identified at total nine (9) such agencies outside the City of Edmonton. The City of Edmonton number was not identified in the Edmonton Housing Plan but probably exceeds seventy (70). These agencies tend to have a passion for their work, a “grass-roots” perspective, engagement of volunteer resources, and attract charitable donations to their causes.

It was indicated in the scan that the biggest challenge these organizations face in the current environment is funding to meet the increasing demand for their services.

Municipalities also use not-for-profit companies for housing purposes. Two examples of this were identified in the scan:

- HomeEd is the operating name for the City of Edmonton’s non-profit housing corporation. They own a portfolio of non-market rental housing. Administrative services for the corporation are provided by members of the City’s administration. Mortgage and other subsidies make these units affordable. The City of Edmonton is the sole shareholder in this corporation.
- The Pioneer Housing Non Profit Foundation is owned by Strathcona County, and holds title to some projects managed by the Heartland Housing Foundation. Strathcona County is the sole shareholder of this organization.

3.2.6 For-Profit Sector

The housing need of eighty percent (80%) of households in most communities is typically met by private market housing. The private (or ‘for-profit’) sector also plays a key role in the provision of Market Affordable and Non-Market Housing in the region. It is private developers that will work with the municipalities to produce entry-level ownership housing. The CRB’s Our Affordable Future framework provides a tool for both the developers and the municipalities to use.

Private landlords partner with government in rent supplement programs, turning market units into non-market housing options. If there is no housing supply, rent supplement programs do not work. In the current low vacancy market, the interest of landlords in programs such as rent supplement can decline.
However, many landlords who have been participating in the programs for some time seem to have a commitment to continued participation. Low vacancy rates provide an opportunity for increasing rents and rent increases put pressure on programs with limited funding.

### 3.3 Non-Market Housing Provision

As mentioned above, the private sector typically provides housing that is accessible to eighty (80%) percent of households. The other twenty (20%) with lower incomes cannot afford market housing options.

Recognizing this gap, governments have provided income support and housing subsidy programs to address some of the variety of needs in this sector of the population. Income Support provides financial benefits to individuals and families who do not have the resources to meet all of their basic needs, like food, clothing and shelter. Housing subsidy programs attempt to address the shelter needs of a variety of groups including: the homeless and those at risk of homelessness; income support recipients; students; seniors; those with special needs; those unable to transition to better employment; those transitioning to better employment; etc..

Housing options provided through direct government subsidies are known as Non-Market Housing.

#### 3.3.1 Households Currently Served

Here is a table showing the number of households served through non-market housing options in the region as identified in the scan and the Edmonton Housing Plan.

**Table #2 – Households Served by Non-Market Housing Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Program</th>
<th>Leduc Sub Region</th>
<th>Parkland Sub Region</th>
<th>Sturgeon Sub Region</th>
<th>Strathcona Sub Region</th>
<th>Lamont Sub Region</th>
<th>Edmonton Sub Region</th>
<th>Total Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,103</td>
<td>6,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Housing</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>4,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat For Humanity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Supplement</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>5,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Suites</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors Self-Contained</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters / Transitional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>2,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Living (Lodge)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>5,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (group homes, special needs)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>789</strong></td>
<td><strong>565</strong></td>
<td><strong>861</strong></td>
<td><strong>931</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,270</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,493</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>701</strong></td>
<td><strong>491</strong></td>
<td><strong>728</strong></td>
<td><strong>731</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,079</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,807</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Change Since 2009</strong></td>
<td><strong>+88</strong></td>
<td><strong>+74</strong></td>
<td><strong>+133</strong></td>
<td><strong>+200</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>+7,191</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,686</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The scan identified 30,493 households receiving assistance through non-market housing programs in the Capital Region. This is an increase of 7,686 households from the numbers identified in the 2009 CRB Housing Plan. The major contributors to the increase were some 3,300 affordable housing units developed since 2009 and the addition of 3,700 rent supplements.

Just over eighty-nine (89%) percent of the households (27,270) are served in the Edmonton Sub-Region. This is an increase from eighty-eight (88%) in 2009. In that Sub-Region it is estimated that seventy-five (75%) percent of the households served (20,357) are non-senior households. Supportive Living (Lodge) and Seniors Self-Contained programs are targeted at seniors, while most of the other programs have non-seniors as their primary target group but do serve some seniors as well. Senior households served in Edmonton are estimated at 6,913.

In the Sub-Regions outside of Edmonton the ratio between senior and non-senior households served is significantly different as shown in the table below.

**Table #3 – Non-Seniors Households Served by Sub Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leduc Sub Region</th>
<th>Parkland Sub Region</th>
<th>Sturgeon Sub Region</th>
<th>Strathcona Sub Region</th>
<th>Lamont Sub Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Seniors Served</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>currently as % of</td>
<td>54% (420)</td>
<td>41% (227)</td>
<td>43% (357)</td>
<td>50% (451)</td>
<td>3% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total currently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served in Sub Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Seniors Served</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in 2009 as % of</td>
<td>50% (350)</td>
<td>52% (257)</td>
<td>36% (265)</td>
<td>34% (246)</td>
<td>3% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Served in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Region in 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What the scan shows is that there have been significant increases in the number of non-market housing options in the region. There has been an increase in the number of options available to non-senior and senior households in most sub-regions, but these have fallen short of the recommended numbers in the CRB Housing Plan in all sub-regions except the City of Edmonton. There was no evidence found that consideration was given to the CRB targets in any planning associated with the delivery of additional options since 2009.

### 3.3.2 Programs & Delivery Agents

Because non-market housing is “government-subsidised” housing it is delivered through a number of government programs. Program funding is provided to a number of delivery agencies. The following gives an overview of who is delivering these programs in the Capital Region:

- **Affordable Housing** – private for-profit and not-for-profit developers, public non-profits including Management Bodies, municipalities.
- **Community Housing, Supportive Living (Lodge), Seniors Self-Contained** – Management Bodies
- **Cooperative Housing** - Cooperatives
- **Rent Supplement** – Management Bodies, Municipalities
• **Secondary Suites** – Municipalities
• **Shelters/Transitional, Groups Homes, Special Needs** – Private not-for-profits

Habitat for Humanity is exclusively delivered in the region by one not-for-profit organization, Habitat for Humanity Edmonton. It is an affordable ownership model. See Appendix H for more information. One other ownership model that should be mentioned is the HOME Program. It prepares households to become homeowners through education and then assists qualifying households with down payment assistance. See Appendix I for more information on this program.

Program Observations:

• **Affordable Housing** provides rental rates at least ten (10%) below market. Operators are supposed to house households from local Management Body waiting lists first. This does not always occur and sometimes those on the waiting list cannot afford the rents. To increase affordability of these units rent supplement is sometimes provided to qualifying residents.

  Affordable Housing Grant recipients commit to keeping their units affordable for a period of time (typically 10-20 years). At the end of that term they are free to do whatever this wish with the property. They also have an option for “early buyout” of the agreement. There is a risk that these units could be lost at some time in the future as non-market housing options.

• **Rent Supplements** are provided through a number of different funding programs. Some provide a fixed amount of subsidy; some provide subsidies based on income. Some are funded through a fixed pool of money and will end when that money is expended. Some have on-going funding allocations with annual allocations dependent on the current fiscal environment of the funder. The number of households served through rent supplement can therefore vary dramatically from year to year.

• There is a very significant asset held in the form of government-owned non-market housing in the region. The asset is ageing and every effort needs to be made to ensure that it is maintained so it can continue to serve the needs in the region. Potential leveraging of the asset to produce additional housing options in the region should also be explored. Planning for both maintenance and leveraging of the asset needs to be carried out in the concept of integrated regional planning.

### 3.3.3 The Right Housing Options in the Right Places

The location of many non-market housing options has been the result of Provincial funding decisions. Because of the absence of an integrated regional housing plan, these decisions were based on available funding and did not look at factors such as what already exists in the location, who best to deliver, etc. Housing options for non-senior households have historically tended to be in centers where needed supports such as transportation were located. Housing options for seniors have been based on the principle of allowing seniors to remain in their communities. As communities have grown, the need for non-senior housing options has grown as well. These households also wish to remain in their
communities. Growing communities also need people to fill jobs and those people want to live close to their employment.

The location of additional non-market housing options over the past few years has also been driven by Provincial priorities for Affordable Housing Grants and for allocation of rent subsidies. Priority setting was done without the benefit of a regional need and demand study being carried out.

The question this scan cannot answer is whether or not the current portfolio of non-market housing options reflects the desired principle of the right type of housing options in the right place? That is a question only a regional need and demand analysis and an integrated planning exercise can address.

Such an exercise could address the following:

- Who are the client groups in need in the region and where are they located?
- What are their current housing and support needs and gaps?
- What are the best program options for meeting the needs and filling the gaps?
- Who would be the best delivery agents for the best programs?
- What might need to be done to allow delivery in the best place, by the best agency?

The scan identified a number of municipal and agency planning-type documents. In many cases the principle driving factor for creation of these plans and needs assessments was: to support an application for Provincial affordable housing requests for proposals; or to determine how municipalities would use funding the Province allocated to them for housing purposes. The plans and needs assessments were done at different times, by different consultants or organizations using a variety of approaches, definitions, and reporting formats. This makes comparability of results extremely difficult, if not impossible. Comparability is a key component of integrated planning. There is a need for a regional planning framework that would result in regular planning exercises producing comparable information from all municipalities allowing for an integrated approach to the provision of non-market housing options.

The scan did identify some existing sub-regional planning models for non-market housing:

- Although unique in that it is a one-municipality sub-region, the Edmonton Sub-Region has produced regular community plans that have involved extensive stakeholder consultations, need and demand analysis and establishment of priorities. The planning and implementation strategies have developed over many years.
- In the Leduc Sub-Region, the Leduc Foundation (Management Body) serves as the sub-regional planning vehicle. There has been a pooling of available funds and allocation based on identified priority needs in the sub-region.
- In the Strathcona Sub-Region, Strathcona County and Fort Saskatchewan are working on a new sub-regional planning model. The Heartland Housing Foundation (Management Body) is to act as lead in bringing the key stakeholders together for integrated planning.
The model for sub-regional planning can be adapted to meet the needs of any sub-region. However these models need to produce coordinated and comparable data that allows regional priorities to be established and households in need served through the best available options.

3.3.3.1 Support Services

Sustainable Community Development works toward building a solid relationship between economic factors and other community elements such as housing, education, the natural environment, health and accessibility. While a range of housing is important to community sustainability, not every community will have or need each of the housing options located in the community. Housing options of the right type for the community is based on a number of elements including demographics, regional assets and community supports. Community services that support addictions, child care, education, employment health, income, mental health and needed resources (such as food, clothing, etc.) are key components of a healthy community and integrally linked to the development of these housing options. However, keeping in mind that real sustainability is community driven and community led, communities must be their own champions in strengthening local supports with regional partnerships and external alliances.

3.4 Market Affordable Housing Provision

The Capital Region Board recently released a market affordable housing policy and implementation document entitled Our Affordable Future. It provides a road map of how to ensure that market affordable housing is well-integrated, attractive and of sufficient quantity in the Capital Region municipalities. It will help stakeholders make market affordable housing a contributor to their strategy to deal with economic growth expected in the Capital Region.

The Capital Region Board and the municipalities now have a tool to help them develop market affordable housing strategies in their communities.

Limited information was provided by the municipalities on their current market affordable housing strategies. Some of the strategies mentioned during the scan process were: land donations; property tax reductions; zoning changes; and from some of the smaller municipalities, willing to work with developers if they will come.

Little information was provided by municipalities on the number of housing units provided through their market affordable housing strategies. Secondary suite numbers (613) were the only numbers identified in the scan. It is assumed that there have been additional units delivered in a number of communities through one or more market affordable strategies, but the number, location and enabling strategy are currently unknown.

It is believed that many municipalities are now reviewing their market affordable housing strategies as a result of the recent work on this through the CRB. Future planning should include encouragement of strategy development, reviews of these strategies showing their results, current effectiveness and relevancy. A method of sharing the strategies and number of units produced amongst the Capital Region municipalities should be explored.
4 Recommendations toward a Planning Framework

The following recommendations are intended to help the Capital Region Board develop a sub-regional planning framework leading to a ten (10) year rolling plan on non-market and market affordable housing.

4.1 The Capital Region Board should lead the development and implementation of a Regional Planning Framework for Market Affordable and Non-Market Housing.

For the Capital Region Board to be successful in its vision for the region, all the region’s municipalities must be willing to carry out planning related to non-market and market affordable housing. Recognizing that not all municipalities have the resources or the support services necessary to meet all the housing needs in their communities, a sub-regional approach would be strongly recommended.

It is recommended that the following suggestions be considered in the development and implementation of such planning models.

4.1.1 Sub-Regional Plans should be 10-year plans with annual updates
In order to achieve a regional ten (10) year rolling plan, sub-regional planning must focus on the same timeframe.

More certainty is known for the immediate future, so plans would have more detail on specific goals and actions in the three (3) to five (5) year time frame and larger picture strategies and objectives going out to ten (10) years. Annual updates will ensure that implementation strategies are followed up on and adjustments are made to reflect current conditions and resources.

The plan could include identification of housing and related support needs and gaps over the next 10 year period and the priority of each. The plan could then recommend strategies to address the priorities including how and by who the components of delivery, ownership, operation and management of housing facilities and programs should be addressed. The plan could also address awareness strategies to promote acceptance of non-market housing as an economic driver in our communities.

The plan will assist municipal councils and other funders in their deliberations over what is to be approved and funded. Final acceptance of the responsibility for all or part of delivery, ownership, operation and management of any facilities or programs would rest with the boards of the applicable agencies.

4.1.2 Sub-Regional Planning Committees be established to carry out the planning
A committee of key stakeholders should be established in each sub-region to carry out the planning process. As a minimum there should be representation from the following:

- each municipality in the sub-region
- the Province
• the Capital Region Board

The planning process should be as inclusive as possible. Involvement of other key stakeholders could be by representation on the committee or as part of an advisory working group. Other key stakeholders that could be part of the process include:

• non-market housing delivery agencies
• private developers
• support service agencies/providers

Subject matter experts would be invited to participate as needed. It is recommended that a municipality or agency in the sub-region be given the responsibility to lead the planning process. They would ensure that the planning committee meets to carry out its planning mandate and chair the committee meetings. This responsibility could be rotated through the committee membership as deemed appropriate. Having the planning committee chair be one of the representatives on the CRB Regional Housing Committee would be a good governance principle.

4.2 A Standardized Sub-Regional Planning Tool should be developed and adopted for reporting purposes by each sub-region.

To be able to develop a regional plan, comparable information and data must be reported in the sub-regional plans. Then in regional planning discussions everyone is talking the same language as priority setting takes place. Reporting of unique programs, ideas, etc. would always be encouraged to educate others and would receive consideration in the planning deliberations.

The tool could:

• provide standard definitions (for programs, client groups, etc.) to be used
• define the type of information and data to be reported on
• define reporting formats for the information (i.e., templates)
• define criteria to the principle of “right type” and “right place” in assessing existing future delivery models
• Identify key stakeholder groups whose input should be sought

4.3 Regularly Scheduled, Standardized Needs Assessments should be carried out.

Identifying the gaps that need to be addressed is crucial to planning. Principles of good planning dictate that this is done on a regular basis so plans can be adjusted to changing circumstances or efforts enhanced to achieve planned objectives. The goal of regional and sub-regional planning would suggest that needs assessments should produce comparable information to feed into the comparable plans suggested in 5.2.
4.3.1 Regularly Scheduled Assessments
For integrated planning purposes it would be ideal if the needs assessments in all municipalities in the Capital Region were co-ordinated to happen during the same time frame and at least every five years. As federal census data on population, incomes and dwellings is crucial to this planning, these assessments should be timed to have access to that data. There is typically a two (2) year waiting period before the most current census data is available.

Given that municipalities have limited resources to dedicate to needs assessments, consideration should be given to carrying out the needs assessments on at least a sub-regional basis. Collaboration by one or more or even all sub-regions may also help with resource allocation.

4.3.2 Standardized Needs Assessment Tool
Regional and sub-regional planning will be more effective if the information on the gaps to be addressed can be easily compared from municipality to municipality.

A standardized assessment tool could:

- provide standard definitions (for programs, client groups, etc.) to be used
- define the minimum information and data to be collected
- define reporting formats for the information and data (i.e., templates)
- identify potential sources for information and data
- identify key stakeholder groups whose input should be sought

4.4 The “Our Affordable Future” Marketing & Communications Plan should be implemented.

It is recommended that the CRB’s development of a marketing and communications plan continue and that it be implemented to ensure correct information and encourages community support and involvement in non-market housing.

There is often a significant lack of understanding and/or misinformation, both with politicians and community residents, about non-market housing (what it really is and its beneficial role in a community). A strategy to raise awareness and provide correct information needs to be implemented.

An on-going communications/education strategy could:

- provide accurate information on non-market housing, client-groups served, how it helps the economic development of communities that embrace it, and how to address the challenges it may present
- encourage citizens to get involved in a variety of way:
  - serve on existing boards, committees
  - help form new support service or delivery agencies
  - make cash donations
  - make Voluntary Labour donations
- help form housing societies, co-ops
- “educate” their family, friends and politicians
- encourage politicians and key municipal employees to support housing initiatives, sub-regional and regional planning
- provide information reports on progress and best practices in region and elsewhere

5 Opportunities / Challenges / Roles

This environmental scan is the first phase in CRB’s initiative to develop a sub-regional planning framework for non-market housing.

The purpose of the scan and this report is not to create the framework, but to provide an understanding of the current environment and the opportunities and challenges it presents to the Capital Region Board, the Province, the Municipalities in the region, the delivery organizations and other related stakeholders.

It was evident during the scan that the majority of stakeholders are anxious to see the sub-regional planning framework developed, often wanting to make the scan phase into the development phase. Great opportunities exist for the various stakeholders.

5.1 Capital Region Board’s Opportunity / Challenge / Role

The opportunity exists for the CRB to take on the lead role in development and implementation of an integrated planning strategy for non-market and market affordable housing. The existing governance structure and working relationship between the CRB, the Province and the municipalities positions the CRB to be an effective co-ordinator of the integrated planning strategy.

The most significant challenges to the CRB and an integrated planning strategy include:

- establishing acceptable processes and criteria for regional priority identification
- determining how to achieve participation by all municipalities in sub-regional planning
- creating an acceptable balance between identified priority needs/expectations and available funding
- creating a sustained effort to Educate/Communicate the positive messages around diversity of housing in communities as an economic driver and contributor to healthy community environments.
- allocating funding and resources to the project and on-going role

The role of the CRB going forward should include leading the development and implementation of an integrated planning framework that promotes sub-regional planning and leads to a regional ten (10) year rolling housing plan. Components of that role could include:
identifying/developing, in consultation with key stakeholders, sub-regional planning models and present such to municipalities for their consideration

- encouraging all municipalities to become participants in a sub-regional planning process.

- creating, in consultation with key stakeholders, templates for planning and needs assessments that will result in the production of documents that will contribute to desired integrated planning and priority setting

- participating in the work of all sub-regional planning committees to share a regional perspective and to help guide the production of the plan to desired integrated planning formats

- creating a multifaceted Education/Communications strategy to address identified education and communication needs

- leading a process for identification of innovative funding models

### 5.2 Province of Alberta’s Opportunities/Challenges/Role

The Province of Alberta is a strong supporter of housing as a contributor to healthy communities. The Province encourages planning for housing at the local level. They recognize that municipalities and housing delivery agencies are closest to the client groups being served. The development of a regional ten (10) year rolling plan presents the opportunity for the Province to have a tool to help it achieve its housing mandate and to better plan for long term funding requirements. It also provides an excellent forum for discussion on the overall delivery of housing.

The most significant challenge for the Province will be how to address the gap between the need that will be identified and the available funding to address the need. A ten (10) year rolling plan will be a constant identifier unmet needs. Long-term planning is also a strategy that is difficult for governments to commit to.

The role of the Province should include:

- continuing to fund non-market housing options through flexible and innovative approaches

- participating with and provide funding for CRB roles identified above

- being an active participant in the regional and sub-regional planning processes

### 5.3 Municipal Opportunities/Challenges/Role

The development of an integrated planning model for the Capital Region will provide the greatest opportunities to the Municipalities. To those that already have a sub-regional planning model it will provide additional tools to help them achieve their objectives. To those who are currently looking at creating sub-regional planning models it will provide tools that will allow them to realize that goal faster and with greater confidence in its success. To those who are not sure if sub-regional planning is for them it will provide better information to assess participation in such a process.

The main challenges that will face Municipalities include:
• acceptance of regional priority setting
• possible allocation of funding and resources to on-going planning and delivery
• commitment to long-range plans is sometimes difficult for governments
• in some cases, how make their community “the right place” for a diversity of housing

The role of Municipalities should include:

• participation in sub-regional planning through allocation of resources as needed
• identification of key representation from the sub-regions to participate with the CRB in carrying out its roles as identified above
• advocacy by Municipal representatives sitting on the sub-regional planning committees for housing with other politicians including MPs, MLAs, other Municipal Council members in the region and provincially
• encouragement of sub-regional planning committees to develop education/communication strategies for the sub-region, building on the work that will be done by the CRB

5.4 Delivery Organization Opportunities/Challenges/Roles

Delivery of non-market and market affordable and related support services is not and cannot be done by one organization. It takes a variety of organizations to provide the housing and support services need by the diversity of client groups to be served. Integrated planning will present opportunities and challenges to the providers.

This will be an opportunity for those who deal with the day to day delivery of services to the client groups to share what works, what doesn’t, what are the gaps they see, with the planners and decision-makers. It is an opportunity to show how various program can contribute to effective delivery with limited resources. It is also an opportunity to learn what others are doing and to perhaps improve their program delivery.

When all the planning is done, the delivery organizations are the ones who must be relied on to develop and operate housing units and needed support services.

The challenges delivery organizations may face include:

• acceptance of sub-regional and regional priority setting for available resources
• acceptance of possible recommendations for restructuring of their existing programs
• acceptance of possible recommendations for expanding their current mandate

The role of delivery organizations should include:

• effective and efficient delivery of their existing programs
• participation in the sub-regional planning process including:
  o identifying challenges their existing programs face and potential innovative solutions to those challenges
- helping to determine capacity of their organization to achieve delivery of planned programs in multiple communities
- providing a voice representing target client groups at the planning table
Advocacy & Communications Committee Membership

Motion

That the Capital Region Board approves that the membership of the Advocacy & Communications Committee’s be updated to include the Chair of the Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee.

Background

- On May 9, 2013 the Board passed a Motion to approve the Terms of Reference for a Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee of the Advocacy and Communications.

- Following this Board decision, the Advocacy & Communications Committee met May 23, 2013 and passed a Motion that, consistent with its current Terms of Reference where Chairs from each of the Board’s standing committees form the base membership, the Chair of this new Sub-Committee should also become a formal member of the Advocacy & Communications Committee.

- The attached Advocacy & Communications Committee Terms of Reference has been updated to reflect the proposed changes on under the subheadings of Composition (page 3) and Appendix 1: Composition (page 6).

Rationale

- The Advocacy & Communications Committee mandate is to coordinate, develop, implement, recommend, execute and monitor the Board’s advocacy and communications activities based on identified priorities within the Board’s Business Plan. In order to carry out its mandate effectively, the Committee directly benefits from a formal and consistent communication link between itself and each of the Board’s Committee’s. Representation from the Chairs of each of these Committees provides that essential link.

- With the establishment of the Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee a Sub-Committee which is also focused on advocacy and communications activities, representation at the Advocacy & Communications Committee in the form of the Sub-Committee’s Chair is even more important.
MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT ACT

CAPITAL REGION BOARD
REGULATION

Alberta Regulation 38/2012

Extract

© Published by Alberta Queen’s Printer

Alberta Queen’s Printer
5th Floor, Park Plaza
10611 - 98 Avenue
Edmonton, AB T5K 2P7
Phone: 780-427-4952
Fax: 780-452-0668

E-mail: qp@gov.ab.ca
Shop on-line at www.qp.alberta.ca
Copyright and Permission Statement

Alberta Queen's Printer holds copyright on behalf of the Government of Alberta in right of Her Majesty the Queen for all Government of Alberta legislation. Alberta Queen's Printer permits any person to reproduce Alberta’s statutes and regulations without seeking permission and without charge, provided due diligence is exercised to ensure the accuracy of the materials produced, and Crown copyright is acknowledged in the following format:

© Alberta Queen's Printer, 20__.*

*The year of first publication of the legal materials is to be completed.

Note

All persons making use of this document are reminded that it has no legislative sanction. The official Statutes and Regulations should be consulted for all purposes of interpreting and applying the law.
(no amd)

ALBERTA REGULATION 38/2012
Municipal Government Act
CAPITAL REGION BOARD REGULATION

Table of Contents

1 Definitions

Part 1
Capital Region Board
2 Establishment of Board
3 Mandate of Board
4 Chair of Board
5 Voting rights of representatives
6 Powers and duties of Board
7 Delegation
8 Bylaws
9 Annual report of Board

Part 2
Preparation of Capital Region Growth Plan
10 Preparation of Plan
11 Objectives of Plan
12 Contents of Plan
13 Approval of Plan
14 Effective date of Plan

Part 3
Effect of Capital Region Growth Plan
15 Application of Part
16 Limitation of Plan
17 Actions must conform with Plan
18 Plan prevails
19 Conformity with Plan

Part 4
Approval of Statutory Plans
20 Application of Part
21 Regional Evaluation Framework
22 Approval of statutory plans

**Part 5**

**General Matters**

23 Effect of Regulation on existing statutory plans
24 Information must be provided
25 Dispute resolution
26 Matters before the Municipal Government Board
27 Limitation of actions
28 No remedy
29 Proceedings barred
30 No expropriation or injurious affection
31 Regulation prevails
32 Ministerial orders
33 Expiry
34 Coming into force

Schedule

**Definitions**

1 In this Regulation,

(a) “Act” means the *Municipal Government Act*;

(b) “Capital Region” means the lands lying within the boundaries of the participating municipalities;

(c) “Capital Region Board” means the Capital Region Board established by section 2;

(d) “Capital Region Growth Plan” means an integrated growth management plan for the Capital Region, including any amendments to that plan, approved by the Minister under section 13;

(e) “Framework” means the Regional Evaluation Framework, including any amendments to the Framework, established by the Minister under section 21;

(f) “Minister” means the Minister responsible for the Act;

(g) “municipal agreement” means an agreement entered into by a participating municipality;

(h) “participating municipality” means a municipality listed in the Schedule;
(i) “representative” means a representative on the Capital Region Board;

(j) “statutory plan” means

(i) a statutory plan as defined in section 616(dd) of the Act, or

(ii) an amendment to a statutory plan referred to in subclause (i).

Part 1

Capital Region Board

Establishment of Board

2(1) The Capital Region Board is established.

(2) The Capital Region Board is a corporation consisting of

(a) the participating municipalities, as represented by the persons appointed by the participating municipalities under subsection (3) or designated by subsection (5),

(b) the persons appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council under subsection (7), and

(c) if applicable, the interim chair appointed under section 4(2).

(3) Each participating municipality shall appoint

(a) a person to represent the participating municipality on the Capital Region Board, and

(b) a person to act in the representative’s place in the event of the representative’s temporary absence or temporary inability to act.

(4) A representative appointed under subsection (3) must be a councillor of the participating municipality that appointed that representative.

(5) Until a participating municipality appoints a representative under subsection (3), the chief elected official of the participating municipality is designated as that municipality’s representative.

(6) If the representative of a participating municipality that is a town or village is unable to attend a meeting of the Capital Region Board, the Capital Region Board, on the request of the participating
municipality, shall provide for an alternative method of representation for the participating municipality at that meeting.

(7) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint one or more persons to represent the Government of Alberta on the Capital Region Board, but those persons do not have voting rights.

**Mandate of Board**

3 The Capital Region Board shall

(a) prepare a proposed Capital Region Growth Plan in accordance with Part 2,

(b) advise and make recommendations to the Minister regarding the preparation and implementation of the Capital Region Growth Plan,

(c) facilitate the resolution of issues arising from the preparation and implementation of the Capital Region Growth Plan,

(d) implement policies for the sharing of costs among the participating municipalities for regional projects of the Capital Region, and

(e) carry out any other functions and duties as the Minister directs.

**Chair of Board**

4(1) The representatives appointed under section 2(3) or designated by section 2(5) shall elect from among themselves a chair of the Capital Region Board, whose term expires on the date the chair’s current term as a councillor expires.

(2) Despite subsection (1), the Minister may by order appoint an interim chair of the Capital Region Board for a term specified by the Minister.

(3) If the Minister appoints an interim chair, the term of the chair elected under subsection (1) commences on the day after the day the interim chair’s term expires.

(4) The interim chair does not have voting rights.

**Voting rights of representatives**

5(1) Subject to sections 2(7) and 4(4), each representative has one vote.
(2) If a decision of the Capital Region Board is to be made by a vote, the decision must be supported by not fewer than 17 representatives from participating municipalities that collectively have at least 75% of the population in the Capital Region.

(3) Subject to section 2(6), if a representative is not present when a vote of the Capital Region Board is taken, or abstains from voting, the representative is deemed to have voted in the affirmative.

**Powers and duties of Board**

6(1) Section 602.08 and Divisions 3 and 4 of Part 15.1 of the Act apply with any necessary modifications in respect of the Capital Region Board as if it were a regional services commission.

(2) Divisions 3 and 4 of Part 15.1 of the Act apply with any necessary modifications in respect of the representatives appointed under section 2(3) or designated by section 2(5) as if those representatives were directors of a regional services commission.

(3) The Capital Region Board is deemed to be a regional services commission for the purposes of

   (a) the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, and

   (b) the *Alberta Capital Finance Authority Act*.

**Delegation**

7(1) Subject to subsection (2), the Capital Region Board may delegate any of its powers, duties or functions under this Regulation to another person.

(2) The Capital Region Board may not delegate

   (a) the power to make bylaws;

   (b) the power to borrow money;

   (c) the power to adopt budgets;

   (d) the power to approve financial statements.

**Bylaws**

8(1) The Capital Region Board may make bylaws respecting its conduct and affairs, including, without limitation, rules and procedures for dealing with matters before the Capital Region Board.
(2) A bylaw made under subsection (1) does not come into force until it has been approved by the Minister.

(3) The Regulations Act does not apply to a bylaw made under subsection (1).

**Annual report of Board**

9(1) The Capital Region Board shall submit a report before May 1 of each year to the Minister summarizing its activities during the preceding calendar year.

(2) On receiving the report under subsection (1), the Minister shall lay a copy of it before the Legislative Assembly if it is then sitting or, if it is not then sitting, within 15 days after the commencement of the next sitting.

---

**Part 2**

**Preparation of Capital Region Growth Plan**

**Preparation of Plan**

10 The Capital Region Board shall, within the time and in the form and manner specified by the Minister, prepare and submit to the Minister a proposed Capital Region Growth Plan.

**Objectives of Plan**

11 The objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan are

(a) to promote an integrated and strategic approach to planning for future growth in the Capital Region;

(b) to identify the overall development pattern and key future infrastructure investments that would

   (i) best complement existing infrastructure, services and land uses in the Capital Region, and

   (ii) maximize benefits to the Capital Region;

(c) to co-ordinate decisions in the Capital Region to sustain economic growth and ensure strong communities and a healthy environment.

**Contents of Plan**

12(1) Except as otherwise specified by the Minister, a proposed Capital Region Growth Plan must contain the following:
(a) a comprehensive, integrated regional land use plan for the Capital Region that includes the following:

(i) population and employment projections;

(ii) the identification of

(A) priority growth areas,

(B) land supply for residential, commercial and industrial purposes,

(C) agricultural lands,

(D) buffer areas,

(E) density of development, and

(F) the development and location of infrastructure;

(iii) the identification of corridors for recreation, transportation, utilities and intermunicipal transit;

(iv) policies regarding environmentally sensitive areas;

(v) policies for the co-ordination of planning and development among the participating municipalities;

(vi) specific actions to be taken by the participating municipalities to implement the land use plan;

(b) a regional intermunicipal transit network plan for the Capital Region that includes the following:

(i) the decision-making process to approve the regional intermunicipal transit network;

(ii) procedures for implementing the delivery of regional intermunicipal transit services;

(iii) provision for special transit services for persons with disabilities;

(iv) methods for reviewing and monitoring the regional intermunicipal transit network plan;

(c) a plan to co-ordinate geographic information services for the Capital Region that includes the following:

(i) the protocols and the methods for collecting, storing and accessing data;
(ii) the protocols and the methods for compiling and analyzing information;

(iii) standardized terminology and standards for mapping capabilities for the participating municipalities;

(d) a plan regarding social and market affordable housing requirements for the Capital Region that includes recommendations with respect to the following:

(i) the general location of social housing;

(ii) options to increase market affordable housing.

(2) In preparing a proposed Capital Region Growth Plan, the Capital Region Board may also have regard to any matter relating to the physical, social or economic development of the Capital Region.

Approval of Plan

13(1) On receiving a proposed Capital Region Growth Plan from the Capital Region Board, the Minister may by order approve it or reject it.

(2) If the Minister rejects the proposed Capital Region Growth Plan, the Minister may return it to the Capital Region Board with suggestions for changes and directions on how to proceed.

(3) The Capital Region Growth Plan is not a regulation within the meaning of the Regulations Act.

Effective date of Plan

14 The Capital Region Growth Plan takes effect on the date specified by the Minister.

Part 3
Effect of Capital Region Growth Plan

Application of Part

15 This Part applies only after the Capital Region Growth Plan takes effect.

Limitation of Plan

16 Despite anything to the contrary in this Regulation, the Capital Region Growth Plan is of no effect to the extent it directs the Government of Alberta to expend funds, to commit to funding
arrangements or to undertake particular actions or adopt particular policies or programs.

**Actions must conform with Plan**

17(1) Despite any other enactment, no participating municipality shall take any of the following actions that conflict with the Capital Region Growth Plan:

(a) undertake a public work, improvement, structure or other thing;

(b) adopt a statutory plan;

(c) make a bylaw or pass a resolution;

(d) enter into a municipal agreement.

(2) If the Capital Region Board finds that a participating municipality has taken an action described in subsection (1)(a) that conflicts with the Capital Region Growth Plan, the Capital Region Board may, by written notice to the participating municipality, order the participating municipality to stop the action within the time set out in the notice.

(3) If the participating municipality fails or refuses to comply with a notice under subsection (2), the Capital Region Board may apply to the Court of Queen’s Bench for an injunction or other order.

(4) The Court of Queen’s Bench may grant or refuse the injunction or other order or may make any order that in the opinion of the Court is just in the circumstances.

**Plan prevails**

18 Despite any other enactment, the Capital Region Growth Plan prevails in the event of a conflict between the Capital Region Growth Plan and a statutory plan, bylaw, resolution or municipal agreement of a participating municipality.

**Conformity with Plan**

19(1) The council of a participating municipality shall amend every statutory plan and bylaw as necessary to conform with the Capital Region Growth Plan no later than the date specified by the Minister.

(2) If the council of a participating municipality fails to amend a statutory plan or bylaw in accordance with subsection (1), the statutory plan or bylaw is deemed to be invalid to the extent that it conflicts with the Capital Region Growth Plan.
(3) The Minister may, in respect of a municipal agreement entered into by a participating municipality that conflicts with the Capital Region Growth Plan, require the council of the participating municipality, to the extent possible under the terms of the municipal agreement,

(a) to amend the municipal agreement so that it conforms to the Capital Region Growth Plan, or

(b) to terminate the municipal agreement.

(4) If the council of a participating municipality fails to amend or terminate a municipal agreement when required to do so by the Minister under subsection (3), the municipal agreement is deemed to be invalid to the extent that it conflicts with the Capital Region Growth Plan.

(5) This section applies only to statutory plans adopted, bylaws made and municipal agreements entered into after April 15, 2008.

Part 4
Approval of Statutory Plans

Application of Part
20 This Part applies to statutory plans only after a Regional Evaluation Framework is established by the Minister under section 21.

Regional Evaluation Framework
21(1) The Minister may by order establish a Regional Evaluation Framework containing

(a) criteria to be used to determine whether a statutory plan must be submitted for approval under section 22(1),

(b) procedures for submitting statutory plans for approval under section 22(1), and

(c) the criteria and procedures to be followed by the Capital Region Board in evaluating and approving statutory plans.

(2) If the Minister establishes a Framework, the Minister shall provide a copy of it to each participating municipality.

(3) The Framework is not a regulation within the meaning of the Regulations Act.
Approval of statutory plans

22(1) Statutory plans to be adopted by a participating municipality that meet the criteria set out in the Framework must be submitted to the Capital Region Board for approval.

(2) The Capital Region Board may, in accordance with the Framework, approve or reject a statutory plan.

(3) A statutory plan referred to in subsection (1) has no effect unless it is approved by the Capital Region Board under subsection (2).

(4) Except as provided in the Framework, a participating municipality has no right to a hearing before the Capital Region Board in respect of its approval or rejection of a statutory plan.

(5) A decision of the Capital Region Board under this section is final and not subject to appeal.

(6) This section applies only to statutory plans to be adopted by a participating municipality after the establishment of the Framework.

Part 5
General Matters

Effect of Regulation on existing statutory plans

23 For greater certainty, except as provided in Parts 3 and 4 of this Regulation and Part 17 of the Act, all statutory plans of a participating municipality that were in effect on April 15, 2008 and have not been repealed before the coming into force of this Regulation remain in full force and effect.

Information must be provided

24(1) The chief elected official of a participating municipality shall, when required in writing by the Capital Region Board to do so, provide the Capital Region Board with information about the participating municipality that the Capital Region Board requires.

(2) A person who contravenes subsection (1) is guilty of an offence and liable to a fine of $10 000 or to imprisonment for a term of not more than one year, or to both a fine and imprisonment.

Dispute resolution

25(1) A participating municipality may make a complaint in writing to the Capital Region Board if the participating municipality is of the view that there has been a breach of process,
improper administration or discriminatory treatment by the Capital Region Board.

(2) On receipt of a complaint under subsection (1), the Capital Region Board shall attempt to resolve the complaint informally with the participating municipality.

(3) If a complaint cannot be resolved under subsection (2), the Capital Region Board may refer the matter to mediation.

(4) If the parties are not able to resolve the matter through mediation, the Capital Region Board may refer the matter to arbitration under the *Arbitration Act*.

**Matters before the Municipal Government Board**

26(1) If under the Act

(a) a matter relating to land within the Capital Region is appealed to the Municipal Government Board, or

(b) the Municipal Government Board is considering an application for an annexation involving 2 or more participating municipalities,

the Minister may by order direct the Municipal Government Board to defer its consideration of the matter.

(2) When the Minister makes an order under subsection (1), all steps in the appeal or application, as the case may be, are stayed as of the date of the order until the Minister gives notice to the Municipal Government Board that the appeal or application may be continued.

(3) This section applies to an appeal or application commenced after April 15, 2008.

**Limitation of actions**

27 No cause of action arises as a result of

(a) the enactment of this Regulation,

(b) the making of an order under this Regulation, or

(c) anything done or omitted to be done in accordance with this Regulation.
No remedy

28 No costs, compensation or damages are owing or payable to any person, and no remedy, including in contract, restitution or trust, is available to any person in connection with anything referred to in section 27.

Proceedings barred

29 No proceedings, including any proceedings in contract, restitution or trust, that are based on anything referred to in section 27 may be brought or maintained against any person.

No expropriation or injurious affection

30 Nothing done or omitted to be done in accordance with this Regulation or an order made under it constitutes an expropriation or injurious affection for the purposes of the Expropriation Act or otherwise.

Regulation prevails

31 In the event of a conflict between this Regulation and any other enactment, other than the Act, this Regulation prevails.

Ministerial orders

32(1) In addition to any other orders the Minister may make under this Regulation, the Minister may make any one or more of the following orders:

(a) an order providing for transitional matters related to the coming into force of this Regulation;

(b) an order respecting the requisition of operating and capital costs of the Capital Region Board;

(c) an order respecting the management, duties and functions of the Capital Region Board;

(d) an order respecting the records to be kept by the Capital Region Board and the manner in which they are to be kept and respecting which reports are to be submitted to the Minister;

(e) an order providing for any other matter that the Minister considers necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Regulation.

(2) In addition to the orders the Minister may make under subsection (1), the Minister may by order take any action that the Capital Region Board may or must take under this Regulation.
(3) If there is a conflict between an order made by the Minister under subsection (2) and an action taken by the Capital Region Board, the Minister’s order prevails.

(4) The Regulations Act does not apply to an order made under this Regulation.

**Expiry**

33 This Regulation is made in accordance with section 603(1) of the Act and is subject to repeal in accordance with section 603(2) of the Act.

**Coming into force**

34 This Regulation comes into force on April 1, 2012.

**Schedule**

**Participating Municipalities**

(a) Town of Beaumont;
(b) Town of Bon Accord;
(c) Town of Bruderheim;
(d) Town of Calmar;
(e) Town of Devon;
(f) City of Edmonton;
(g) City of Fort Saskatchewan;
(h) Town of Gibbons;
(i) Lamont County;
(j) Town of Lamont;
(k) City of Leduc;
(l) Leduc County;
(m) Town of Legal;
(n) Town of Morinville;
(o) Parkland County;
(p) Town of Redwater;
(q) City of St. Albert;
(r) City of Spruce Grove;
(s) Town of Stony Plain;
(t) Strathcona County;
(u) Sturgeon County;
(v) Village of Thorsby;
(w) Village of Wabamun;
(x) Village of Warburg.
CRB Unaudited Financial Statements

Motion

That the Capital Region Board approves the Financial Statements for the year ended March 31, 2013.

Background

The Conditional Grant Agreement between the Province of Alberta and the Board is to be used to fund the Board’s operations for the period from April 1 to March 31.

Rationale

These statements are unaudited as the Board’s year end currently follows the calendar year and the auditors completed a full audit from January 1 to December 31, 2012. These financial statements are for reporting purpose to the Province as their fiscal year is April 1 to March 31.
CAPITAL REGION BOARD
FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
FOR THE YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2013
(Unaudited - See Notice to Reader)
NOTICE TO READER

On the basis of information provided by management, we have compiled the statement of financial position of Capital Region Board as at March 31, 2013, the results of its operations and change in its net financial assets (debt) for the year then ended.

We have not performed an audit or a review engagement in respect of these financial statements and, accordingly, we express no assurance thereon.

Readers are cautioned that these statements may not be appropriate for their purposes.

Edmonton, Alberta
May 24, 2012

HAWKINGS EPP DUMONT LLP
Chartered Accountants
CAPITAL REGION BOARD
STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION
MARCH 31, 2013
(Unaudited - See Notice To Reader)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$285,971</td>
<td>$405,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and Services Tax receivable</td>
<td>$14,649</td>
<td>$21,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$300,620</td>
<td>$427,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>160,383</td>
<td>134,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue (Note 3)</td>
<td>86,892</td>
<td>260,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamortized deferred lease inducement</td>
<td>6,723</td>
<td>12,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$253,998</td>
<td>$427,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net financial assets (debt)</td>
<td>$46,622</td>
<td>($535)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-financial assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible capital assets (Note 4)</td>
<td>77,310</td>
<td>91,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>$77,310</td>
<td>92,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$123,932</td>
<td>$91,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD:

_________________________ Chair

__________               __ Vice Chair
CAPITAL REGION BOARD

STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS

FOR THE YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2013

(Unaudited - See Notice To Reader)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants (Note 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province of Alberta:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>$3,177,085</td>
<td>$2,878,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Internship</td>
<td>35,805</td>
<td>20,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Roadmap</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other contributions</td>
<td>29,070</td>
<td>19,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and other income</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>3,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>3,245,288</td>
<td>2,928,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board and committee expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>148,000</td>
<td>123,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>70,356</td>
<td>54,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>34,677</td>
<td>24,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td>1,311,914</td>
<td>1,188,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting fees</td>
<td>1,252,307</td>
<td>1,154,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office lease</td>
<td>167,308</td>
<td>167,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td>52,504</td>
<td>64,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>21,229</td>
<td>38,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of capital assets</td>
<td>33,181</td>
<td>36,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>16,365</td>
<td>21,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>20,311</td>
<td>17,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies</td>
<td>36,127</td>
<td>12,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>3,895</td>
<td>5,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>4,008</td>
<td>4,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>3,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on disposal of assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>1,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Internship (Note 3)</td>
<td>35,804</td>
<td>20,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Roadmap</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,212,889</td>
<td>2,957,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual surplus (deficit)</strong></td>
<td>32,399</td>
<td>(29,076)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accumulated surplus at beginning of year</strong></td>
<td>91,533</td>
<td>120,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accumulated surplus at end of year</strong></td>
<td>$123,932</td>
<td>$91,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CAPITAL REGION BOARD**

**STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN NET FINANCIAL ASSETS (DEBT)**

**FOR THE YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2013**

*(Unaudited - See Notice to Reader)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual surplus (deficit)</td>
<td>$32,399</td>
<td>$(29,076)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>(18,958)</td>
<td>(9,226)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>33,181</td>
<td>36,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on sale of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14,223</td>
<td>29,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of prepaid expense

|                                |           | 25         |

(Increase) decrease in net financial assets (debt)

|                                | 47,157    | 25         |

Net financial assets (debt) at beginning of year

|                                | (535)     | (560)      |

Net financial assets (debt) at end of year

|                                | $46,622   | $(535)     |
CAPITAL REGION BOARD
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
FOR THE YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2013
(Unaudited - See Notice To Reader)

1. NATURE OF OPERATIONS
Capital Region Board (the "Board") was established by the Capital Region Board Regulation 49/2008 (the "Regulation") under the Municipal Government Act of the Province of Alberta on April 15, 2008. On September 16, 2010, the Regulation was updated (145/2010). The updated Regulation is in effect until December 31, 2012. The Board is an other government entity and is exempt from income taxes.

Members of the Board include elected officials of 24 participating municipalities representing 5 cities (Edmonton, St. Albert, Fort Saskatchewan, Spruce Grove and Leduc), 11 towns (Beaumont, Bon Accord, Bruderheim, Calmar, Devon, Gibbons, Lamont, Legal, Morinville, Redwater and Stony Plain), 3 villages (Thorsby, Wabamun and Warburg), and 5 counties (Strathcona, Lamont, Sturgeon, Parkland and Leduc) in the Capital Region.

The Board was established by the Province to prepare a proposed Capital Region Growth Plan (the "Plan"), advise and make recommendations to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (the "Minister") regarding the preparation and implementation of the Plan, facilitate the resolution of issues arising from the preparation and implementation of the Plan, implement policies for the sharing of costs among the participating municipalities for regional projects of the Capital Region and carry out any other functions and duties as the Minister directs. Key elements of the Plan include development of a regional land use plan, a regional intermunicipal transit network plan, a plan to coordinate geographic information services, and a plan regarding non-market and market affordable housing requirements for the Capital Region.

In June 2009, the Minister requested that the Board complete additional work on the Growth Plan including land use, a cost allocation formula for the municipal portion of regional transit projects, Geographic Information Services (GIS), and the general location of housing. This work was completed in two separate Addenda to the Growth Plan in October and December 2009. The Province of Alberta approved the Growth Plan in March 2010. Since that time, the Board has been working to accomplish the projects set out in the updated 2012-2014 business plan.

2. ACCOUNTING POLICIES
The financial statements have been prepared by management in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards for other government entities established by the Canadian Public Sector Accounting Board. The financial statements have, in management's opinion, been properly prepared within reasonable limits of materiality and within the framework of the accounting policies summarized below:

(a) Revenues
Revenues are recognized in the period in which the transactions or events occurred that gave rise to the revenues. All revenues are recorded on an accrual basis, except when the accruals cannot be determined with a reasonable degree of certainty or when their estimation is impracticable.

Funds from external parties and earnings thereon restricted by agreement or legislation are accounted for as deferred revenue until used for the purposes specified.

Interest income is recorded as it is earned.

(CONTD)
2. ACCOUNTING POLICIES (CONT'D)

(b) Expenses
Expenses are reported on an accrual basis. The cost of all goods consumed and services received during the year is expensed.

(c) Tangible Capital Assets
Tangible capital assets are recorded at cost, which includes amounts that are directly related to the acquisition, design, construction, development, improvement or betterment of the assets. Cost includes overhead directly attributable to construction and development, as well as interest costs that are directly attributable to the acquisition or construction of the asset.

The cost, less residual value, of the tangible capital assets, is amortized using the following methods at the following annual rates. The half year rule applies to the tangible capital assets in the year when they are purchased or disposed. Only assets with costs in excess of $2,500 are capitalized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and equipment</td>
<td>Declining balance</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>Declining balance</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold improvements</td>
<td>Straight-line</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tangible capital assets are written down when conditions indicate that they no longer contribute to the Board's ability to provide goods and services, or when the value of future economic benefits associated with the tangible capital assets are less than their net book value. The net write-downs are accounted for as expenses in the statement of operations.

Contributed capital assets are recorded into revenues at their fair market value on the date of donation, except in circumstances where fair value cannot be reasonably determined, which are then recognized at nominal value. Transfers of capital assets from related parties are recorded at carrying value.

(d) Contributed Goods and Services
Contributed goods and services represent goods and services which the Board would normally purchase. The contribution amount is recorded at the fair value of the goods or services received.

(e) Prepaid Expenses
Prepaid expenses include deposits and insurance and are charged to expense over the periods expected to benefit from it.

(f) Measurement Uncertainty
The preparation of financial statements in conformity with Canadian public sector accounting standards, requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities, and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements, and the reported amounts of the revenues and expenses during the period. Items requiring the use of significant estimates include the useful life of tangible capital assets, rates for amortization, and impairment of assets.

Estimates are based on the best information available at the time of preparation of the financial statements and are reviewed annually to reflect new information as it becomes available. Measurement uncertainty exists in these financial statements. Actual results could differ from these estimates.

(CONT'D)
CAPITAL REGION BOARD
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (CONT'D)

FOR THE YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2013
(Unaudited - See Notice To Reader)

2. ACCOUNTING POLICIES (CONT'D)

(g) Deferred Revenue
Certain amounts are received pursuant to legislation, regulation or agreement and may only be
used in the conduct of certain programs or in the delivery of specific services and transactions.
These amounts are recognized as revenue in the fiscal year the related expenses are incurred,
services are performed or when stipulations are met.

(h) Deferred Lease Inducement
Deferred lease inducement represents the unamortized value of an inducement received when
the Board entered into a new lease arrangement in 2009 for rental of additional office space.
Amortization is provided on a straight-line basis over the five year term of the related lease as
a reduction in office rent.

3. DEFERRED REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Deferred revenues</th>
<th>Amounts receivable</th>
<th>Revenues recognized</th>
<th>Deferred revenues end of year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Province of Alberta:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>$ 237,782</td>
<td>$ 3,000,000</td>
<td>$ 3,177,085</td>
<td>$ 60,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Internship</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>35,805</td>
<td>26,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 280,782</td>
<td>$ 3,019,000</td>
<td>$ 3,212,890</td>
<td>$ 86,892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operations:
The 2012-2013 Conditional Grant Agreement between the Province of Alberta (Alberta
Municipal Affairs) and the Board was signed by the Minister on April 24, 2012. The Agreement
provides a conditional grant in the amount of $3,000,000. The grant is to be used to fund the
Board’s operations for the period from April 1, 2012 to March 31, 2013. There was an unspent
amount of $60,697 as at March 31, 2013.

Municipal Internship Program:
A 2012-2014 Municipal Internship Program for Land Use Planners was signed by the Minister
on January 20, 2012. The $62,000 one-time conditional grant was funded as $43,000 for
2012/13 and $19,000 for 2013/14. There was an unspent amount of $26,195 as at March 31,
2013.

4. TANGIBLE CAPITAL ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Accumulated Amortization</th>
<th>Net Book Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and equipment</td>
<td>$ 28,220</td>
<td>$ 17,631</td>
<td>$ 10,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>98,034</td>
<td>58,727</td>
<td>39,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold improvements</td>
<td>87,403</td>
<td>59,989</td>
<td>27,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 213,657</td>
<td>$ 136,347</td>
<td>$ 77,310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2013 2012

$ 13,468
33,221
44,844
$ 91,533
June 4, 2013

“WITHOUT PREJUDICE”

Mr. Nolan Crouse, Chair
Capital Region Board
1405 Bell Tower, 10104 103 Avenue
Edmonton, AB T5J 0H8

Dear Mr. Crouse:

Subject: Request for Proposed Motions on June 13, 2013, CRB Agenda

Parkland County hereby requests the following motions be put before the Capital Region Board at its meeting on Thursday, June 13, 2013:

Motion #1: THAT The REF process voted on by the Board on May 9, 2013, be amended as follows:

For Applications which the CRB Administration and the CRB’s third party consultant have recommended APPROVAL, the Application will be approved unless one or more participating municipalities appeal to the Board within a defined time limit. To overturn an Administrative approval, an appeal must be supported by not fewer than 17 representatives from participating municipalities that collectively have at least 75% of the population in the Capital Region or the Administrative approval of the application will stand; and

For Applications which the CRB Administration and third party consultant have recommended to REJECT: The Application will be dismissed unless one or more participating municipalities appeal to the Board within a defined time limit. To overturn an Administrative rejection, an appeal must be supported by not fewer than 17 representatives from participating municipalities that collectively have at least 75% of the population in the Capital Region.

Motion #2: THAT upon the passing of Motion #1, the Board will request the Minister of Municipal Affairs to endorse the amended REF process by passing a Ministerial Order signed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Motion #3: THAT the Capital Region Board waive the requirement for the Parkland County REF Application 2012-019 – Acheson ASP and MDP Amendment to wait twelve (12) months after date of decision before coming before the Board for reconsideration.
Yours truly,

[signature]

Mayor Rod Shaigec

Ph: 780-968-8410
Email: rshaigec@parklandcounty.com

/Jo
Enclosure

Copy: Parkland County Council
Parkland County Executive Committee
Strathcona County proud of role in developing resolution

June 3, 2013

Canadian municipalities rally for nation-wide energy value

Strathcona County Mayor and past-president of Alberta's Industrial Heartland Association (AIHA) Linda Osinchuk says she is pleased by the progress being made to enhance value-added industries across Canada.

"As an active member of AIHA, Strathcona County worked diligently to forward a resolution encouraging the federal government to commit to developing national energy policies that reinforce and expand Canada's energy value chain. It is rewarding to see it supported nationwide by so many municipalities at this weekend's Annual General Meeting of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities."

According to a news release sent out by the AIHA, the "resolution calls on the Government of Canada to work with industry and governments at all levels in their efforts to enhance the energy value chain. A collaborative approach will help address potential challenges, including skilled labour shortages and cost competitiveness, that might inhibit major value added projects and economic prosperity." Many members of the Capital Region Board, comprised of 24 municipalities in the Alberta Capital Region, are supportive of this resolution.

The AIHA is comprised of Strathcona County, Sturgeon County, Lamont County, and the Cities of Fort Saskatchewan and Edmonton.

Set in the centre of Alberta's energy and agricultural heartland, Strathcona County is a thriving, successful and vibrant community of more than 92,000 residents. Strathcona County is made up of the urban area of Sherwood Park and a large adjacent rural area of farms, acreages and smaller hamlets. It is home to 75 per cent of refining in Western Canada. With a focus on economic, governance, social, cultural and environmental sustainability, Strathcona County is committed to balancing the unique needs of its diverse community.

Contact:
Mayor Linda Osinchuk, 780-464-8000
LAND USE COMMITTEE  
Committee Report #46  
June 13, 2013

1. Committee Meeting — May 23, 2013  
   • Next Meeting: June 27, 2013, Rainbow Room, Edmonton Petroleum Club

2. Cluster Country Residential Areas Policy Clarification  
   The Committee was presented with the PAG recommended Cluster Country Residential Area Policy Clarification as directed by the Board pursuant to the Strathcona County motion last year. The Land Use Committee approved a motion to recommend the policy clarification to the Board for approval.

   During the CCRA Policy Clarification discussion it was suggested that there be a requirement for municipalities to enter into IDP’s when statutory plans are proposed adjacent to municipal boundaries in PGAs and CCRAs in order to address issues of intermunicipal planning and consultation. The Land Use Committee approved a motion referring the matter to the Planning Advisory Group for further information.

3. Non-Priority Growth Areas Policy Clarification  
   The Committee was updated on the progress at PAG with respect to the Non-PGA Policy Clarification as directed by the Board pursuant to the Strathcona County motion last year. CRB Administration anticipates a recommendation from PAG at the next Land Use Committee meeting.

4. Alternative REF Process  
   The Committee was provided with an overview of the Alternative REF Process approved at the recent Board meeting.

5. REF Report Implementation Workplan  
   The Committee was presented with an updated workplan for the implementation of the REF Report recommendations.

6. Revised 2013 Land Use Committee Business Plan  
   Doug Lagore, CEO, presented a proposal to revise the Land Use Committee Business Plan and Budget to include a Prioritization of Transportation Master Plan project that would result in the development of a regional transportation project priority list. The funding for the project would be taken from the Integrated Regional Intermunicipal Planning Framework project, which would in turn be submitted for a Regional Collaboration Grant. The Committee unanimously approved a motion that recommended the Governance Committee approve the revised 2013 Land Use Committee Business Plan and Budget.
REGIONAL HOUSING COMMITTEE

Committee Report #21

June 13th, 2013

1. Committee Meeting Date - May 16th, 2013
   • Next Committee Meeting: June 20th, 2013

2. 2013 Housing Committee Project Updates

   **Sub-Regional Planning Model**
   Following the presentation of the Environmental Scan report at the April 18th Committee meeting, Project consultant Kent Fletcher, of Arrow Consulting, was again in attendance to participate in the discussion and respond to questions. The Environmental Scan report was circulated to Housing Committee members prior to the meeting. The Committee recommended that the report be provided to the Capital Region Board for information. Administration, in consultation with the Housing Advisory Working Group, will prepare a work plan describing the next phase(s) of this project.

   **Our Affordable Future Report - Implementation**
   CRB Administration is in the process of developing an implementation plan to raise awareness, understanding and commitment among the parties interested in partnering with the CRB on this initiative. Ongoing discussions between CRB Administration and Industry groups, including the Urban Development Institute (UDI), Canadian Home Builders Association (CHBA), and the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) have continued to build support for this market-affordable housing initiative. Although implementation planning has proceeded slowly, advocates of this initiative remain unwavering in their commitment to seeing the Report’s recommendations accepted by a broader group of stakeholders. Recent evidence of this includes a presentation from Greg Christenson to the CHBA’s Government Relations Committee, where he described the benefits of exploring opportunities to build market affordable pilot projects in Capital Region municipalities (i.e., report recommendation #9).

_____________________________
Ed Gibbons, Chair, Regional Housing Committee
1. **Committee Meetings—May 23, 2013**
   
   - Next Meeting: June 27, 2013

2. **Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee**
   The Committee reviewed and discussed the Sub-Committee Terms of Reference as approved by the Board May 9th. The Sub-Committee’s first meeting is scheduled for June 13, 2013.

   A motion “That the Advocacy & Communications Committee supports the CRB Administration recommendation to allocate an additional $30,000 to the Committee’s budget to support the Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee for the remainder of 2013” was carried.

   A motion that the Advocacy & Communications Committee recommends to the Board “That the Capital Region Board approves that the membership of the Advocacy & Communications Committees be updated to include the Chair of the Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee” was carried.

3. **FCM Resolution: Building Canada’s Energy Value Chain Economy**
   Mayor Osinchuk provided the Committee with an overview of the resolution “Building Canada’s Energy Value Chain Economy” that will be voted on June 1, 2013 at the Vancouver FCM convention.

   A motion “That the Advocacy & Communications Committee will provide support for the FCM resolution ‘Building Canada’s Energy Value Chain Economy’ by providing communications material to support this FCM resolution” was carried.

   A motion to move into in-camera was carried by the Committee.

4. **Advocacy & Communications Committee Strategy**
   A motion to revert back to the public meeting was carried by the Committee.

5. **Advocacy Update**
   The Committee reviewed the progress made in 2013 towards its Advocacy priorities.

   6a) Hansard – Tabling of the 2012 CRB Annual Report on May 7, 2013 was accepted as information.

   6b) Hansard – Discussions regarding MSI Funding and Capital Region Municipal Planning in which the CRB was referred on May 9, 2013 was accepted as information.
6. **Advocacy and Communications Requirements of the CRB Committees**

Each CRB Committee Chair identified their advocacy and communications requirements:

**Governance Committee:** With the completion and issuance of the Annual Report, the Governance Committee currently does not have any emerging needs.

**Transit Committee:** The importance of continuous government representation on the Committee needs to reinforced, and affirming the benefits of adding Smartcard to GreenTRIP Round 2, and the shared cost model and progress of the business case.

**Housing Committee:** The Sub-Regional Planning Framework Phase 1: Environmental Scan has been completed and affirms that the “Our Affordable Future” marketing and communications plan should be implemented.

**Land Use Committee:** Provincial acceptance of the Integrated Regional Transportation System Study, Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan (IRTMP) and 30-Year Transit Service Plan in the form of an addendum to the Growth Plan remains outstanding.

------------------------------------------

Mayor Greg Krischke, Chair Advocacy and Communications Committee
Summary of Meeting with Towns (population under 3,500)

Present

- CRB Chair, Mayor Nolan Crouse
- CRB CEO, Doug Lagore
- Councillor Doug Horner, Gibbons
- CAO, Farrell O’Malley, Gibbons
- Mayor Lisa Magera, Legal
- Councillor Trina Jones, Legal
- Mayor Randy Boyd, Bon Accord
- CAO, Vicki Zinyk, Bon Accord
- Councillor Shelley Ross, Bruderheim
- CAO John Dance, Bruderheim
- Mayor Mel Smith, Redwater
- CAO, Debbie Hamilton, Redwater
- Councillor Lori Lumsden, Redwater

Items that were discussed

- Discussed opportunity for a regional collaboration grant application for planning funds for the group.

  Note: Town of Gibbons has now volunteered to lead their initiative.

- Discussion around the opportunity for an application under the GreenTRIP program to fund some form of transportation for their respective communities.

- Discussion around the need for affordable housing in their respective communities.

- The municipality representatives collectively stated that they felt:
  - They should not be subject to the REF process.
  - Communities under 5,000 population should not be subject to the funding formula.