# Council Meeting Agenda

April 24, 2018

9:00 a.m.



CALL MEETING TO ORDER

UPDATES/ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA

- A CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
  - 1. April 10, 2018 Council Meeting
- B FINANCIAL REPORTS
  - 1. All Divisions File: 2025-400 2017 Year End Audited Financial Statements

Staff Report

2. All Divisions - File: 2025-350 - 2018 Budget Adjustments

Staff Report

C APPOINTMENTS/PUBLIC HEARINGS

<u>NOTE</u>: As per Section 606(2)(a) of the *Municipal Government Act*, the Public Hearings for items C-1, C-2, and C-4 were advertised in the Rocky View Weekly on March 27, 2018 and April 3, 2018.

The Public Hearing for item C-3 was advertised in the Rocky View Weekly on April 3, 2018 and April 10, 2018.

#### MORNING APPOINTMENTS 10:00 A.M.

 Division 7 – File: PL20180011 (06415050) Bylaw C-7770-2018 – Redesignation Item – Residential Two District to Residential One District – Balzac East Area Structure Plan

Staff Report

Page 72

#### AFTERNOON APPOINTMENTS 1:30 P.M.

 Division 7 – File: PL20170018 (07306001) Bylaw C-7767-2018 – Redesignation Item – Ranch and Farm District to Industrial – Industrial Activity District

Staff Report

Page 90 AGENDA Page 1 of 410

Page 4

Page 13

Page 68

<b>Council Meeting Agenda</b>					
	Apri	1 24, 2018	9:00 a.m.		ROCKY VIEW COUNTY Cultivating Communities 911 – 32 AVENUE NE CALGARY, AB, T2E 6X6
	3.	Bylaw C-7766-201	L20170114 (03329006) 8 – Redesignation Item – Ra rial Activity District and Public		
		Staff Report			Page 114
	4.	Bylaw C-7739-201 Natural Resource I	L20170145 (06731002) 7 – Redesignation Item – Rai ndustrial District puld be considered in conjunc		
		Staff Report			Page 137
D	GE	NERAL BUSINESS			
	1.	Division 4 – File: 4 Right-of-Way	020-200 – Land Purchase in	Langdo	on to Secure Permanent
		Staff Report			Page 223
	<ol> <li>All Divisions – File: 6060 – Spring 2018 Community Recreation Funding Grant</li> <li>Operational Funding Requests</li> </ol>				ecreation Funding Grant
		Staff Report			Page 227
	3.	All Divisions – File: – Capital Funding F	6060 – Spring 2018 Commu Requests	unity Re	ecreation Funding Grant
		Staff Report			Page 231
	4.	All Divisions - File:	4010-100 – Aggregate Reso	ource Pl	an
		Staff Report			Page 277
	5.	Summit Aggregates	L20170184 (06731002) – M s Pit buld be considered in conjunc		
		Staff Report			Page 283
	6.		N/A – Appointment of Counc Consultative Committee	cillor to	the Springbank Airport
		Staff Report			Page 389

### AGENDA Page 2 of 410

# **Council Meeting Agenda** April 24, 2018 9:00 a.m.

- **ROCKY VIEW COUNTY** Cultivating Communities 911 – 32 AVENUE NE CALGARY, AB, T2E 6X6
- 7. All Divisions File: 1025-225/500-400 Budget Adjustment to Receive ACRP **Grant Funds**

Staff Report

#### Е **BYLAWS**

1. All Divisions - File: 2025-350 - Bylaw C-7764-2018 - 2018 Tax Rate Bylaw

Staff Report

Page 396

Page 393

2. Division 4 - File: 2025-350 - Bylaw C-7765-2018 - 2018 Langdon Special Tax Rate Bylaw

Staff Report

Page 404

- F **UNFINISHED BUSINESS** - None
- G COUNCIL REPORTS
- Н MANAGEMENT REPORTS - None
- L NOTICES OF MOTION - None
- SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS J - None
- Κ COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE/IN CAMERA - None

ADJOURN THE MEETING

AGENDA Page 3 of 410

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Council of Rocky View County was held in Council Chambers of the Municipal Administration Building, 911 – 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE, Calgary, Alberta on April 10, 2018 commencing at 9:00 a.m.

Present:	Division 6 Division 5 Division 1 Division 2 Division 3 Division 4 Division 7 Division 8 Division 9	Reeve G. Boehlke Deputy Reeve J. Gautreau Councillor M. Kamachi Councillor K. McKylor Councillor K. Hanson Councillor A. Schule Councillor D. Henn Councillor S. Wright Councillor C. Kissel	
Also Present:	B. Riemann, Gen C. O'Hara, Gener A. Keibel, Manag	Robinson, Interim County Manager Riemann, General Manager O'Hara, General Manager Keibel, Manager, Legislative and Legal Services	

B. Woods, Manager, Financial Services

- S. Baers, Manager, Planning Services
- R. Wiljamaa, Manager, Engineering Services
- M. Wilson, Planning Supervisor, Planning Services
- J. Fleischer, Agricultural Services Supervisor, Agricultural and Environmental Services
- P. Simon, Planner, Planning Services
- D. Kazmierczak, Planner, Planning Services
- C. Satink, Deputy Municipal Clerk, Legislative and Legal Services
- T. Andreasen, Legislative Clerk, Legislative and Legal Services

#### Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. with all members present.

#### 1-18-04-10-01 Updates/Acceptance of Agenda

Administration withdrew item E-1 from the April 10, 2018 Council meeting agenda.

MOVED by Councillor Wright that the April 10, 2018 Council meeting agenda be accepted as amended.

Carried

#### 1-18-04-10-02 Confirmation of Minutes

MOVED by Councillor Hanson that the March 27, 2018 Council meeting minutes be accepted as presented.

Carried

	April 10, 2018	Page 2
1-18-04-10-03 (B-1) All Divisions – 2018 Tax Re <u>File: 2020-250</u>	covery Sale Properties – Reserve Bids	
MOVED by Councillor Hansc Attachment 'A'.	n that the reserve bids for the 2018 tax recovery sale be app	-
		Carried
1-18-04-10-06 (D-1) All Divisions – 2017 Agricul File: 6000-300	tural Service Board Annual Report	
MOVED by Deputy Reeve Ga	autreau that the 2017 Agricultural Service Board Annual Rep	
		Carried
1-18-04-10-09 (E-2) All Divisions –Bylaw C-7778 <u>File: 0160</u>	-2018 – Assessment Review Boards Bylaw and Appointmen	t of Chair
MOVED by Deputy Reeve Ga	autreau that Bylaw C-7778-2018 be given first reading.	Carried
MOVED by Councillor McKyl	or that Bylaw C-7778-2018 be given second reading.	Carried
MOVED by Councillor Henn	that Bylaw C-7778-2018 be considered for third reading.	Carried
MOVED by Councillor Hanso	n that Bylaw C-7778-2018 be given third and final reading.	Carried
MOVED by Deputy Reeve Ga	autreau that Ken Sawatzky be appointed as Chair of the Asse	essment Review
Boards until the 2018 Orga	<b>,</b> , , ,	Carried
		Cameu
1-18-04-10-10 (J-1) Division 7 – Subdivision Itel File: PL20170188 (077230	n – Ranch and Farm Three District and Residential Three Dis 108)	strict
MOVED by Councillor Henn PL20170188.	that the applicant be allowed to address Council regarding S	ubdivision Application
In Favour:	In Opposition:	Carried
Councillor Kamachi	Councillor Hanson	
Councillor McKylor	Reeve Boehlke	
Deputy Reeve Gautreau Councillor Schule		

Councillor Henn Councillor Wright Councillor Kissel

The applicant, Charles Goodhart, proceeded to address Council regarding the proposed conditions of approval for the subdivision application.

MOVED by Councillor Schule that condition 7, municipal reserves, in Appendix 'A' be amended to read as follows:

The provision of Reserve in the amount of 10 percent of the area of Lots 1 and 2 as determined by the Plan of Survey, is to be provided by payment of cash-in-lieu in accordance with the per acre value listed in the land appraisal prepared by Northern Lights Real Estate Appraisals, file 1712035, dated December 20, 2017, pursuant to Section 666(3) of the *Municipal Government Act*.

a) The provision of Reserve in the amount of 10 percent of Lot 3 is to be deferred by caveat pursuant to Section 669(2) of the *Municipal Government Act.* 

Lost

<u>In Favour:</u>	In Opposition:
Councillor Henn	Councillor Kissel
Councillor Schule	Councillor Wright
Reeve Boehlke	Deputy Reeve Gautreau
	Councillor Hanson
	Councillor McKylor
	Councillor Kamachi

MOVED by Councillor Henn that Subdivision Application PL20170188 be approved with the conditions as noted in Appendix 'A':

- A. The application to create one ± 4.49 hectare (± 11.09 acre) parcel and one ± 4.29 hectare (± 10.59 acre) parcel with a ± 13.27 hectare (± 32.79 acre) remainder within SW-23-27-03-W05M, having been evaluated in terms of Section 654 of the *Municipal Government Act*, Sections 7 and 14 of the *Subdivision and Development Regulations*, and having considered adjacent landowner submissions, is approved as per the Tentative Plan for the reasons listed below:
  - 1) The application is consistent with the Statutory Policy;
  - 2) The subject lands hold the appropriate land use designation;
  - 3) The technical aspects of the subdivision proposal have been considered and are further addressed through the conditional approval requirements.
- B. The Applicant/Owner is required, at their expense, to complete all conditions attached to and forming part of this conditional subdivision approval prior to Rocky View County (the County) authorizing final subdivision endorsement. This requires submitting all documentation required to demonstrate each specific condition has been met, or agreements (and necessary securities) have been provided to ensure the conditions will be met, in accordance with all County Policies, Standards, and Procedures, to the satisfaction of the County, and any other additional party named within a specific condition. Technical reports required to be submitted as part of the conditions must be prepared by a qualified professional, licensed to practice in the Province of Alberta within the appropriate field of practice. The conditions of this subdivision approval do not absolve an Applicant/Owner from ensuring all permits, licenses, or approvals required by Federal, Provincial, or other jurisdictions are obtained.
- C. Further, in accordance with Section 654 and 655 of the *Municipal Government Act*, the application be approved subject to the following conditions of approval:

Page 4

#### Plan of Subdivision

1) Subdivision is to be effected by a Plan of Survey, pursuant to Section 657 of the *Municipal Government Act*, or such other means satisfactory to the Registrar of the South Alberta Land Titles District.

#### Transportation and Access

- 2) In order to provide access to Lots 1 and 3, the Owner shall:
  - a) Provide an access right-of-way plan; and
  - b) Prepare and register respective easements on each title, where required.
- 3) The Owner shall demonstrate that Lot 2 has been provided legal access through the existing access easement agreement (instrument # 891243196). If the existing access easement agreement does not provide legal access to Lot 2, the Applicant/Owner shall:
  - a) Amend the existing access easement agreement (instrument #891243196) to ensure Lot 2 has legal access; or
  - b) Provide a new access right-of-way plan and prepare and register respective easements on title, where required.
- 4) The Owner is to dedicate, by caveat, a 30 m wide service road along the highway frontage boundary of Lot 3 (the remainder), to the satisfaction of Alberta Transportation.

#### Payments and Levies

- 5) The Owner shall pay the County subdivision endorsement fee, in accordance with the Master Rates Bylaw, for the creation of two (2) new lots.
- 6) The Owner shall pay the Transportation Off-Site Levy (TOL) in accordance with Bylaw C-7356-2014 prior to subdivision endorsement.
  - a) The TOL will be applicable on 3.00 acres of Lot 1.
  - b) The TOL will be applicable on 3.00 acres of Lot 2.
  - c) The TOL will be deferred on Lot 3 (the remainder).

#### Municipal Reserve

7) The provision of Reserve in the amount of 10 percent of the area of Lots 1, 2, and 3, as determined by the Plan of Survey, is to be provided by payment of cash-in-lieu in accordance with the per acre value listed in the land appraisal prepared by Northern Lights Real Estate Appraisals, file 1712035, dated December 20, 2017, pursuant to Section 666(3) of the *Municipal Government Act*.

#### Taxes

8) All taxes owing up to and including the year in which subdivision is to be registered are to be paid to Rocky View County prior to signing the final documents pursuant to Section 654(1) of the *Municipal Government Act*.

#### D. SUBDIVISION AUTHORITY DIRECTION:

1) Prior to final endorsement of the subdivision, the Planning Department is directed to present the Applicant/Owners with a Voluntary Recreation Contribution Form and ask them if they will contribute to the Fund in accordance with the contributions prescribed in the Master Rates Bylaw.

Carried

The Chair called for a recess at 9:50 a.m. and called the meeting back to order at 10:12 a.m. with all previously mentioned members present.

#### 1-18-04-10-04 (C-1) All Divisions – Bylaw C-7762-2018 and Bylaw C-7763-2018 – County Plan and Land Use Bylaw Amendments – First Parcel Out Process Change <u>File: 1014-825</u>

MOVED by Councillor Schule that the public hearing for item C-1 be opened at 10:12 a.m.

Carried

Person(s) who spoke in favour:	None
Person(s) who spoke in opposition:	None
Person(s) who spoke in rebuttal:	None

MOVED by Deputy Reeve Gautreau that the public hearing for item C-1 be closed at 10:47 a.m.

Carried

The Chair called for a recess at 10:53 a.m. and called the meeting back to order at 11:14 a.m. with all previously mentioned members present.

MOVED by Deputy Reeve Gautreau that Administration be directed to bring the proposed amendments to the County's First Parcel Out process back to Council after the afternoon public hearing with the following considerations:

- 1) Simplifying the layout of the proposed district amendments, including:
  - a) the addition of headings clearly identifying the regulations based on parcel size;
  - b) Amending section 43.8 to provide for an accessory building of less than 2,000 sq. ft.; and
  - c) Amending section 43.9 to provide for an accessory building of greater than 2,000 sq. ft. but no more than 4,000 sq. ft.

Carried

The Chair called for a recess at 11:17 a.m. and called the meeting back to order at 1:32 p.m. with all previously mentioned members present.

#### 1-18-04-10-05 (C-2)

Division 8 – Bylaw C-7668-2017 – Redesignation Item – Residential One District to Public Services District File: PL20150134 (05632020)

#### 1-18-04-10-07 (D-2)

Division 8 – Master Site Development Plan – Centre for religious assembly and community services File: PL20150086 (05632020)

MOVED by Councillor Wright that the applicants be allowed to address Council regarding the request for a postponement of items C-2 and D-2.

Carried

#### AGENDA Page 8 of 410

Page 6

Jonathan Ryder, Abdul Rahman, and Riaz Ahmed proceeded to address Council on behalf of the applicants regarding the request for postponement of items C-2 and D-2.

MOVED by Councillor Wright that members of the public be allowed to address Council regarding the request by the applicants for a postponement of items C-2 and D-2, with a time limit of three minutes per person. Carried

Person(s) who spoke: Kyle Petryshen, Resident Gerry Neustaedter, Resident Ken Waddell, Resident Habib Abdullah, Resident Riaz Ahmed, on behalf of Canadian Muslims for Peace and Justice Tahir Alvi, Resident Vic Cotton, Resident Bill Gwynn, Resident Essa Al Awad, Resident Muhammad Khahid, Resident

MOVED by Councillor Wright that Council move in camera at 2:21 p.m. pursuant to the following sections of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*:

Section 27 - Advice from officials

<u>In Favour:</u>	In Opposition:
Councillor Kamachi	Councillor Henn
Councillor McKylor	Councillor Schule
Councillor Hanson	Deputy Reeve Gautreau
Councillor Wright	Reeve Boehlke
Councillor Kissel	

Council held the in camera session with the following people in attendance to provide advice to Council:

- K. Robinson, Interim County Manager, Rocky View County
- A. Keibel, Manager, Legislative Services, Rocky View County

MOVED by Councillor Schule that Council move out of in camera at 2:32 p.m.

Carried

Carried

MOVED by Councillor Wright that the public hearing for item C-2 be opened at 2:38 p.m.

Carried

In Favour:In Opposition:Councillor KamachiCouncillor McKylorCouncillor HansonReeve BoehlkeDeputy Reeve GautreauCouncillor SchuleCouncillor SchuleCouncillor HennCouncillor WrightCouncillor Kissel

Person(s) who presented:

Abdul Rahman, on behalf of the Islamic Association of Northwest Calgary

The Chair called for a recess at 3:04 p.m. and called the meeting back to order at 3:11 p.m. with all previously mentioned members present.

Person(s) who spoke in favour: Riaz Ahmed, on behalf of Canadian Muslims for Peace and Justice Essa Al Awad, Resident Tahir Alvi, Resident Habib Abdullah, Resident Afsham Habib, Resident Nabeed Abdullah, Resident Ghazanfar Zafar, on behalf of the Muslim Council of Calgary Adnan Mansoor, Resident Noman Faridi, on behalf of the Islamic Association of Northwest Calgary

MOVED by Councillor Wright that the late submission be accepted.

Carried

The Chair called for a recess at 4:09 p.m. and called the meeting back to order at 4:18 p.m. with all previously mentioned members present.

Person(s) who spoke in opposition: Donna Wasson, Resident Kelly Gwynn, Resident Bill Gwynn, Resident Kyle Petryshen, Resident, and on behalf of Gordon Thompson and Wally Batarseh Ken Waddell, Resident Vic Cotton, Resident

MOVED by Deputy Reeve Gautreau that the meeting proceed past 5:00 p.m.

#### Carried

The Chair called for a recess at 4:49 p.m. and called the meeting back to order at 5:00 p.m. with all previously mentioned members present.

Person(s) who spoke in rebuttal: Abdul Rahman, on behalf of the Islamic Association of Northwest Calgary Riaz Ahmed, on behalf of Canadian Muslims for Peace and Justice

The Chair called for a recess at 5:44 p.m. and called the meeting back to order at 5:56 p.m. with all previously mentioned members present.

MOVED by Councillor Wright that the public hearing for item C-2 be closed at 5:57 p.m.

Carried

Page 8

MOVED by Councillor Wright t	hat application PL20150134 be refuse	ed. Carried
In Favour: Councillor Hanson Reeve Boehlke Deputy Reeve Gautreau Councillor Schule Councillor Henn Councillor Wright Councillor Kissel	<u>In Opposition:</u> Councillor Kamachi Councillor McKylor	Gameu
MOVED by Councillor Wright t	hat application PL20150086 be refuse	ed. Carried
1-18-04-10-04 (C-1) All Divisions – Bylaw C-7762- – First Parcel Out Process Ch <u>File: 1014-825</u>		ty Plan and Land Use Bylaw Amendments
	at 6:31 p.m. and called the meeting ba ers present, with the exception of Counc	•
MOVED by Deputy Reeve Gau	itreau that Bylaw C-7762-2018 be give	n first reading. Carried Absent: Councillor Wright Councillor Henn
MOVED by Councillor Schule	that Bylaw C-7762-2018 be given seco	nd reading. Carried Absent: Councillor Wright Councillor Henn
MOVED by Deputy Reeve Gau	treau that Bylaw C-7762-2018 be cons	-
		Carried Absent: Councillor Wright Councillor Henn
MOVED by Councillor Schule	that Bylaw C-7762-2018 be given third	-
		Carried Absent: Councillor Wright Councillor Henn
Councillor Wright returned to	the meeting at 6:49 p.m.	

MOVED by Deputy Reeve Gautreau that Bylaw C-7763-2018 be amended as follows:

- a) Adding headings clearly identifying the regulations based on parcel size;
- b) Amending section 43.8 to provide for an accessory building of less than 2,000 sq. ft.;
- c) Amending section 43.9 to provide for an accessory building of greater than 2,000 sq. ft. but no more than 4,000 sq. ft.; and
- d) Amending section 43.9 to state private riding arenas on parcels greater than 6.00 hectares in area (14.83 acres in area).

Carried Absent: Councillor Henn

MOVED by Deputy Reeve Gautreau that Bylaw C-7763-2018 be given first reading as amended.

Carried Absent: Councillor Henn

MOVED by Councillor Schule that Bylaw C-7763-2018 be given second reading as amended.

Carried Absent: Councillor Henn

MOVED by Deputy Reeve Gautreau that Bylaw C-7763-2018 be considered for third reading as amended. Carried Absent: Councillor Henn

MOVED by Deputy Reeve Gautreau that Bylaw C-7763-2018 be given third and final reading as amended. Carried Absent: Councillor Henn

Councillor Henn returned to the meeting at 6:52 p.m.

#### Adjournment

MOVED by Councillor McKylor that the April 10, 2018 Council Meeting be adjourned at 6:52 p.m.

Carried

REEVE

CAO or Designate



# **FINANCIAL SERVICES**

TO: Council

**DATE:** April 24, 2018

DIVISION: All

FILE: 2025-400

SUBJECT: 2017 Year End Audited Financial Statements

#### <sup>1</sup>ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the 2017 Audited Financial Statements be approved as presented in Attachment 'A'.

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The external audit of Rocky View County's financial statements for December 31, 2017 has now been completed by MNP, the County's external auditors. An operating surplus of \$7,211,228 currently exists from an increase in revenue collection and specific expense savings. Administration is respectfully requesting approval of the 2017 Audited Financial Statements so they may be submitted to the Province of Alberta by the May 1 deadline.

Administration recommends Option # 1:

#### BACKGROUND:

Pursuant to the requirements outlined in the *Municipal Government Act* (MGA) - section 281(1), each year the auditor for Rocky View County must report to Council on the annual financial statements and financial information return. On September 24, 2013, Council appointed MNP to be the County's auditors. MNP has conducted Rocky View County's financial statement audit for the year ending December 31, 2017.

The Auditors have issued an unqualified opinion letter. This opinion letter assures that there are no material misstatements within Rocky View County's financial statements.

The financial statements and the auditor's report on the financial statements, as well as the financial information return and the auditor's report on the financial information return are required to be submitted to the Province by May 1 of each year as per section 278 of the *MGA*.

**Section I** – This section contains the 2017 audited financial statements, supporting schedules and notes to the financial statements. An operating surplus in the amount of \$7,211,228 is derived from an increase in revenue collection and expense savings. The annual surplus will be transferred to the Tax Stabilization Reserve upon approval of the Financial Statements per Rocky View County policy C-222 "Reserve Fund Policy". These funds are available for Council's consideration of future service delivery enhancements or identified project funding.

**Section II** – This section contains a variance analysis of significant changes in the Statement of Financial Position and the Statement of Operations.

**Section III** – This section provides an overview of audit findings which will be presented by representatives of MNP.

**Section IV** – Administration has included a copy of the management letter from MNP. This letter provides observations and recommendations that will enhance Rocky View County's

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Administration Resources

Barry Woods, Financial Services



efficiencies, effectiveness and enhanced internal controls. During the 2017 Audit it was observed that contributed land for prior years had not been added in to the Tangible Capital Assets until the 2017 year. Contributed land refers to land that is turned over to the County from developers at various stages of completion. They consist of municipal reserves and public utility lots and are not depreciated. Recognition of this land occurs at various stages that is dependent on the type of development. It was identified that due to the handling of land between the various departments and the time of recognition that the land becomes Rocky View County's that there was not a consistent approach. Administration has implemented a process to review land transactions on a two week basis starting with the download of land titles and consistent verification amongst departments.

#### **BUDGET IMPLICATION(S):**

Transfer to Reserve - \$7,211,228 - operating surplus

#### **OPTIONS:**

Option #1 THAT the 2017 Audited Financial Statements be approved as presented in Attachment 'A'.

Option #2 THAT alternative direction be provided.

Respectfully submitted,

"Kent Robinson"

Acting County Manager

BW/bs

#### ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 'A' - 2017 financial statements and supporting documents

# **ROCKY VIEW COUNTY**

# **SECTION I**

# 2017 Year End Financial Statements and Notes to the Financial Statements

April 24, 2018

#### **Independent Auditors' Report**



To the Reeve and Members of Council of Rocky View County:

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of Rocky View County, which comprise the statement of financial position as at December 31, 2017, and the statements of operations, change in net financial assets (net debt), cash flows and schedules 1 through 6 for the year then ended, and a summary of significant accounting policies and other explanatory information.

#### Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards, and for such internal control as management determines is necessary to enable the preparation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

#### Auditors' Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we comply with ethical requirements and plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditors' judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the entity's preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion.

#### Opinion

In our opinion, the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Rocky View County as at December 31, 2017 and the results of its operations, change in net financial assets (net debt) and its cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.

Red Deer, Alberta

April 24, 2018

**Chartered Professional Accountants** 

# ROCKY VIEW COUNTY



#### Statement of Financial Position As at December 31, 2017

FINANCIAL ASSETS	2017 \$	2016 \$ (Note 23)
Investments (Note 2)	85,005,067	82,167,796
Receivables		
Taxes and grants in place of taxes (Note 4)	3,244,999	3,345,194
Trade and other receivables (Note 4)	9,163,208	7,559,638
Debt charges recoverable (Note 5)	700,892 98,114,166	752,416 93,825,044
	90,114,100	93,625,044
LIABILITIES		
Bank indebtedness (Note 3)	5,492,855	2,822,885
Accounts payable and accrued liabilities	8,106,173	4,652,566
Deposit liabilities	5,050,623	5,817,165
Deferred revenue (Note 6)	15,669,053	12,740,025
Employee benefit obligations (Note 7)	1,076,909	1,045,394
Landfill closure and post-closure costs (Note 17)	518,921	545,206
Long-term debt (Note 8)	54,681,047	58,917,378
Capital lease obligations (Note 9)	120,133	199,484
	90,715,714	86,740,103
NET FINANCIAL ASSETS (DEBT)	7,398,452	7,084,941
NON- FINANCIAL ASSETS		
Tangible capital assets (Schedule 2)	584,458,612	566,481,982
Resource asset	16,375,000	16,375,000
Inventory for consumption	1,948,337	1,366,565
Prepaid expenses	529,194	548,609
	603,311,143	584,772,156
ACCUMULATED SURPLUS (Schedule 1, Note 14)	610,709,595	591,857,097

Commitments and contingencies - See Note 11 and 12 The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements



#### ROCKY VIEW COUNTY Statement of Operations For the Year Ended December 31, 2017

	<b>D</b>	0047	0010
	Budget	2017	2016
	\$ (Note 21)	\$	\$ (Note 23)
	(11016 21)		(NOLE 23)
REVENUE			
Net municipal taxes (Schedule 3)	66,088,700	66,838,355	62,924,813
User fees and sales of goods	9,033,400	10,092,852	9,788,878
Cash-In-Lieu of Public Reserve	663,000	706,133	581,073
Government transfers for operating (Schedule 4)	4,111,400	4,324,555	3,502,271
Investment income	550,000	1,348,412	1,045,916
Penalties and cost of taxes	1,029,000	982,618	923,147
Development agreements and levies	8,935,800	6,215,530	4,363,621
Licenses and permits	2,838,000	2,989,451	3,957,631
Fines	722,200	1,220,207	1,099,984
Other	723,100	1,685,698	845,575
Total Revenue	94,694,600	96,403,811	89,032,909
EXPENSES			
Legislative	840,600	814,550	778,746
Administration	17,949,700	30,937,517	16,027,304
Fire	12,055,200	11,704,028	11,692,466
Disaster services	203,500	98,588	56,304
Bylaw enforcement	5,890,700	5,497,394	5,278,617
Transportation and field services	38,942,000	36,752,615	35,799,948
Water supply and distribution	3,641,200	4,091,322	3,811,644
Wastewater treatment and disposal	6,015,200	6,335,356	6,026,095
Waste management	2,853,800	2,453,930	2,228,399
Family and community support	1,068,500	1,035,033	1,084,773
Cemetery	1,575,200	1,412,389	1,166,004
Planning and development	5,120,800	4,053,236	4,143,274
Community services	2,268,400	2,099,625	2,005,395
Recreation and parks	5,913,400	3,851,700	4,715,787
Total Expenses	104,338,200	111,137,283	94,814,756
EXCESS (SHORTFALL) OF REVENUE OVER			
EXPENSES BEFORE OTHER	(9,643,600)	(14,733,472)	(5,781,847)
OTHER			
Contributed assets	-	13,055,635	45,871,170
Government transfers for capital (Schedule 4)	61,497,000	20,530,335	11,811,271
Total Other	61,497,000	33,585,970	57,682,441
EXCESS OF REVENUE OVER EXPENSES	51,853,400	18,852,498	51,900,594
ACCUMULATED SURPLUS, BEGINNING OF YEAR (Note 23)	591,857,097	591,857,097	539,956,503



#### ROCKY VIEW COUNTY Statement of Change in Net Financial Assets (Debt) For the Year Ended December 31, 2017

	Budget \$ (Note 21)	2017 \$	2016 \$ (Note 23)
EXCESS OF REVENUE OVER EXPENSES	51,853,400	18,852,498	51,900,594
Acquisition of tangible capital assets Contributed tangible capital assets Proceeds on disposal of tangible capital assets Amortization of tangible capital assets Loss (gain) on sale of tangible capital assets	(85,224,300) - 108,400 19,777,000 -	(27,066,027) (13,055,635) 329,570 21,983,993 (168,531)	(20,893,629) (45,871,170) 274,958 21,101,652 (263,028)
	(65,338,900)	(17,976,630)	(45,651,217)
Use of (acquisition of) supplies inventories Use of (acquisition of) prepaid assets Use of (acquisition of) resource assets		(581,772) 19,415 -	369,081 910 -
		(562,357)	369,991
DECREASE (INCREASE) IN NET DEBT	(13,485,500)	313,511	6,619,368
NET FINANCIAL ASSET (DEBT), BEGINNING OF YEAR	7,084,941	7,084,941	465,573
NET FINANCIAL ASSETS (DEBT), END OF YEAR	(6,400,559)	7,398,452	7,084,941



# ROCKY VIEW COUNTY Statement of Cash Flows

For the Year Ended	December	31,	2017
--------------------	----------	-----	------

	2017 \$	2016 \$
NET INFLOW (OUTFLOW) OF CASH RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES:		(Note 23)
OPERATING ACTIVITIES		
Excess of revenue over expenses	18,852,498	51,900,594
Non-cash items included in excess of revenue over expenses:		
Amortization of tangible capital assets	21,983,993	21,101,652
Loss (gain) on disposal of tangible capital assets	(168,531)	(263,028)
Tangible capital assets received as contributions	(13,055,635)	(45,871,170)
Non-cash charges to operations (net change):		
Decrease (Increase) in taxes and grants in place of taxes	100,195	(40,482)
(Increase) decrease in trade and other receivables	(1,603,570)	2,477,124
(Increase) decrease in inventory for consumption	(581,772)	369,081
Decrease in prepaid expenses	19,415	910
Increase in accounts payable and accrued liabilities	3,453,607	1,646,852
Increase in accounts payable amount applied to capital	1,055,634	731,142
Decrease in deposit liabilities Increase in deferred revenue	(766,542)	(315,968)
Increase (decrease) in employee benefit obligations	2,929,028 31,515	1,231,699 (9,245)
Decrease in provision for landfill closure and post-closure costs	(26,285)	(16,435)
Decrease in provision for landin closure and post-closure costs	(20,203)	(10,433)
Cash provided by (applied to) operating transactions	32,223,550	32,942,726
CAPITAL		
Accounts payable amount applied to capital	(1,055,634)	(731,142)
Acquisition of assets	(27,066,027)	(20,893,629)
Sale of tangible assets	329,570	274,958
		Burgaria destructiones administra
Cash provided by (applied to) capital transactions	(27,792,091)	(21,349,813)
INVESTING		
Decrease (Increase) in investments	(2,837,271)	(21,254,963)
FINANCING		
Debt charges recovered	51,524	72,895
Capital lease paid	(79,351)	(75,114)
Long-term debt repaid	(4,236,331)	(6,463,413)
Long-term debt raised	<u> </u>	5,416,793
Cash provided by (applied to) financing transactions	(4,264,158)	(1,048,839)
CHANGE IN CASH DURING YEAR	(2,669,970)	(10,710,889)
(BANK INDEBTEDNESS) CASH AT BEGINNING OF YEAR	(2,822,885)	7,888,004
BANK INDEBTEDNESS AT END OF YEAR	(5,492,855)	(2,822,885)

Bank Indebtedness - See Note 3

# DRAFT

#### ROCKY VIEW COUNTY Schedule of Changes in Accumulated Surplus For the Year Ended December 31, 2017 Schedule 1

	Unrestricted Surplus	Restricted Surplus	Equity in Other Assets	Equity in Tangible Capital Assets	2017 \$	2016 (Note 23) \$
BALANCE, BEGINNING OF YEAR, as restated (Note 23)	246,243	67,118,318	16,375,000	508,117,536	591,857,097	539,956,503
Excess (deficiency) of revenue over expenses	18,852,498	-	-	-	18,852,498	51,900,594
Unrestricted funds designated for future use	(18,185,799)	18,185,799	-	=	-	-
Restricted funds used for operations	18,682,006	(18,682,006)	-	=	-	-
Restricted funds use for tangible capital assets	-	(3,958,652)	-	3,958,652	-	-
Current year funds used for assets	(23,107,375)	-	=	23,107,375	/+	-
Contributed tangible capital assets	(13,055,635)	-	-	13,055,635	-	3 <b>5</b> .
Disposal of tangible capital assets	161,039	-	<u>-</u>	(161,039)	-	-
Annual amortization expenses	21,983,993	Ξ.	-	(21,983,993)	-	-
Capital lease paid	(79,351)	-	-	79,351	-	<u>ः च</u> ्
Long term debt repaid net of debt charges recovered	(4,184,807)		-	4,184,807	<u> </u>	
Change in accumulated surplus	1,066,569	(4,454,859)	-	22,240,788	18,852,498	51,900,594
BALANCE, END OF YEAR	1,312,812	62,663,459	16,375,000	530,358,324	610,709,595	591,857,097



#### ROCKY VIEW COUNTY Schedule of Tangible Capital Assets For the Year Ended December 31, 2017 Schedule 2

		Land		Engineered	Machinery and		2017	2016 (Note 23)
	Land	Improvements	Buildings	Structures	Equipment	Vehicles	\$	\$
COST: BALANCE, BEGINNING OF YEAR (Note 23)	108,952,634	530,728	56,853,164	879,282,617	13,815,079	15,671,967	1,075,106,189	1,009,692,822
Acquisition of tangible capital assets	3,379,101	221,429	376,900	13,080,830	858,545	785,206	18,702,011	56,248,391
Acquisition of tangible capital assets, capital lease Construction-in-progress, net Disposal of tangible capital assets	2,846,752 (17,021)	-	16,172,258	2,659,770 (145,406)	71,102 (172,574)	(330,231) (506,216)	21,419,651 (841,217)	10,516,408 (1,351,432)
BALANCE, END OF YEAR	115,161,466	752,157	73,402,322	894,877,811	14,572,152	15,620,726	1,114,386,634	1,075,106,189
ACCUMULATED AMORTIZATION: BALANCE, BEGINNING OF YEAR	-	28,764	7,947,732	483,227,991	9,743,252	7,676,468	508,624,207	488,862,057
Annual Amortization Annual Amortization, capital lease Accumulated amortization on disposals	-	33,242	970,349 - -	19,087,361 - (36,140)	839,297 31,800 (148,147)	1,021,944 - (495,891)	21,952,193 31,800 (680,178)	21,069,852 31,800 (1,339,502)
BALANCE, END OF YEAR	-	62,006	8,918,081	502,279,212	10,466,202	8,202,521	529,928,022	508,624,207
NET BOOK VALUE OF TANGIBLE CAPITAL ASSETS	115,161,466	690,151	64,484,241	392,598,599	4,105,950	7,418,205	584,458,612	566,481,982
2016 NET BOOK VALUE OF TANGIBLE CAPITAL ASSETS (Note 23)	108,952,634	501,964	48,905,432	396,054,626	4,071,827	7,995,499	566,481,982	



### ROCKY VIEW COUNTY Schedule of Property and Other Taxes For the Year ended December 31, 2017 Schedule 3

	Budget	2017	2016
	\$	\$	\$
	(Note 21)		
TAXATION			
Real property taxes	97,558,333	98,174,857	91,970,359
Linear property taxes	13,283,277	13,367,220	12,279,984
Governments grants in place of property taxes	206,790	208,098	205,321
Special assessments and local improvement taxes	434,000	429,286	508,360
	111,482,400	112,179,461	104,964,024
REQUISITIONS FROM OTHER AUTHORITIES			
Alberta School Foundation Fund	41,374,500	41,261,416	38,250,555
Calgary Roman Catholic Separate School District	3,394,900	3,455,408	3,160,147
Rocky View Seniors Foundation	624,300	624,282	628,509
	45,393,700	45,341,106	42,039,211

66,088,700

66,838,355

62,924,813

# NET MUNICIPAL TAXES



#### ROCKY VIEW COUNTY Schedule of Government Transfers

For the Year Ended December 31, 2017

	Schedule 4		
	Budget \$ (Note 21)	2017 \$	2016 \$
TRANSFERS FOR OPERATING: Provincial Government Federal Government	4,111,400  4,111,400	4,324,555	3,502,271
TRANSFERS FOR CAPITAL: Provincial Government Federal Government	61,497,000 - 61,497,000	20,530,335 - 20,530,335	11,811,271 - 11,811,271
TOTAL GOVERNMENT TRANSFERS	65,608,400	24,854,890	15,313,542

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements

AGENDA Page 24 of 410

# ROCKY VIEW COUNTY Schedule of Expenses by Object For the Year Ended December 31, 2017



Schedule 5

	Budget	2017	2016
	\$	\$	\$
EXPENSES BY OBJECT	(Note 21)		
Salaries, wages and benefits	37,212,300	36,592,268	35,409,461
Contracted and general services	30,488,200	38,137,884	24,151,728
Materials, goods and supplies	7,478,600	6,680,308	5,820,473
Interest on long-term debt	1,409,850	1,596,885	1,497,569
Interest on capital lease	9,400	8,989	13,225
Purchased from other Governments	905,600	673,187	637,879
Grants to organizations	4,678,800	3,473,508	4,594,365
Grants to Municipal agencies	2,141,800	1,472,961	1,365,290
Other	236,650	517,300	223,114
Amortization of tangible capital assets	19,777,000	21,983,993	21,101,652
Loss on disposal of tangible capital assets			
TOTAL EXPENSES	104,338,200	111,137,283	94,814,756

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements

AGENDA Page 25 of 410

#### ROCKY VIEW COUNTY Schedule of Segmented Disclosure For the Year Ended December 31, 2017



		Schedule 6				
	General	Emergency	1&0	Planning &	Community	Total
-	Government	Services	Services	Development	Services	\$
REVENUE						
Net municipal taxes	66,838,355	-	-	-	-	66,838,355
Government transfers	16,101,307	72,057	7,214,630	191,720	1,275,176	24,854,890
User fees and sales of goods	284,188	531,563	6,284,376	1,530,822	1,461,903	10,092,85
Investment income	1,348,412	<del></del>	-	3 <del>4</del>	-	1,348,41
Contributed assets	-	-	13,055,635	-	-	13,055,63
Other revenues	1,276,112	1,418,155	7,409,798	2,989,439	706,133	13,799,63
	85,848,374	2,021,775	33,964,439	4,711,981	3,443,212	129,989,78
EXPENSES						
Salaries, wages and benefits	8,602,186	10,167,160	12,120,611	5,248,491	453,820	36,592,26
Contracted and general services	18,581,966	601,833	16,707,506	1,631,072	615,507	38,137,88
Materials, goods and supplies	206,755	223,339	6,158,705	59,455	32,054	6,680,30
Transfers to local boards	2,175,652	79,000	-	•	2,691,817	4,946,46
Long-term debt interest	( <del>1</del>	59,995	1,536,890	-	-	1,596,88
Capital lease interest	-	-	8,989	-	-	8,98
Other expenses	419,513	673,187	97,787			1,190,48
	29,986,072	11,804,514	36,630,488	6,939,018	3,793,198	89,153,29
NET REVENUE, BEFORE AMORTIZATION	55,862,302	(9,782,739)	(2,666,049)	(2,227,037)	(349,986)	40,836,49
Amortization expenses	216,264	887,228	20,877,343	3,158	-	21,983,99
EXCESS (DEFFICIENCY) OF REVENUE OVER EXPENSES	55,646,038	(10,669,967)	(23,543,392)	(2,230,195)	(349,986)	18,852,49

**ROCKY VIEW COUNTY** 

NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

DRA Fage 15 of 55

#### **DECEMBER 31, 2017**

#### NOTE 1: SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

These financial statements of Rocky View County (the "County") are the representations of management prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles for local governments established by the Public Sector Accounting Board (PSAB) of the Canadian Institute of Chartered Professional Accountants. Significant aspects of the accounting policies adopted by the County are outlined as follows:

#### **Reporting Entity**

The financial statements reflect the assets, liabilities, revenues and expenditures, changes in fund balances and change in financial position of Rocky View County.

The schedule of taxes levied also includes requisitions for education, health, social and other external organizations that are not part of Rocky View County.

The financial statements exclude trust assets that are administered for the benefit for external parties. Interdepartmental and organizational transactions and balances are eliminated.

#### Basis of Accounting

The financial statements are prepared using the accrual basis of accounting. The accrual basis of accounting records revenue as it is earned and measurable. Expenses are recognized as they are incurred and measurable based upon receipt of goods or services and/or the legal obligation to pay.

#### **Revenue Recognition**

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

Government transfers, contributions and other amounts are received from third parties pursuant to legislation, regulation or agreement and may only be used for certain programs, in the completion of specific work, or for the purchase of tangible capital assets. In addition, certain user charges and fees are collected for which the related services have yet to be performed. Revenue is recognized in the period when the related expenses are incurred, services performed or the tangible capital assets are acquired. Revenue on investments, fines and penalties are recognized when earned.

#### Tax Revenue

The County recognized taxes as assets and revenue when they meet the definition of an asset, are authorized by bylaw, and the taxable event has occurred. Tax Revenue is initially measured at administrations best estimate of the amount resulting from the original taxable event in accordance with legislation. The related tax receivable is initially recognized at its realizable value at the date of acquisition.

Requisitions operate as a flow through and are excluded from municipal revenue.

ROCKY VIEW COUNTY DRAFPage 16 of 55 NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

#### **DECEMBER 31, 2017**

#### **Government Transfers**

Government transfers are the transfer of assets from senior levels of government that are not the result of an exchange transaction, are not expected to be repaid in the future, or the result of a direct financial return.

Government transfers are recognized in the financial statements as revenue in the period in which events giving rise to the transfer occur, providing the transfers are authorized, any eligibility criteria have been met, and reasonable estimates of the amounts can be determined.

#### **Use of Estimates**

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with Canadian Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and in conjunction with the Public Services Accounting Board (PSAB) requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amount of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements, and the reported amounts of revenue and expenditure during the period. Where measurement uncertainty exists, the financial statements have been prepared within reasonable limits of materiality. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

Accounts receivable are stated after evaluation as to their collectability. Amortization is based on the estimated useful lives of tangible assets. Reclamation, closure and post-closure liabilities are calculated based on management's best estimates of costs and timing.

#### Investments

Investments are recorded at amortized cost. Investment premiums and discounts are amortized on the net present value basis over the term of the respective investments. When there has been a loss in value that is other than a temporary decline, the respective investment is written down to recognize the loss.

#### **Debt Charges Recoverable**

Debt charges recoverable consist of amounts that are recoverable from municipal agencies or other local governments with respect to outstanding debentures or other long-term debt pursuant to annexation orders or joint capital undertakings. These recoveries are recorded at a value that equals the offsetting portion of the un-matured long-term debt.

#### **Local Improvement Charges**

Construction and borrowing costs associated with local improvement projects are recovered through annual special assessments during the period of related borrowings. These levies are collectable from property owners for work performed by Rocky View County.

#### Inventories

Inventories held for consumption are recorded at the lower of cost or net realizable value with the cost determined by the average cost method.

> AGENDA Page 28 of 410

DRA age 17 of 55

NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

**ROCKY VIEW COUNTY** 

**DECEMBER 31, 2017** 

#### Landfill Closure and Post-Closure Liability

Pursuant to the Alberta Environment Protection and Enhancement Act, the County is required to fund the closure of its landfill sites and provide for post-closure care of the facility. Closure and post-closure activities include the final clay cover, landscaping, as well as surface and ground water monitoring, leachate control, and visual inspection. The requirement is being provided for over the estimated remaining life of the landfill sites based on usage.

#### Liability for Contaminated Sites

Contaminated sites are a result of contamination being introduced into air, soil, water or sediment of a chemical, organic or radioactive material or live organism that exceeds an environmental standard. The liability is recorded net of any expected recoveries. A liability for remediation of a contaminated site is recognized when a site is not in productive use and is management's estimate of the cost of post remediation including operation, maintenance and monitoring.

#### **Non-Financial Assets**

Non-financial assets are not available to discharge existing liabilities and are held for use in the provision of services. They have useful lives extending beyond the current year and are not intended for sale in the normal course of operations. The change in non-financial assets during the year, together with the excess of revenues over expenses, provides the Change in Net Financial Assets (Debt) for the year.

#### i) Tangible Capital Assets

Tangible capital assets are recorded at cost which includes all amounts that are directly attributable to acquisition, construction, development or betterment of the asset. The cost, less residual value, of the tangible capital assets is amortized on a straight-line basis over the estimated useful life as follows:

	YEARS	
Land Improvements	15-20	
Buildings	10-50	
Engineered structures		
Water system	30-75	
Wastewater system	30-75	
Other engineered structures	5-25	
Machinery and equipment (owned and leased)	3-10	
Vehicles	8-20	

One-half of the annual amortization is charged in the year of acquisition and in the year of disposal. Assets under construction are not amortized until the asset is available for productive use.

#### ii) Contributions of Tangible Capital Assets

Tangible capital assets received as contributions are recorded at fair value at the date of receipt and also are recorded as revenue.

DRAPage 18 of

# ROCKY VIEW COUNTY NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS DECEMBER 31, 2017

#### iii) Resource Asset

The water licenses are recorded at cost and have been assessed with an indefinite life. The assets will not be amortized and impairment will be reviewed when there are indicators of a decline in value.

#### iv) Capital Leases

Leases are classified as capital or operating leases. A lease that transfers substantially all of the benefits and risks incidental to ownership of property are accounted for as capital leases. At the inception of a capital lease, an asset and payment obligation is recorded at an amount equal to the lesser of the present value of the minimum lease payments and the property's fair market value. All other leases are accounted for as operating leases and the related lease payments are charged to expenses as incurred.

An arrangement contains a lease where the arrangement conveys a right to use the underlying tangible asset, and whereby its fulfilment is dependent on the use of the specific tangible asset. After the inception of the arrangement, a reassessment of whether the arrangement contains a lease is made only in the event that:

- There is a change in contractual terms;
- A renewal option is exercised or an extension is agreed upon by the parties to the arrangement;
- There is a change in the determination of whether the fulfilment of the arrangement is dependent on the use of the specific tangible asset; or
- There is a substantial physical change to the specified tangible asset.

#### **Requisition Over-levy and Under-levy**

Over-levies and under-levies arise from the difference between the actual property tax levy made to cover each requisition and the actual amount requisitioned.

If the actual levy exceeds the requisition, the over-levy is accrued as a liability and property tax revenue is reduced. Where the actual levy is less than the requisition amount, the under-levy is accrued as a receivable and as property tax revenue.

Requisition tax rates in the subsequent year are adjusted for any over-levies or under-levies of the prior year.

#### Pensions

The County participates in two multi-employer pension plans. The plan is accounted for as a defined contribution plan. Contributions for current services are recorded as expenditures in the year in which they become due.

#### Funds Held in Trust

The County held \$ 381,328 in a Cemetery Perpetual Care Trust Account as at December 31, 2017 (2016 - \$ 432,493).

DRA Fage 19 of 55

NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

**ROCKY VIEW COUNTY** 

#### **DECEMBER 31, 2017**

#### Segmented Disclosure

The County conducts its business through a number of reportable segments. The operating segments are established by management and facilitate the achievement of long-term objectives and aid in resource allocation decision. For each reported segment, revenues and expenses represent both amounts that are directly attributable to the segment and amounts that are allocated on a reasonable basis. The accounting policies used in these segments are consistent with those followed in the preparation of the financial statements.

#### **NOTE 2: INVESTMENTS**

	2017	2016
Investments	<u>\$ 85,005,067</u>	<u>\$ 82,167,796</u>

Investments have effective interest rates of 1.50% to 2.00% (2016 – 1.21% to 1.85%) and mature in less than one year.

Investments include funds that are designated for developer's refundable deposits, public reserve funds and grant funds for capital and operating expenditures.

#### **NOTE 3: BANK INDEBTEDNESS**

	2017	2016
Cash in bank Outstanding cheques	\$ 4,391,536 (9,884,391)	\$    2,502,797 (5,325,682)
	<u>\$ (5,492,855)</u>	<u>\$ (2,822,885)</u>

The County has a \$5,000,000 (2016 - \$5,000,000) unsecured operating line of credit with ATB Financial. This line of credit bears interest, when utilized, at  $\frac{1}{4}$  % below the prime lending rate as established by ATB Financial. The outstanding balance at year end is \$ Nil (2016 - \$ Nil).

#### NOTE 4: RECEIVABLES

	 2017	 2016
Property Taxes Current taxes and grants in place of taxes Arrears taxes	\$ 2,222,592 1.022,407	\$ 2,275,054 1,070,140
	\$ 3.244.999	\$ 3.345.194

#### **ROCKY VIEW COUNTY**



#### NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

#### **DECEMBER 31, 2017**

Other Trade Accounts Fuel Tax Rebate GST	\$	8,465,550 12,453 685,205	\$	7,034,652 8,334 516,652
	<u>\$</u>	9,163,208	<u>\$</u>	7,559,638
Total	<u>\$</u>	12,408,207	<u>\$</u>	10,904,832

#### NOTE 5: DEBT CHARGES RECOVERABLE

	2017	2016
Current debt charges recoverable Non-current debt charges recoverable	\$    54,140 <u>    646,752</u>	\$
	<u>\$ 700,892</u>	<u>\$ 752,416</u>

The County has secured long-term financing on behalf of several community organizations for joint projects within the County. This debt is recoverable from the organizations at interest rates from 4.758% to 5.250%. The debts mature and will be fully recovered starting in the year 2023 and ending in 2032.

2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 Thereafter	Principal           \$ 54,140           56,888           59,777           62,812           66,001           401,274           \$ 700,892	<u>Interest</u> \$ 34,246 31,498 28,610 25,574 22,385 <u>97,102</u> <u>\$ 239,415</u>	<u>Total</u> \$ 88,386 88,387 88,386 88,386 <u>498,376</u> <u>\$ 940,307</u>
NOTE 6: DEFERRED REVENUE Prepaid property tax Deferred grant revenue Developer contributions Other deferred revenue		2017 \$ 123,103 12,961,667 80,825 2,503,458 \$ 15,669,053	2016 \$ 188,350 10,052,355 180,825 2,318,495 \$ 12,740,025

#### NOTE 7: EMPLOYEE BENEFIT OBLIGATIONS

	2017	2016
Vacation	<u>\$ 1,076,909</u>	<u>\$ 1,045,394</u>

The vacation liability is comprised of the vacation that employees are deferring to futuragenerate Page 32 of 410

DRA Fage 21

#### **ROCKY VIEW COUNTY**

NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

#### **DECEMBER 31, 2017**

Employees have either earned the benefit (and are vested) or are entitled to these benefits within the next budgetary year.

#### NOTE 8: LONG-TERM DEBT

Operating debt, maturing between 2023 and 2032,	2017	2016
bearing interest at rates between 4.758% and 5.250%	\$ 700,892	\$ 752,416
Capital debt, maturing between 2018 and 2046, bearing	÷ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	¢,
variable and fixed interest rates at	53,980,155	58,164,962
between 1.637% and 4.057%	<u>\$ 54,681,047</u>	<u>\$ 58,917,378</u>
Funding for future payments from:		
General Tax	\$ 206,330	\$ 234,970
Emergency Services Tax	1,843,579	2,441,598
Local Improvement Tax	5,938,399	6,043,348
Special Levy	46,592,720	50,080,774
User Fees	<u>    100,019</u>	116,688
	<u>\$ 54,681,047</u>	<u>\$ 58,917,378</u>

Debenture debt is issued on the credit and security of the County at large.

Principal and interest repayments are as follows, assuming debt will be renewed at similar terms as it comes due:

	<u>Capital</u>	Interest	Operating	Interest	Total
2018	\$ 3,901,357	\$ 1,378,814	\$ 54,140	\$ 34,246	\$ 5,368,557
2019	3,882,196	1,283,820	56,888	31,498	5,254,402
2020	3,417,523	1,191,441	59,777	28,610	4,697,351
2021	3,428,340	1,104,533	62,812	25,574	4,621,259
2022	3,439,539	1,017,244	66,001	22,385	4,545,169
Remainder	35,911,200	7,528,170	<u>401,274</u>	97,102	<u>43,937,746</u>
Total	<u>\$ 53,980,155</u>	<u>\$ 13,504,022</u>	<u>\$ 700,892</u>	<u>\$ 239,415</u>	<u>\$ 68,424,484</u>

Of the \$700,892 in principal payments to be made in future years on operating debt, all will be paid from tax levies and local improvement tax.

Of the \$53,980,155 in principal payments to be made in future years on capital debt, all will be paid from user fees, special levies, local improvement tax and tax levies.

Interest expense on long-term debt amounted to \$ 1,596,885 (2016 - \$ 1,497,569). The County's total cash payments for interest were \$ 1,611,016 (2016 - \$ 1,488,705).

DRAPage 22 of 55

#### **ROCKY VIEW COUNTY**

#### NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

#### **DECEMBER 31, 2017**

#### NOTE 9: CAPITAL LEASE OBLIGATIONS

	2017	2016
Obligation under capital lease payable in monthly		
Instalments of \$7,362 including interest at	120,133	199,484
5.499%, due at every month end		

Future minimum lease payments related to obligations under capital lease are as follows:

	2018	88,340
	2019	<u>36,808</u>
		125,148
Less: imputed interest		<u>(5,015)</u>
		<u>\$ 120,133</u>

Capital lease obligations are secured by related property, plant and equipment having a net book value of \$ 238,500 in 2017 (\$ 270,300 in 2016).

#### NOTE 10: PENSION PLANS

#### Local Authorities Pension Plan (LAPP)

Employees of the County participate in the Local Authorities Pension Plan ("LAPP" or the "Plan"), which is covered by the Public Sector Pension Plans Act. This plan is financed by employer and employee contributions and by investment earnings of the LAPP Fund. Contributions for current service are recorded as expenditures in the year in which they become due.

Rocky View County is required to make current service contributions to the Plan of 11.39% of pensionable earnings up to the year's maximum pensionable earnings under the Canada Pension Plan (CPP), and 15.84% of pensionable earnings above this amount. Employees of the County are required to make current service contributions of 10.39% of pensionable earnings up to the year's maximum pensionable earnings and 14.84% on pensionable earnings above this amount.

Total employer contributions by Rocky View County to the LAPP in 2017 were \$ 2,602,778 (2016 - \$ 2,474,288). Total contributions by the employees of Rocky View County to the LAPP in 2017 were \$ 2,418,237 (2016 - \$ 2,283,638).

At December 31, 2016, the date of the most recent actuarial valuation, the Plan disclosed an actuarial deficiency of \$637,357 million (2015 - \$923,416 million).

#### **APEX Supplementary Pension Plan**

The APEX Supplementary Pension Plan, an Alberta Urban Municipality Association (AUMA) sponsored defined benefit pension plan covered under the provisions of the Alberta Employment Pensions Plans Act, commenced in 2008 and provides supplementary pension plan benefits. The plan supplements the Local Authorities Pension Plan.

The County Manager and General Managers of the County can participate in the APEX Supplementary Pension Plan. APEX is financed by Employer and Employee contributions and investment earnings of the APEX fund. Contributions for current service are recorded as expenditures in the year in which there are the terms of the APEX fund.

DRAP ge 73 of 55

NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

**ROCKY VIEW COUNTY** 

#### DECEMBER 31, 2017

become due.

Rocky View County makes current service contributions to the plan of 3.78% of pensionable earnings up to the APEX maximum earnings of \$145,722. Eligible employees of the County can make current service contributions of 2.84% of earnings up to the APEX maximum earnings of \$145,722. Total employer contributions by Rocky View County to APEX in 2017 amounted to \$22,033 (2016 - \$17,340). Total contributions by employees of the County to APEX amounted to \$16,554 for the 2017 year (2016 - \$14,450).

The cost of post-retirement benefits earned by employees is actuarially determined using the projected benefit method prorated on service and administration's best estimate of salary and benefit escalation and retirement ages of employees. The costs of post-retirement benefits are fully funded.

#### NOTE 11: COMMITMENTS & CONTINGENCIES

No provision has been made on the statement of financial position for the various lawsuits and legal claims filed against the County as the extent of the lawsuits and legal claims are not determinable at December 31, 2017. The amount of any future settlement would be accounted for in the year the losses are determined.

The County has entered into equipment leases. The commitments for the next 5 years are as follows:

Operating

	-pg
2018	\$ 686,484
2019	\$ 551,587
2020	\$ 548,505
2021	\$ 548,505
2022	\$ 275,615

The County has entered into architectural building design and construction agreements for the new Administrative Building with an estimated amount payable of \$ 10,309,099. The County has also entered into an agreement to perform Flood Mitigation work in the Bragg Creek area with an estimated amount payable of \$ 891,126.

The County has contributed resources to an aquatic facility located on lands owned 50/50 by the County and the Town of Cochrane. As there is not currently a definitive ownership agreement in place, it is not possible to recognize the contributions as an asset or consider if additional assets have been acquired. Negotiations are expected to occur in 2018 whether an asset has been acquired and the amount of the acquisition.

#### NOTE 12: RECIPROCAL INSURANCE EXCHANGE MEMBERSHIPS

The County was a member of the Genesis Reciprocal Insurance Exchange and the Jubilee Reciprocal Insurance Exchange as at December 31, 2017. Under the terms of the membership, the County could become liable for its proportionate share of any claim losses in excess of the funds held by the exchange. Any liability incurred would be accounted for as a current transaction in the year the losses are determined.

AGENDA Page 35 of 410

DRA Physe I4

### ROCKY VIEW COUNTY

NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

#### **DECEMBER 31, 2017**

#### NOTE 13: DEBT LIMITS

Section 276(2) of the Municipal Government Act and related provincial regulations require that the debt and debt limits, as defined by Alberta Regulation 255/00, for the County, be disclosed as follows:

	2017	2016
Total debt limit	144,605,717	133,549,364
Total long term debt	_ <u>(54,801,180)</u>	<u>(59,116,862)</u>
Total amount of debt limit unused	<u>\$ 89,804,537</u>	<u>\$74,432,502</u>
Debt Servicing Limit	24,100,953	22,258,227
Debt Servicing	<u>(5,456,897)</u>	(4,777,135)
Amount of Debt Servicing Limit unused	<u>\$18,644,056</u>	\$17,481,092

The debt limit is calculated at 1.5 times revenue of the County (as defined in Alberta Regulation 255/00) and the debt service limit is calculated at 0.25 times such revenue. Incurring debt beyond these limitations requires approval by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. These thresholds are guidelines used by Alberta Municipal Affairs to identify municipalities that could be at financial risk if further debt is acquired. The calculation taken alone does not represent the financial stability of the County; rather, the financial statements must be interpreted as a whole.

#### NOTE 14: ACCUMULATED SURPLUS

	2017	<u>2016</u> (Note 23)
Unrestricted surplus	7,211,227	6,144,658
Capital deficit	<u>(5,898,415)</u> <u>\$    1,312,812</u>	<u>(5,898,415)</u> <u>\$246,243</u>
Restricted surplus		
Reserve funds	\$ 3,802,759	\$ 4.259.548
General Operating Roads	\$    3,802,759 1,942,661	\$   4,259,548 1,173,733
Offsite Levies	19,767,086	17,444,626
Tax Stabilization	19,791,292	28,588,610
Utility	703,693	539,068
Public	12,206,560	11,741,039
Equipment	3,650,519	2,581,605
Voluntary Recreation	798,889	790,089
Equity in water license	16,375,000	16,375,000
Equity in tangible capital assets (Note 19)	530,358,324	508,117,536
	<u>\$ 610,709,595</u>	<u> </u>
	$\frac{1}{2}$ 010,703,333	<u>Ψ 331,031,031</u>
**Attachment 'A'** 

DRAP ge 75 of 55

NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

**ROCKY VIEW COUNTY** 

# **DECEMBER 31, 2017**

#### NOTE 15: FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS

The County's financial instruments consist of cash and temporary investments, accounts receivable, investments, debt charges recoverable, bank indebtedness, accounts payable and accrued liabilities, employee benefit obligations, deposit liabilities, long-term debt, and capital lease obligations. It is managements' opinion that the County is not exposed to significant interest or currency risks arising from these financial instruments.

The County is subject to credit risk with respect to taxes and grants in place of taxes, accounts receivable and debt charges recoverable. Credit risk arises from the possibility that taxpayers and entities to which the County provides services may experience financial difficulty and be unable to fulfil their obligations. The large number and diversity of taxpayers and customers minimizes the credit risk.

Unless otherwise noted, the carrying value of the financial instrument approximates fair value.

SALANT AND BENELTI DISCEOSORE

NOTE 16: SALARY AND BENEELT DISCLOSURE

	No. of Persons	Salary \$	Benefits & Allowances \$	Total 2017 \$	No. of Persons	Total 2016 \$
Councillors:		-				
Division 1	2	46,782	33,097	79,879	1	76,436
Division 2	2	44,932	32,208	77,140	1	75,779
Division 3	2	47,232	28,690	75,922	1	72,517
Division 4	2	44,932	31,961	76,893	1	78,755
Division 5	2	50,016	29,683	79,699	1	78,244
Division 6	1	60,695	40,999	101,694	1	99,799
Division 7	2	44,932	31,451	76,383	1	75,239
Division 8	2	45,532	32,224	77,756	1	75,797
Division 9	2	46,882	33,272	80,154	1	78,156
County Manager	1	244,228	40,977	285,205	1	277,425
Designated Officers	2	227,281	31,836	259,117	2	258,610

Salaries and benefits for elected Municipal Officials, the County Manager and the Designated Officers as required by Alberta Regulation 313/2000, is disclosed as follows:

(1) Salary includes regular base pay, bonuses, overtime, lump sum payments, gross honoraria and any other direct cash remuneration.

- (2) Elected Officials: Benefits & Allowances include the County's contribution and payments for Canada Pension Plan (CPP), Workers Compensation Board (WCB), dental coverage, vision coverage, group life insurance, accidental disability and dismemberment insurance, travel allowance and general expense allowance.
- (3) County Manager/Designated Officers: Benefits & Allowances include the County's contribution and payments for Canada Pension Plan (CPP), Workers Compensation Board (WCB), employment insurance, extended health care, dental coverage, vision coverage, group life insurance, accidental disability and dismemberment insurance, local authorities pension plan (LAPP), and APEX Supplementary Pension Plan.
  AGENDA
  Page 37 of 410

Attachment 'A'

**ROCKY VIEW COUNTY** 

NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

DRA Fage 26 of 55

#### **DECEMBER 31, 2017**

#### NOTE 17: LANDFILL CLOSURE AND POST-CLOSURE LIABILITY

Pursuant to the Alberta Environment Protection and Enhancement Act, the County is required to fund the closure of its landfill sites and provide for post-closure care of the facility. Closure and post-closure activities include the final clay cover, landscaping, pumping of ground water and leachates from the site, and ongoing environmental monitoring, site inspection and maintenance.

The County is responsible for landfill sites which have been capped and closed with no further useful life and capacity. No performance bonds have been paid on the sites and no assets have been specifically allocated to these sites.

The estimated total liability is based on the sum of discounted future cash flows of post closure activities for the remainder of the terms (between 17 years and 20 years) using a discount rate of 3.41 %.

The total estimated liability is \$ 518,921, of which \$ 518,921 has been accrued as a liability.

	2017	2016
Estimated post-closure costs	518,921	545,206
Estimated total liability	<u>\$                                    </u>	<u>\$                                    </u>

#### NOTE 18: CONTAMINATED SITES LIABILITY

On January 1, 2015, the County adopted PS 3260 Liability for Contaminated Sites. The standard was applied on a retroactive basis and did not result in any adjustments to the financial liabilities, tangible capital assets or accumulated surplus of the County. During 2017 the County did not identify any sites that qualify as contaminated under PS 3260 and therefore no Contaminated Sites Liability was required.

#### NOTE 19: EQUITY IN TANGIBLE CAPITAL ASSETS

	2017	<u>2016</u> (Note 23)
Tangible capital assets (Schedule 2) Accumulated amortization (Schedule 2) Long-term debt (Note 8) Capital lease (Note 9) Debt charges recoverable (Note 5)	\$ 1,114,386,634 (529,928,022) (54,681,047) (120,133) <u>700,892</u>	\$ 1,075,106,189 (508,624,207) (58,917,378) (199,484) <u>752,416</u>
	<u>\$ 530,358,324</u>	<u>\$ 508,117,536</u>

Attachment 'A'

DRA age 27 of 55

NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

**ROCKY VIEW COUNTY** 

# DECEMBER 31, 2017

### NOTE 20: COMPARATIVE FIGURES

Certain prior year corresponding figures have been restated to conform to the current year's presentation.

#### NOTE 21: BUDGET

The budget figures presented in these financial statements are based on the budget approved by council on April 25, 2017 and subsequent budget adjustments are not included.

#### NOTE 22: APPROVAL OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Council and Management have approved these financial statements.

#### NOTE 23: PRIOR PERIOD ADJUSTMENT

During the year it was determined that land which had been contributed to the County in 2006 – 2016 had not been recorded. As a result, the comparative figures have been restated. The effect of this prior period adjustment is an increase in tangible capital assets of \$20,675,961, an increase in 2016 contributed assets and excess of revenue over expenses of \$9,721,000, an increase in 2016 opening accumulated surplus of \$10,954,961 and an increase in 2016 ending accumulated surplus of \$20,675,961.



# **ROCKY VIEW COUNTY**

# **Financial Statement Variance Analysis**

For The Year Ending December 31, 2017

# Statement of Financial Position - Year over Year

The Statement of Financial Position reports on the County's assets, liabilities and accumulated surplus as at December 31, 2017. Material changes have been identified and analyzed as follows.

#### FINANCIAL ASSETS

**Investments** – Increased due to improved cash flow predictions resulting in an excess amount available for investments.

**Trade and other receivables** - This change is due to; a) Increased accrual of receivables to the amount of \$ 533k from Rocky View School Division for the Langdon Joint Use Project, b) Increased trade receivables of \$ 559k, c) Increased GST refunds \$ 168k and d) Increased accrued investment interest of \$344k.

#### **LIABILITIES**

**Bank Indebtedness** – This increase is due to a timing difference between investment maturity and outstanding accounts payable payments and is of a temporary nature (\$ 2,670m).

Accounts payable and accrued liabilities – This change is due to; a) Increased developer holdbacks of \$ 976k, b) Increased trade payables and accrued trade payables \$ 1,941m, c) Increase in Cemetery perpetual care trust due \$ 274k and d) Accrued provincial School requisition of \$ 304k.

**Deposit liabilities** – This change is due to the repayment of refundable development deposits (\$ 760k).

**Deferred revenue** – This change is due to; a) Increase in grant funding available for already committed to projects of \$ 2,909m and b) Increased unearned Cemetery revenue of \$ 168k.

**Long term debt** – This change is due to the pay down of net outstanding debt for the 2017 year of (\$ 4,236m).

#### **NON-FINANCIAL ASSETS**

**Tangible capital assets** – This change is due to the construction, contribution and amortization of capital assets with the main contributors being; a) New Municipal campus of \$ 16,223m, b) Contributed engineering structures of \$ 1,505m and c) Decreased amortization charges \$ 250k.

**Inventory for consumption** – This change is due to an increase in gravel inventories of \$ 582k.

# Statement of Operations – Budget to Actual – December 31, 2017

The Statement of Operations reports on revenue, expenses, contributed assets, grants applied to projects and the change in the accumulated surplus for the period of January 1 to December 31, 2017.

# **REVENUE**

**Net municipal taxes** – The actual revenue is increased over budget due to the collection of unexpected linear taxes.

**User fees** – These fees consist of payments from rate payers for various services provided by the County. This variance is due to; a) Increased Fire response and Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation (Emergency Response Recovery) revenue \$ 219k, b) Increased planning and related fees for statutory projects \$ 276k, c) Increased cemetery plot sales \$ 267k and d) Re-imbursement for Inter Municipal Agreements, Area Structure Plan's and Alberta Community Partnership Programs \$ 230k .

**Cash-in-Lieu of public reserve** – This revenue is received from developers who are required to contribute land or cash in lieu of land to the County. This variance is due to increased collection of cash in lieu of land payments within the County.

**Government transfers for operating** – This line consists of transfers (grants) from various levels of Government. This variance is due to; a) Reimbursement received relating to the 2015 flood for \$ 595K, b) Unapplied (timing) Flood Recovery and Erosion Control grant (\$ 465k) and c) Receipt of Alberta Community Partnership Grant \$ 96k.

**Investment income** – This line consists of the investment of surplus funds held by the County. This variance is due to better negotiated interest rates and effective timing of cash flows.

**Development agreements and levies** – This line consists of special levies collected from developers. They include transportation, water and wastewater levies. This variance is due to; a) Decreased East Rocky View development levies (\$ 2,455m), b) Decreased Bragg Creek development levy (\$ 103k), c) Decreased transportation levies (\$ 235k), d) Increased storm water levy \$ 63k.

**Licenses and permits** – Licenses and permits relate to the issuance of development and building permits across the County. This variance is due to increased issuance of building related permits within the County of \$ 223k.

**Fines** – Fines consist of revenue from various bylaw violations. This variance is due to the increased issuance of fines of \$ 481k.

**Other** – Other revenue consists of cost recoveries from other local governments, oil well drilling tax, annexation compensation. The variance is due to; a) Increased Langdon joint use funding from Rocky View Schools \$ 865k, b) Capital adjustment \$37k.

# **EXPENSES**

Administration services – These services include Council, County Manager/General Manager's office, Human Resources, Financial services, Communications, Legislative services, Corporate properties, and Information technology. This variance is due to; a) Unspent training (\$ 239k), b) Position savings (\$ 369k), c) Decreased printing and advertising (\$ 177k), d) Unspent engineering fees (\$ 152k), e) Unspent information technology costs (\$ 274k), f) Unanticipated, Council approved legal settlement \$ 14m, g) Increased legal expenses \$ 723k, h) Other Human Resources initiatives (\$ 83k), i) Ongoing strategic planning (\$ 128k) and j) Unspent utility and building maintenance (\$ 313k).

Disaster Management Services – The variance is due to unspent funds of (\$ 113k).

**Fire services** – This service provides Fire protection to all areas of Rocky View County. This variance is due to decreased mutual aid contracts (\$ 238k).

**Bylaw enforcement** – These services include Bylaw/Traffic enforcement and Building permits. This variance is due to; a) Reduced 911 dispatch services (\$ 84k), b) Reduced enhanced RCMP costs (\$ 90k), c) Reduced services (\$ 83k), and d) Position Savings (\$ 135k).

**Transportation and field services** – This service consists of road construction, maintenance, engineering, construction of capital projects and fleet services. This variance is due to; a) Decreased fleet operations parts and fuel (\$ 384k), b) Decreased road operation projects (\$ 200k), c) Decreased road maintenance projects (\$ 923k), d) Langdon Joint Use Project not completed (\$ 766k) and e) Increased rural lighting \$ 103k.

**Water supply and distribution** – This service consists of the operation of the County's water systems. The variance is due to a) Increased amortization expense of \$ 386k, b) Increased service costs for the Bragg Creek Water Systems \$ 40k.

**Wastewater treatment and disposal** – This service consists of the operation of the County's wastewater systems. The variance is due to a) Increased maintenance costs for the Langdon Sewer System \$ 223k and b) Increased amortization of \$ 63k.

**Waste management** – This service consists of solid waste and recycling programs. This variance is due to funds unspent of a) Langdon green cart service (\$ 126k), b) Contract efficiencies (\$ 233k) and c) Reduced landfill monitoring costs (\$ 27k).

**Cemetery** – This section provides end of life services. This variance is due to unspent services due to late season working conditions leading to uncompleted projects of (\$ 144k).

**Planning and development services** – This service relates to the administration of land use and includes the Assessment services and Economic development departments. This variance is due to; a) Ongoing amounts for Inter-municipal projects (\$ 141k), b) Ongoing amounts on Municipal Policy project (\$ 574k), c) Ongoing OMNI ASP (\$ 46k), d) Decreased usage of materials and services (\$ 133k) and e) Position savings of (\$ 86k). **Community services** – This service provides assistance to community groups for the benefit of Rocky View County residents. This variance is due to funds unspent for; a) Contracted services (\$ 50k), b) Materials (\$ 50k) and c) Rural Library Services (\$ 26k).

**Recreation and Parks** – This service consists of various recreational initiatives. The variance is due to; a) Less funding requests received than expected from the various Recreation Boards to the amount of (\$ 675k), b) Less than expected capital grants (\$ 1,149m) and c) Savings on contacted and professional services of (\$ 205k).

**Contributed assets** – This category consists of developer constructed assets that are transferred to the County during the year. These assets include; a) Land and Land Improvements of \$ 3,444m, b) Roads of \$ 4,893m, c) Wastewater & Storm of \$ 4,277m and d) Water of \$ 439k. No budget exists for this category as it changes from year to year and cannot be reasonably estimated.

**Government transfers for capital** – This category consist of transfers (grants) from various levels of Government for the construction of capital infrastructure such as the new Municipal Campus (\$ 10m) and Bragg Creek Flood mitigation (\$ 29m).

# Legend

- k Thousand dollars
- (k) Decrease of a thousand dollars
- m Million dollars
- (m) Decrease of a million dollars

#### ROCKY VIEW COUNTY VARAINCE ANALYSIS - OPERATING SURPLUS FOR THE YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2017

An operating surplus of \$7,211,228 exists at December 31, 2017 from increased revenue collections and expense savings. Administration has included significant items that have contributed to this operating surplus. This amount will be transferred to the Tax Stabilization Reserve.

#### **Increased Revenue Collection** Government Reimbursement From Disaster Relief Program (DRP) 2015 \$594,893 Interest Earned on Investments 798,412 **Enforcement Fines** 481,356 Alberta Transport Recoverable 218,541 **Compliance Inspection Permitting** 223,118 Planning Fees and permitting 276,342 **Cemetery Sales** 267,258 **Total Increased Revenue Collection** 2,859,920 **Unspent Expenses County Wide Vacant Position Savings** 616,342 **Reduced Organization Training** 239,392 Reduced Communication, Advertisements and Publications 176,830 **Reduced Information Technology License Fees** 178,004 **Reduced Policy and Intermunicipal Projects** 639,088 **Reduced Fire Mutual Aid Requirement** 237,714 Fleet Operations Parts and Fuel Savings 384,352 **Unspent Rail Road Crossing Upgrades** 200,092 Reduced Flood Pumping, Grader Leases, Road Maintenance Projects 923,310 **Reduced Agriculture Equipment Rental** 92,267 Savings from Solid Waste Bin Replacement and Green Cart Program 386,637 Reduced Cemetery Projects due to late seasonal start 143,516 **Total Unspent Expenses** 4.217.544 **Other Organizational Minor Net Variances** 133,764 **Total 2017 Operating Surplus** \$7,211,228



AGENDA Page 46 of 410

# **Rocky View County**

**Report to Council** For the Year Ending December 31, 2017 For presentation at the Council meeting April 24, 2018

AGENDA Page 47 of 410



April 24, 2018

Members of Council of Rocky View County

Dear Sirs/Mesdames:

We are pleased to submit to you this report for discussion of our audit of the financial statements of Rocky View County (the "County") as at December 31, 2017 and for the year then ended. In this report we cover those significant matters which, in our opinion, you should be aware of as members of Council.

We have completed our audit of the financial statements of the County which has been carried out in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards.

Unless unforeseen complications arise, our Audit Report will provide an unqualified opinion to the members of Council of the County. A draft copy of our proposed Independent Auditors' Report is attached at the end of this report.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of Council and management and should not be distributed to or used by any other parties than these specified parties.

The matters raised in this and other reports that will flow from the audit are only those which have come to our attention arising from or relevant to our audit that we believe need to be brought to your attention. They are not a comprehensive record of all the matters arising, and in particular we cannot be held responsible for reporting all risks in your business or all control weaknesses. This report has been prepared solely for your use and should not be quoted in whole or in part without our prior written consent. No responsibility to any third party is accepted as the report has not been prepared for, and is not intended for, any other purpose.

We would like to express our appreciation for the excellent cooperation we have received from management and employees with whom we worked.

We appreciate having the opportunity to meet with you and to respond to any questions you may have about our audit, and to discuss any other matters that may be of interest to you.

Sincerely,

MNPLLP

**Chartered Professional Accountants** 

encls.





# CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
ENGAGEMENT STATUS	1
SIGNIFICANT AUDIT, ACCOUNTING AND REPORTING MATTERS	1
CHANGES FROM AUDIT SERVICE PLAN	1
AREAS OF AUDIT EMPHASIS	1
FINAL MATERIALITY	1
DEFICIENCY IN INTERNAL CONTROL	2
DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED	2
IDENTIFIED OR SUSPECTED FRAUD	2
IDENTIFIED OR SUSPECTED NON-COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS AND REGULATIONS	2
GOING CONCERN	2
AUDITORS' VIEWS OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING PRACTICES	2
MATTERS ARISING FROM DISCUSSIONS WITH MANAGEMENT	3
MATTERS ARISING IN THE AUDIT OF COMPONENTS	4
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES	4
MODIFICATIONS TO THE INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT	4
MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATIONS	4
AUDITOR INDEPENDENCE	4
APPENDIX A – MNP AUDIT PROCESS	5
APPENDIX B – AREAS OF AUDIT EMPHASIS	6
APPENDIX C – DEFICIENCY IN INTERNAL CONTROL	7
DRAFT INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT	
MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATIONS	
INDEPENDENCE COMMUNICATION	

# INTRODUCTION

As auditors, we report to the Council on the results of our examination of the financial statements of Rocky View County (the "County") as at and for the year ended December 31, 2017. The purpose of this Audit Findings Report is to assist you, as members of Council, in your review of the results of our audit. To facilitate in your understanding of our findings, Appendix A to this report summarizes our audit process.

Our report will discuss the status of our engagement, as well as communicate to you significant audit, accounting and reporting matters arising from our procedures. We hope that this report is of assistance to you, and we look forward to discussing our findings and answering your questions.

# ENGAGEMENT STATUS

We have completed our audit of the financial statements of the County and are prepared to sign our Auditors' Report subsequent to completion of the following procedures:

- Receipt of the remaining outstanding legal confirmations;
- Receipt of the signed management representation letter;
- Discussion of subsequent events with Council;
- The Council's review and approval of the financial statements.

We expect to have the above procedures completed and to release our Audit Report on April 24, 2018. Our draft report, which will provide an unqualified opinion, is attached at the end of this report.

# SIGNIFICANT AUDIT, ACCOUNTING AND REPORTING MATTERS

#### **CHANGES FROM AUDIT SERVICE PLAN**

There were no deviations from the Audit Service Plan previously presented to you.

#### AREAS OF AUDIT EMPHASIS

The following lists the key areas of our audit emphasis for your County:

- Financial statement Presentation and Disclosure; and
- Fraud and misstatements, including restatement of the prior period.

Detailed information on Areas of Audit Emphasis is included as Appendix B to this report.

#### FINAL MATERIALITY

Materiality is a concept used to assess the significance of misstatements or omissions that are identified during the audit and is used to determine the level of audit testing that is carried out. The scope of our audit work is tailored to reflect the relative size of operations of the County, and is affected by our assessment of materiality and audit risk.

Final materiality used for our audit was \$3,000,000 for December 31, 2017 and \$3,000,000 for December 31, 2016.



Page 1

#### DEFICIENCY IN INTERNAL CONTROL

Our audit process focuses on understanding the controls utilized in management's reporting systems to the extent necessary to identify overall and specific financial reporting risks. This risk assessment allows us to concentrate our audit procedures on high risk areas and, where possible, place reliance on controls within the financial reporting system to reduce the extent of our testing.

It is important to note that our assessment was not, nor was it intended to be, sufficient to comment or conclude on the sufficiency of internal controls.

We are required under Canadian generally accepted auditing standards to communicate all significant deficiencies identified during an audit to Council on a timely basis. However, we may not be aware of all significant deficiencies that do, in fact, exist.

While our review of controls was not sufficient to express an opinion as to their effectiveness or efficiency, we have detected a significant deficiency in internal controls related to contributed assets, which is included in Appendix C to this report.

#### **DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED**

No significant limitations were placed on the scope or timing of our audit.

#### IDENTIFIED OR SUSPECTED FRAUD

Due to the inherent limitations of an audit and the nature of fraud, including attempts at concealment through forgery or collusion, an audit conducted in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards cannot be relied upon to detect fraud.

While our audit cannot be relied upon to detect all instances of fraud, no incidents of fraud, or suspected fraud, came to our attention in the course of our audit.

#### **IDENTIFIED OR SUSPECTED NON-COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS AND REGULATIONS**

Nothing has come to our attention that would suggest any non-compliance with laws and regulations that would have a material effect on the financial statements.

#### **GOING CONCERN**

We have not identified any material uncertainties related to events or conditions that may cast significant doubt on the County's ability to continue as a going concern.

We are of the opinion that the going concern assumption is appropriate in preparation of the financial statements.

#### AUDITORS' VIEWS OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING PRACTICES

The application of Canadian public sector accounting standards allows and requires the County to make accounting estimates and judgments regarding accounting policies and financial statement disclosures.

As auditors, we are uniquely positioned to provide open and objective feedback regarding your County's

Page 2



accounting practices, and have noted the following items during the course of our audit that we wish to bring to your attention.

#### **Accounting Policies**

- The accounting policies used by the County are appropriate and have been consistently applied.
- No new accounting policies, or changes in accounting policies were applied.

#### Accounting Estimates

The preparation of the financial statements is subject to significant accounting estimates made by management. All significant management estimates were reviewed for the current period and no material differences were noted.

#### Inventory measurement

• Net realizable value determined as the estimated selling price in the ordinary course of business less the estimated costs of completion and the estimated selling costs.

#### **Provision for legal contingencies**

• No provision deemed necessary.

#### Amortization period of tangible capital assets

• Amortized over the estimated useful life of the respective assets. For assets under the straight-line method, the rates were from 5 to 75 years.

#### Liabilities

• Amortization period and costs associated with landfill closure and post closure and gravel pit reclamation.

#### Financial Statement Disclosures

The disclosures made in the notes to the financial statements appear clear, neutral and consistent with our understanding of the entity and the amounts presented in the financial statements.

#### MATTERS ARISING FROM DISCUSSIONS WITH MANAGEMENT

We would like to formally acknowledge the cooperation and assistance we received from the management and staff of the County.

There were no significant matters discussed, or subject to correspondence, with management that in our judgment need be brought to your attention.



#### SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

A couple significant differences were proposed to management with respect to the December 31, 2017 financial statements.

An adjustment was made as noted in the prior period correction note to the financial statements for \$20,675,961.

An estimate for gravel pit reclamation obligation was left unadjusted. The impact is an increase to liabilities and an increase to expenses of \$800,000.

#### **MODIFICATIONS TO THE INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT**

As discussed earlier, our independent auditors' report will provide an unqualified opinion to the members of Council.

# MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATIONS

We have requested certain written representations from management, which represent a confirmation of certain oral representations given to us during the course of our audit.

This letter, provided by management, has been included as additional material to this report.

# AUDITOR INDEPENDENCE

We confirm to Council that we are independent of the County. Our letter to Council discussing our independence is included as part of the additional materials attached to this report.

Page 4



# **APPENDIX A – MNP Audit Process**

Our audit was carried out in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards, and included a review of all significant accounting and management reporting systems, with each material year end balance, key transaction and other events considered significant to the financial statements considered separately.

Our audit process focused on understanding the controls utilized in management's reporting systems to the extent necessary to identify overall and specific financial reporting risks. This risk assessment enabled us to concentrate our audit procedures on the areas where differences were most likely to arise. Our assessment was not, nor was it intended to be, sufficient to conclude on the effectiveness or efficiency of internal controls.

During the course of our audit, we have:

- Examined, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements;
- · Assessed the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management;
- Obtained an understanding of the County and its environment, including management's internal controls (regardless of whether we relied on them for the purpose of the audit), sufficient to identify and assess the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements and to design and perform audit procedures;
- Reviewed and assessed those accounting systems deemed necessary to support our audit opinion;
- Evaluated the overall financial statement presentation;
- Performed a subsequent events review with management;
- Reviewed and assessed the status of contingencies, commitments and guarantees;
- Reviewed and assessed exposure to environmental liabilities.

We have obtained written representations from management, included as additional materials following this report, in order to confirm oral representations given to us and reduce the possibility of misunderstanding. Specifically, we have obtained written confirmation of significant representations provided on matters that are:

- Directly related to items that are material, either individually or in the aggregate, to the financial statements;
- Not directly related to items that are material to the financial statements, but are significant, either individually or in the aggregate, to the engagement; and
- Matters relevant to management judgments or estimates that are material, either individually or in the aggregate, to the financial statements.





# **APPENDIX B – Areas of Audit Emphasis**

#### Financial statement presentation and disclosure

-We have reviewed the financial statements and concluded that the corresponding presentation and disclosure is in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.

-We have participated in discussions with management on all significant transactions during the course of the past 12 months, and have assisted in ensuring appropriate treatment and disclosure.

-We have concluded that the County's financial statements have been appropriately presented and appropriate disclosures have been made in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards. A matter with respect to the treatment of offsite levies has been referred to the CPA Canada as there is diversity in practice.

#### Fraud and misstatements

-Obtained from management and those charged with governance an assessment of the entity's susceptibility to material misstatements arising from fraud;

-Discussed with management and those charged with governance the entity's susceptibility to material misstatements arising from fraud; and,

-Obtained management representations concerning fraud.

-There were found to be omissions and errors in contributed tangible assets in the year, requiring a restatement. Procedures were applied to ensure that this was extent of the error and a management letter point on considering updating the processes has been added.

-We concur with management's assessment that the County's susceptibility to material misstatements arising from fraud or misstatement is reasonably low.

Page 6



# **APPENDIX C – Deficiency in Internal Control**

#### **Contributed Assets**

#### Observation:

During the year it was noted that contributed land from prior years (2006-2016) was not added until 2017. It was also noted that some contributed land had since been disposed of in prior years and was not recorded until 2017.

#### Impact:

Tangible capital assets and accumulated surplus were materially misstated.

#### **Recommendation:**

Develop procedures to ensure that the financial department reconciles contributed land to what both municipal lands and the tax department has.

#### Management's response:

Management has added processes to ensure that land is reconciled between the departments every two weeks.



# **Draft Independent Auditors' Report**

(See Attached)





# **Independent Auditors' Report**

To the Reeve and Members of Council of Rocky View County:

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of Rocky View County, which comprise the statement of financial position as at December 31, 2017, and the statements of operations, change in net financial assets (net debt), cash flows and schedules 1 through 6 for the year then ended, and a summary of significant accounting policies and other explanatory information.

#### Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards, and for such internal control as management determines is necessary to enable the preparation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

#### Auditors' Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we comply with ethical requirements and plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditors' judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the entity's preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion.

#### Opinion

In our opinion, the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Rocky View County as at December 31, 2017 and the results of its operations, change in net financial assets (net debt) and its cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.

Red Deer, Alberta

April 24, 2018



**Chartered Professional Accountants** 





**Management Representations** 

(See Attached)



April 24, 2018

MNP LLP 4922 - 53 St. Red Deer, Alberta T4N 2E9

To Whom It May Concern:

In connection with your audit of the financial statements of Rocky View County ("the Municipality") as at December 31, 2017 and for the year then ended, we hereby confirm to the best of our knowledge and belief, the following representations made to you during the course of your audit.

We understand that your audit was made in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards. Accordingly, the audit included an examination of the accounting system, controls and related data, and tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as you considered necessary in the circumstances, for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the financial statements. We also understand that such an audit is not designed to identify, nor can it necessarily be expected to disclose, misstatements, non-compliance with laws and regulations, fraud or other irregularities, should there be any.

Certain representations in this letter are described as being limited to matters that are material. An item is considered material, regardless of its monetary value, if it is probable that its omission from or misstatement in the financial statements would influence the decision of a reasonable person relying on the financial statements.

#### **Financial Statements**

- 1. We have fulfilled our responsibilities, as set out in the terms of the audit engagement letter dated November 17, 2017, for the preparation and fair presentation of the Municipality's financial statements and comparatives in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards. We believe these financial statements and comparatives are complete and present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Municipality as at December 31, 2017 and December 31, 2016, and the results of its operations and its cash flows, in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.
- 2. All transactions have been recorded in the accounting records and are reflected in the financial statements, and are reported in the appropriate period.
- 3. We acknowledge that we are responsible for the accounting policies followed in the preparation of the Municipality's financial statements. Significant accounting policies, and any related changes to significant accounting policies, are disclosed in the financial statements. The selection of accounting policies is appropriate in accordance with the requirements of Canadian public sector accounting standards, and are applied consistently throughout the financial statements.
- 4. We have disclosed to you all significant assumptions used in making accounting estimates and judgments, and believe they are reasonable.
- 5. We are aware of and concur with the contents and results of the journal entries prepared pertaining to the prior period error correction, and accept responsibility for the financial statement effects of the entries.
- 6. We believe the effects of those uncorrected financial statement differences aggregated by you during the audit are immaterial, both individually and in the aggregate, to the financial statements taken as a whole. A summary of these differences has been attached to this written representation.

- 7. Related party relationships and transactions have been appropriately accounted for and disclosed in accordance with the requirements of Canadian public sector accounting standards.
- 8. All events or transactions that have occurred subsequent to the statement of financial position and for which Canadian public sector accounting standards require adjustment or disclosure have been adjusted or disclosed appropriately in the financial statements.
- 9. The restatements made to correct material misstatements in prior periods affecting comparative information have been properly recorded, are approved by us, and will be recorded on the accounting records of the Municipality.
- 10. All plans or intentions that may affect the carrying value or classification of assets and liabilities are appropriately reflected in the financial statements in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.
- 11. All liabilities, both known and contingent, requiring recognition or disclosure in the financial statements in accordance with the requirements of Canadian public sector accounting standards have been adjusted or disclosed as appropriate.
- 12. All outstanding and possible claims, whether or not they have been discussed with legal counsel, have been disclosed to you and are appropriately reflected in the financial statements.
- 13. All assets, wherever located, to which the Municipality had satisfactory title at the year-end, have been fairly stated and recorded in the financial statements. The assets are free from hypothecation, liens and encumbrances, except as noted in the financial statements. We have disclosed the nature and carrying amounts of any assets pledged as collateral. All assets of uncertain value, and restrictions imposed on assets, are appropriately reported in the financial statements.
- 14. All aspects of laws, regulations or contractual agreements, including non-compliance, are appropriately reflected in the financial statements.
- 15. Accounts and contributions receivable are correctly described in the records and represent valid claims as at December 31, 2017. An appropriate allowance has been made for losses from uncollectible accounts and for costs or expenses that may be incurred with respect to sales made or services rendered.
- 16. Inventory is correctly recorded in the financial statements in accordance with the requirements of Canadian public sector accounting standards. All required provisions for slow-moving, obsolete, and unsaleable stock have been recorded. Inventory does not include any goods on consignment to others or goods invoiced to customers.
- 17. All charges to tangible capital assets represent capital expenditures. No expenditures of a capital nature were charged to operations of the Municipality. Depreciation of property, plant and equipment has been recorded according to our best estimates of their useful lives. All events or circumstances giving rise to impairments are appropriately reflected in the financial statements.
- 18. All long-term debt and capital lease obligations have been appropriately recorded in the financial statements. All payments and accrued interest has been accounted for. The current portion of long-term debt and capital lease obligations is appropriately classified.
- 19. Revenue has been recognized only where sales have been made and items delivered, or services rendered, and the amounts have been collected or are collectible. Revenues do not include any amounts arising from consignment sales or from any other transaction from which the Municipality is not entitled to the proceeds.

#### Information provided

- 1. We have responded fully to all inquiries made to us and have made available to you:
  - A complete record of all financial records that are relevant to the preparation and presentation of the financial statements and minutes of the meetings of the Council held throughout the year to the present date as well as summaries of recent meetings for which minutes have not yet been prepared;
  - Additional information that you have requested from us for the purpose of your audit;
  - Unrestricted access to persons within the entity from whom you determined it necessary to obtain audit evidence.
- 2. We acknowledge management's responsibility for the design, implementation and operation of controls that have been designed to prevent and detect fraud.
- 3. We have assessed the risk that the financial statements may be materially misstated as a result of fraud, and have determined such risk to be low.
- 4. Where the impact of any frauds or suspected frauds, and non-compliance or possible non-compliance with laws and regulations, has a material effect on the financial statements, we have disclosed to you all known significant facts relating thereto, including circumstances involving management, employees having significant roles over controls, and others. We have made known to you any allegations of fraud or suspected fraud communicated by employees, former employees, analysts, regulators and others. The effects of such events, if any, are properly presented in the financial statements.
- 5. We have disclosed to you all deficiencies in the design or operation of internal controls over financial reporting of which we are aware.
- 6. We have disclosed to you all aspects of laws, regulations or contractual agreements that may affect the financial statements, including non-compliance.
- 7. We have disclosed to you the identities of all related parties to the Municipality and all related party relationships and transactions of which we are aware.
- 8. We have no knowledge of side agreements (contractual or otherwise) with any parties that have not been disclosed to you.
- 9. The previous year's representation letter dated April 25, 2017 is still applicable to the prior year's financial statements and comparatives, and no matters have arisen that require restatement of those financial statements and comparatives.
- 10. There are no discussions with your firm's personnel regarding employment with the Municipality.

#### **Professional Services**

- 1. We acknowledge the engagement letter dated November 17, 2017, which states the terms of reference regarding your professional services.
- 2. We are not aware of any reason why MNP LLP would not be considered independent for purposes of the Municipality's audit.

Sincerely, Rocky View County

Signature

Independence Communication

(See Attached)





April 24, 2018

Council Rocky View County 911 32 Ave NE Calgary, AB T2E 6X6

Dear Sirs/Mesdames:

We have been engaged to audit the financial statements of Rocky View County ("the Municipality") as at December 31, 2017 and for the year then ended.

CAS 260 *Communication With Those Charged With Governance* requires that we communicate with you matters that are significant to our engagement. One such matter is relationships between the Municipality and its related entities or persons in financial reporting oversight roles at the Municipality and MNP LLP and any affiliates ("MNP") that, in our professional judgment, may reasonably be thought to bear on our independence. In determining which relationships to report, the Standard requires us to consider relevant rules and related interpretations prescribed by the appropriate professional accounting body and applicable legislation, covering such matters as:

- (a) Holding a financial interest, either directly or indirectly, in a client;
- (b) Holding a position, either directly or indirectly, that gives the right or responsibility to exert significant influence over the financial or accounting policies of a client or a related entity;
- (c) Personal or business relationships of immediate family, close relatives, partners or retired partners, either directly or indirectly, with a client or a related entity;
- (d) Economic dependence on a client; and
- (e) Provision of non-assurance services in addition to the audit engagement.

We are not aware of any relationship between the Municipality and MNP that, in our professional judgment, may reasonably be thought to bear on our independence, which have occurred from January 1, 2017 to April 24, 2018.

We hereby confirm that MNP is independent with respect to the Municipality within the meaning of the Rules of Professional Conduct of the Institute of Chartered Professional Accountants of Alberta as of April 24, 2018.

The total fees charged to the Municipality for 2017 audit services interim billings were \$21,000.00 plus \$2,000 for the LAPP and billings for 2016 audit services was \$23,000, during the period from January 1, 2017 to April 24, 2018. There were no billings for non-audit services.

This report is intended solely for the use of Council, management and others within the Municipality and should not be used for any other purposes.

We look forward to discussing with you the matters addressed in this letter as well as other matters that may be of interest to you at our meeting on April 24, 2018. We will be prepared to answer any questions you may have regarding our independence as well as other matters.

Sincerely,

MNPLLP

**Chartered Professional Accountants** 





ACCOUNTING > CONSULTING > TAX 4922 - 53 STREET, RED DEER AB, T4N 2E9 1.877.500.0779 T: 403.346.8878 F: 403.341.5599 AGENDA Page 64 of 410



AGENDA Page 65 of 410

B-1 Page 54 of 55

April 24, 2018

Mr. Woods Rocky View County 911 32 Ave NE Calgary, AB T2E 6X6

Dear Mr. Woods:

#### Management letter for the year ended December 31, 2017

We have recently completed our audit of Rocky View County in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards ("GAAS"). The objective of our audit was to express an opinion on the financial statements, which have been prepared in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards. Included in our audit was the consideration of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements. This consideration of internal control was for the purpose of designing audit procedures that were appropriate in the circumstances. It was not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control or for identifying all significant control deficiencies that might exist.

An audit is not specifically designed to identify all matters that may be of interest to management in discharging its responsibilities, however, if during the course of our audit, we did identify some areas for improvement we would bring them to your attention with this letter. It is our responsibility to communicate any significant deficiencies identified to those charged with governance. A significant deficiency in internal control is defined as a deficiency or combination of deficiencies in internal control that, in the auditor's professional judgment, is of sufficient importance to merit the attention of those charged with governance.

#### **Contributed Assets**

#### **Observation:**

During the year it was noted that contributed land from prior years was not added until 2017. It was also noted that some contributed land had since been disposed of in prior years and was not recorded until 2017.

#### Impact:

Tangible capital assets and accumulated surplus were materially misstated.

#### **Recommendation:**

Develop procedures to ensure that the financial department reconciles contributed land to what both municipal lands and the tax department has.

#### Management's response:

Management has added processes to ensure that land is reconciled between the departments every two weeks.

We would like to express our appreciation for the co-operation and assistance we have received during the course of our audit from all staff members.

We would be pleased to discuss with you further any matters mentioned in this letter at your convenience. This communication is prepared solely for the information of management and is not intended for any other purpose. We accept no responsibility to any third party who uses this communication.

Sincerely,

**Chartered Professional Accountants** 

/dlh encls.





# FINANCIAL SERVICES

TO: Council

**DATE:** April 24, 2018

**DIVISION:** All

**FILE:** 2025-350

**SUBJECT:** 2018 Budget Adjustments

#### <sup>1</sup>ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the 2018 budget adjustment be approved as presented in Attachment 'A' and Attachment 'B'.

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

With completion of the 2018 assessment roll and review of the 2018 operating base budget Administration requires additional operating budget adjustments as presented in Attachment 'A'. With the receipt of external requisitions for Alberta Schools, the Rocky View Foundation and the Province of Alberta, further flow through adjustments are to be incorporated into the 2018 operating budget as presented in Attachment 'B'. Administration recommends that the 2018 budget adjustment be approved as presented in Attachment 'A' and Attachment 'B'.

Administration recommends Option #1

#### **BACKGROUND:**

#### Municipal Budget Adjustments – Attachment 'A'

1) Since approval of the 2018 Operating and Capital base budget the 2018 assessment roll has now been finalized. On March 27, Council approved \$597,100 in operating budget adjustments for special initiatives. Upon completion of the 2018 assessment roll it has been determined that the live growth component (new development) is 3.1% which equates to approximately \$2.6 million dollars. It is in this regard Administration is requesting Council approval to transfer the remaining unallocated funds in the amount of \$1,000,000 and \$1,100,800 as presented in Attachment 'A', to the Tax Stabilization Reserve for Council's future consideration. Upon further review of the 2018 operating base budget Administration has also determined that the following adjustments are required:

#### Expenses

Reduced temporary staff – Fire Services	(\$80,000)
Reduced services budget – County Manager	(\$9,000)
Increased part time Fire wages (change in Alberta labour standards)	\$124,000
Purchase of Enforcement vehicle	\$52,400
Transfer to Tax Stabilization Reserve – legal recoverable	\$1,000,000
Transfer to Tax Stabilization Reserve – unallocated amount	<u>\$1,100,800</u>

#### **Total Expenses**

\$2,188,200

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Administration Resources Barry Woods, Financial Services



#### <u>Revenue</u>

Net property tax from live growth and adjustments in this report	\$1,946,100
Addition of unspent 2017 Provincial grants	\$ 74,800
Reimbursement from the Province of Alberta – Designated Industrial Properties	\$ <u>\$167,300</u>

#### **Total Revenue**

\$2,188,200

# External Requisitions – Attachment 'B'

2) The Operating and Capital base budget was approved on February 27, 2018. Administration has now received final external requisitions. External requisitions are flow through amounts in that Rocky View County collects these funds through the property tax system and forwards them to the requisitioning bodies. Changes to Rocky View County's external requisitions are as follows: Alberta School Foundation Fund (ASFF) and the Roman Catholic Separate School District (RCSSD) have increased by 6.0% or \$2,677,900. The Rocky View Foundation has increased by 6.3% or \$39,100. A new Provincial requisition for the administration of Designated Industrial Properties has been added in the amount of \$62,800.

# **BUDGET IMPLICATION(S):**

Attachment "A"	\$2,188,200
Attachment 'B'	<u>\$2,779,800</u>
Total Budget Adjustment	\$4,968,000

### **OPTIONS:**

Option #1	THAT the 2018 budget adjustment be approved as presented in Attachment 'A' and Attachment 'B'
Option #2	THAT alternative direction be provided

Respectfully submitted,

"Kent Robinson"

Acting County Manager BW/bs

# ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 'A' – 2018 Municipal Budget Adjustment Attachment 'B' – 2018 External Requisition Budget Adjustment

# ROCKY VIEW COUNTY INTERIM BUDGET ADJUSTMENT REQUEST FORM BUDGET YEAR: <u>2018</u>

Description		Budget Adjustment
EXPENDITURES:		
WAGES AND BENEFITS - TEMPORARY	STAFF	(80,000)
SERVICES - COUNTY MANAGERS OFFI		(9,000)
PART-TIME PROFESSIONAL FIRE FIGH		124,000
VEHICLE - ENFORCEMENT		52,400
TRANSFER TO TAX STABILIZATION RES	SERVE - LEGAL RECOVERABLE	1,000,000
TRANSFER TO TAX STABILIZATION RES		1,100,800
TOTAL EXPENSE:		2,188,200
REVENUES:		
GENERAL PROPERTY TAX		(1,946,100)
PROVINCIAL GRANTS		(74,800)
REVENUE GOVERNMENT REIMBURSEN	MENT	(167,300)
TOTAL REVENUE:		(2,188,200)
NET BUDGET REVISION:		0
REASON FOR BUDGET REVISION:		
2018 Spring Finalization Budget Adjustmer	nts	
AUTHORIZATION:		
County Manager:	Council Meeting Date:	
General Manager:	Council Motion Reference:	
Managar	Data	
Manager:	Dale.	
	Budget AJE No:	
	Posting Date:	

AGENDA Page 70 of 410

#### Attachment 'B'

# ROCKY VIEW COUNTY INTERIM BUDGET ADJUSTMENT REQUEST FORM BUDGET YEAR: <u>2018</u>

Description		Budget Adjustment
EXPENDITURES: ASFF - BASIC CALGARY RCSSD#1 ROCKVIEW FOUNDATION DESIGNATED INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY TAX	X	2,355,600 322,300 39,100 62,800
TOTAL EXPENSE: REVENUES:		2,779,800
GENERAL PROPERTY TAX		(2,779,800)
TOTAL REVENUE: NET BUDGET REVISION:		(2,779,800)
REASON FOR BUDGET REVISION: 2018 Spring Finalization - External Requisition	IS	
AUTHORIZATION:		
County Manager:	Council Meeting Date:	
General Manager :	Council Motion Reference:	
Manager:	Date:	
	Budget AJE No: Posting Date:	



# **PLANNING SERVICES**

TO:	Council	
DATE:	April 24, 2018	DIVISION: 7
TIME:	Morning Appointment	
FILE:	06415050	APPLICATION: PL20180011
SUBJECT:	Redesignation Item – Re Area Structure Plan	esidential Two District to Residential One District – Balzac East

#### <sup>1</sup>ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:

Motion #1	THAT Bylaw C-7770-2018 be given first reading.
Motion #2	THAT Bylaw C-7770-2018 be given second reading.
Motion #3	THAT Bylaw C-7770-2018 be considered for third reading.
Motion #4	THAT Bylaw C-7770-2018 be given third and final reading.

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The purpose of this application is to redesignate the subject land from Residential Two District to Residential One District. This would facilitate the creation of  $a \ge 0.81$  hectare ( $\ge 2.0$  acre) parcel and  $a \ge 0.81$  hectare ( $\ge 2.0$  acre) remainder.

The subject property contains an existing dwelling and accessory buildings. The parcel is currently serviced by water well and a conventional septic system. The proposed lots would be required to connect to the Rocky View Coop water supply system, and the existing well would need to be decommissioned in accordance with Alberta Environment and Protection requirements. A private sewage treatment system would provide wastewater servicing to the proposed Lot 2. Access to the subject parcel is provided from an existing approach off Range Road 293. The Applicant indicated that access to the proposed parcel would be provided via an existing mutual approach, shared with the adjacent parcel to the north.

The subject property is located within the Balzac East Area Structure Plan (ASP), and is identified as Residential Phase One. The proposed redesignation application was evaluated in accordance with the policies of the ASP, and Administration determined that:

 The proposal is consistent with the policies of 4.2.2 – Phase One –Residential Intensification Area Policies.

Therefore, Administration recommends approval in accordance with Option #1.

#### DATE APPLICATION DEEMED COMPLETE: January 22, 2018

To redesignate the subject land from Residential Two District (R-2) to Residential One District (R-1) to facilitate the creation of a  $\geq$  0.81 hectare ( $\geq$  2.0 acre) parcel and a  $\geq$ 0.81 hectare ( $\geq$  2.0 acre) remainder

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

**PROPOSAL:** 

Lot 2, Plan 911 1892 within NW-15-26-29-W04M

<sup>1</sup> Administrative Resources Andrea Bryden, Planning Services Vince Diot, Engineering Services


GENERAL LOCATION:	Located approximately 0.41 km (1/4 mile) north of Twp. Rd. 262A and on the east side of Rge. Rd. 293
APPLICANT:	Grant & Brenda Larsen
OWNERS:	Grant & Brenda Larsen
EXISTING LAND USE DESIGNATION:	Residential Two District
PROPOSED LAND USE DESIGNATION:	Residential One District
GROSS AREA:	$\pm$ 1.62 hectares ( $\pm$ 4.00 acres)
SOILS (C.L.I. from A.R.C.):	<b>Class 3T40, 3M, T40, 4T, E20</b> – Moderate to severe limitations due to adverse topography, low moisture holding or adverse texture, or erosion damage.
	<b>Class 5T60, 5T, E40</b> – Very severe limitations due to adverse topography or erosion damage.

#### **PUBLIC & AGENCY SUBMISSIONS:**

Letters were circulated to 22 adjacent and area property owners when the application was received, and one letter was received in response. The application was also circulated to a number of internal and external agencies. Those responses are available in Appendix 'A'.

#### **HISTORY:**

**1991** Subdivision Plan 9111892 was registered at Land Titles, creating the subject parcel. Municipal Reserves were previously provided by cash-in-lieu.

#### BACKGROUND:

The subject property contains an existing dwelling and accessory buildings. The parcel is currently serviced by water well and a conventional septic system. Access to the subject parcel is provided from an existing approach off of Range Road 293.

#### POLICY ANALYSIS:

The Balzac East ASP supports the orderly and sequential development of residential parcels and encourages beginning with the in-filling of existing residential land. The subject property is identified as Residential Phase One, and the proposal meets Policy 4.2.2 Phase One – Residential Intensification Area Policies:

- a. Minimum parcel size shall be two (2.0) acres.
  - The minimum parcel sizes would be 2.0 acres.
- b. Proposals for redesignation, subdivision, and development within the Phase One Residential Intensification Area shall be supplied by a surface water system, with written confirmation of a sufficient water supply.
  - Both lots would tie into the Rocky View Water Co-op.
- c. Figure 4 identifies where Conceptual Schemes may be required for redesignation and subdivision applications deemed to have an impact on the long-term land use scenario, servicing requirements, future road network, or development pattern of surrounding lands.
  - The proposed lot configuration would not impact future servicing requirements, road network(s), or the development pattern of surrounding lands. Therefore, a Conceptual Scheme would not be beneficial at this time.



#### CONCLUSION:

The application is consistent with the policies of the Balzac East ASP. Therefore, Administration recommends approval in accordance with **Option #1**.

#### **OPTIONS:**

Option # 1:	Motion #1	THAT Bylaw C-7770-2018 be given first reading.
	Motion #2	THAT Bylaw C-7770-2018 be given second reading.
	Motion #3	THAT Bylaw C-7770-2018 be considered for third reading.
	Motion #4	THAT Bylaw C-7770-2018 be given third and final reading.
Option # 2:	THAT Application No. PL20180011 be refused.	

Respectfully submitted,

Concurrence,

"Chris O'Hara"

"Kent Robinson"

**General Manager** 

Interim County Manager

AB/rp

#### **APPENDICES:**

APPENDIX 'A': Application Referrals APPENDIX 'B': Bylaw C-7770-2018 and Schedule A APPENDIX 'C': Map Set



#### APPENDIX A: APPLICATION REFERRALS

AGENCY	COMMENTS
School Authority	
Rocky View Schools	Rocky View Schools has no objection to this circulation.
Calgary Catholic School District	Calgary Catholic School District (CCSD) has no objection to the circulation (PL20180011) located near Balzac. As per the circulation, Municipal Reserves will be considered at subdivision stage.
Public Francophone Education	No comments received.
Catholic Francophone Education	No comments received.
Province of Alberta	
Alberta Environment	Not required for circulation.
Alberta Transportation	Not required for circulation.
Alberta Sustainable Development (Public Lands)	Not required for circulation.
Alberta Culture and Community Spirit (Historical Resources)	No comments received.
Energy Resources Conservation Board	No comments received.
Alberta Health Services	No comments received.
Public Utility	
ATCO Gas	No comments received.
ATCO Pipelines	No objections.
AltaLink Management	No comments received.
FortisAlberta	No comments received.
Telus Communications	No objections. However, TELUS will need to review the subdivision application when it is circulated.
TransAlta Utilities Ltd.	No comments received.
Other External Agencies	
EnCana Corporation	No comments received.



AGENCY	COMMENTS
Calgary Airport Authority	Calgary International Airport Vicinity Protection Area (AVPA) Regulation
	The proposed development is located within the 25-30 NEF (Noise Exposure Forecast) contours. Residential uses are not considered prohibited uses within this area. However, all buildings constructed on land in the Protection Area must comply with the acoustical requirements set out in the Alberta Building Code.
	Bird Hazard Considerations
	Incompatible land uses that attract bird activity by providing food sources or water must be avoided or mitigated. For further information on mitigation measures please contact the Calgary Airport Authority Environmental Group at 403.735.1405.
	Land Use in the Vicinity of Airports
	As this development is occurring outside of the Calgary International Airport property boundary, the proposed development should ensure compatibility to the land use recommendations and guidelines as set out in <i>TP1247 – Land</i> <i>Use in the Vicinity of Airports.</i>
Rocky View Water Co-op	No comments received.
Rocky View County - Boards	
ASB Farm Members and Agricultural Fieldman	No comments received.
Rocky View Central Recreation Board	Recommends cash-in-lieu.
Internal Departments	
Agricultural Services	Because this parcel falls within the Balzac East ASP, we have no concerns.
Municipal Lands	The Municipal Lands office has no concerns at this time; however, comments pertaining to reserve dedication will be provided at any future subdivision stage.
Development Authority	No comments received.
GeoGraphics	No comments received.
Building Services	No comments received.
Enforcement Services	No concerns.
Fire Services	No comments at this time.



AGENCY	COMMENTS
Infrastructure and Operations- Engineering Services	General
	<ul> <li>The applicant will be responsible for all 3rd party costs associated with the review and approval of the supporting technical studies at the time of subdivision;</li> <li>As this application is for land use only, ES has no concerns with the application. Detailed engineering requirements noted below will be required at the subdivision stage and are</li> </ul>

#### Geotechnical:

No concerns as this application is for land use only and no significant land features appear to exist that would preclude the proposed subdivision. See comments below on PSTS investigations required at subdivision.

provided for the applicants understanding.

#### Transportation:

- The applicant has indicated access to the proposed 2ac lot will be via an existing mutual approach located on the north boundary of the site. ES supports this as the County desires to limit access to RR293, which is identified as a Network A roadway on the County long range transportation network;
- As a condition to the future subdivision, the County will require confirmation that an access easement and the associated agreement are in place for the proposed mutual approach with the lot to the north;
- The County's Transportation Offsite Levy will apply at the subdivision stage in accordance with Bylaw C-7356-2014, as amended:
  - Based off of the current levy, the estimated amount 0 owing is \$18,380.
  - The applicant is advised the levy is currently 0 undergoing changes and that the version of the bylaw in place at time of subdivision approval is what will apply. Bylaw updates, public input and other information can be accessed on the County's website.
- We note that Range Road 293 is identified on the County's Long Range Transportation Plan as requiring a 30m right of way. We also note it has already been provided for the subject site (5m) through plan 731464. As a result, no further land dedication is required from the applicants parcel at this time.

#### Sanitary/Waste Water:

The applicant has indicated the proposed lot will be serviced by a new Private Sewage Treatment System (PSTS). ES has reviewed and there appear to be no significant features on the land that would preclude the use of a PSTS system. We do note there is a natural watercourse approximately 30m south of the subject lands. This will need to be



#### COMMENTS

#### Water Supply And Waterworks:

- The Balzac East Area Structure Plan requires parcel sizes of 2 acres be connected to a piped water supplier and therefore both parcels shall be connected to Rocky View Water Co-op;
- The application proposes servicing to the lot with the existing house via the Rocky View Water Coop (RVWC) and servicing to the undeveloped lot via an existing groundwater well. ES has reviewed the letter from RVWC dated January 8, 2018 and note the letter should be updated to confirm capacity for both lots, as currently the letter identifies capacity for one lot;
- Service(s) will be required to be installed to service the proposed lot(s), at the owner's expense, at the subdivision stage and to the satisfaction of the RVWC. Additionally, the well shall be decommissioned in accordance with AEP requirements and any water lines shall be disconnected and removed.

#### Storm Water Management:

• ES has reviewed the site and has no significant concerns related to the site's surface drainage that would preclude subdividing as proposed. As a condition to a future subdivision, the County may request a letter from a qualified engineering professional regarding the necessity for a detailed stormwater management report including the general rationale for the position. The letter should provide recommendations for managing post development stormwater on the site in the event a more detailed report is deemed unnecessary.

#### Environmental:

ES has no requirements at this time.

Infrastructure and Operations- Maintenance	No issues.
Infrastructure and Operations- Capital Delivery	No concerns.
Infrastructure and Operations- Operations	Applicant to confirm how he intends to access the new 1.62 ha lot. Access management is a concerns along this section of Rge Rd 293 given the roadway gradeline and sight lines.
Infrastructure and Operations- Utility Services	Confirmation required from Rockyview Water Co-op re: capacity and agreement to supply water.

Circulation Period: February 2, 2018 – February 23, 2018



# **BYLAW C-7770-2018**

## A Bylaw of Rocky View County to amend Bylaw C-4841-97, being the Land Use Bylaw.

The Council of Rocky View County enacts as follows:

#### PART 1 – TITLE

This Bylaw shall be known as Bylaw C-7770-2018.

#### **PART 2 – DEFINITIONS**

In this Bylaw, the definitions and terms shall have the meanings given to them in Land Use Bylaw C-4841-97 and the Municipal Government Act.

#### PART 3 – EFFECT OF BYLAW

- **THAT** Part 5, Land Use Map No. 64, No. 64-South, and No. 64-North of Bylaw C-4841-97 be amended by redesignating Lot 2, Plan 911 1892 within NW 15-26-29-W4M from Residential Two District to Residential One District as shown on the attached Schedule 'A' forming part of this Bylaw.
- **THAT** Lot 2, Plan 911 1892 within NW 15-26-29-W4M is hereby redesignated to Residential One District, as shown on the attached Schedule 'A' forming part of this Bylaw.

#### PART 4 – TRANSITIONAL

Bylaw C-7770-2018 is passed when it receives third reading, and is signed by the Reeve/Deputy Reeve and the Municipal Clerk, as per Section 189 of the *Municipal Government Act*.

#### **Division:** 7 **File:** 06415050/PL20180011

PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD IN COUNCIL this	day of	<i>, 20</i> 18
READ A FIRST TIME IN COUNCIL this	day of	, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME IN COUNCIL this	day of	, 2018
UNANIMOUS PERMISSION FOR THIRD READING	day of	, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME IN COUNCIL this	day of	, 2018

Reeve

CAO or Designate

Date Bylaw Signed

#### APPENDIX 'B': Bylaw and Schedule A SCHEDULE "A"

## BYLAW: C-7770-2018









#### **APPENDIX 'C': Map Set**

#### C-1 Page 13 of 18



Contours are generated using 10m grid points, and depict general topographic features of the area. Detail accuracy at a local scale cannot be guaranteed. They are included for reference use only.

## TOPOGRAPHY Contour Interval 2 M

# Lot:2 Plan:9111892 NW-15-26-29-W04M

Date: Jan 24, 2018

Division #7

File: 06415050

AGENDA Page 84 of 410



Date: <u>Jan 24, 2018</u>

Page 85 of 410







From: Mike Lee Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2018 11:03 PM To: PAA\_ LegislativeServices Subject: FW: Bylaw C-7770-2018

To whom it may concern, As the owner of , I would like to support the application no. : PL20180011 (06415050) since I believe this area is now next to all kinds of amenities that local residents should open to share with more people. Sincerely, Le, Le Thi Lu, Phuoc Hong



## PLANNING SERVICES

TO:	Council	
DATE:	April 24, 2018	DIVISION: 7
TIME:	Afternoon Appointment	
FILE:	07306001	APPLICATION: PL20170018
SUBJECT:	Redesignation Item – Ranch and Farm District to Industrial – Industrial Activity District; outside of a business area	

#### <sup>1</sup>ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:

THAT application PL20170018 be refused.

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The purpose of this application is to redesignate a portion of the subject lands from Ranch and Farm District to Industrial – Industrial Activity District to facilitate the creation of a  $\pm$  4.05 hectare ( $\pm$ 10.0 acre) parcel with a  $\pm$  53.05 hectare ( $\pm$ 131.09 acre) remainder to accommodate industrial and diesel mechanics, and welding and machine shops.

The subject land is approximately  $\pm$  57.1 hectares ( $\pm$ 141.09 acres) in size, and is currently undeveloped and used for the cultivation of cereal crops.

The County Plan identifies the appropriate locations in which business development should occur to accommodate the growth of the County's business sectors. Business development should be directed to these identified business areas to complement the other businesses, maximize the use of existing infrastructure, minimize land use conflicts, and minimize the amount of traffic being drawn into the rural areas. Applications for other business development can be supported if the application meets County Plan policies 14.19 – 14.22.

Administration does not recommend approval of the application for the following reasons:

- The redesignation of the subject land, in conjunction with previous development in the quarter section, is not limited in size, scale, intensity, and scope, and may have adverse impacts on existing residential, business, or agricultural uses; thus, the application does not meet Policy 14.22;
- The rationale provided for being located outside of an identified business area is for financial considerations, which does not constitute a planning rationale for changing a parcel's land use and does not satisfy Policy 14.21;
- The proposed land use designation and use could be incompatible with the surrounding agricultural and business uses as the proposed land use district allows for uses that may have off-site nuisances; and
- Incremental development of the subject land creates an ad-hoc business area without the benefit of comprehensive planning.

Consequently, Administration recommends refusal in accordance with Option #2.



#### **DATE APPLICATION DEEMED COMPLETE:** March 7, 2018 (received January 31, 2017)

PROPOSAL:	To redesignate a portion of the subject lands from Ranch and Farm District to Industrial – Industrial Activity District to facilitate the creation of a $\pm$ 4.05 hectare (10.0 acre) parcel with a $\pm$ 53.05 hectare (131.09 acre) remainder to accommodate industrial and diesel mechanics, and welding and machine shops.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	Lot 3, Block 1, Plan 1411819; SE-06-27-28-W4M
GENERAL LOCATION:	Located at the northwest junction of Rge. Rd. 285 and Twp. Rd. 270 (see Appendix 'C').
APPLICANT:	Andre Aubut
OWNERS:	J. Kenneth & Shannon Chitwood
EXISTING LAND USE DESIGNATION:	Ranch and Farm District
PROPOSED LAND USE DESIGNATION:	Industrial – Industrial Activity District
GROSS AREA:	± 57.1 hectares (141.09 acres)
SOILS (C.L.I. from A.R.C.):	<b>Class 6W60, 2H, M40</b> – Limitations to cereal, oilseeds and tame hay crop production due to excessive wetness/poor drainage and slight limitations due to temperature, low moisture holding, adverse texture.

#### **PUBLIC & AGENCY SUBMISSIONS:**

The application was circulated to seven adjacent landowners; one letter in support and one letter in opposition of the application were received (see Appendix 'D'). The application was also circulated to a number of internal and external agencies. Those responses are available in Appendix 'A'.

#### **HISTORY**:

2013	Application to redesignate a portion of the subject land from Ranch and Farm District to Industrial – Industrial Activity District and create a $\pm$ 3.24 hectare ( $\pm$ 8.0 acre) parcel with a $\pm$ 57.76 hectare ( $\pm$ 142.74 acre) remainder was approved by Council.
2006	Application to redesignate the subject land from Farmstead District to General Business District Two to accommodate the future development of a heavy equipment storage facility was approved by Council.

#### BACKGROUND:

The subject land is undeveloped and currently used for the cultivation of cereal crops. The land is generally flat and contains numerous drained/altered or intact wetlands.

#### POLICY ANALYSIS:

#### Land Use Bylaw

The Industrial – Industrial Activity district has a minimum parcel size of 1.01 hectares (2.50 acres), creating the subdivision potential for four lots.



#### County Plan

The application was evaluated in accordance with Section 14, Business Development, of the County Plan. The goal of this section is to provide a range of business areas, and encourage the majority of new commercial and industrial business to locate in those identified business areas. The County Plan supports Other Business Development provided the proposal meets policies 14.19 – 14.22:

- 14.19 Applications to redesignate land for business uses adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the boundaries of an identified business area shall not be supported.
  - The subject land is not located adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the boundaries of an identified business area. However, the parcel is located in proximity to the Airdrie/Rocky View County boundary. The City of Airdrie has requested that the application not be approved. The City is currently undertaking a study for the 12 Thousand Acres Plan, which will provide the groundwork for how the development of 12,640 acres of land, annexed from Rocky View County in 2012, will accommodate services, amenities, and housing.
- 14.20 Small scale value-added agriculture and agriculture services, natural resource extraction, and business as defined in relevant Federal or Provincial legislation may be supported adjacent to, or near, a business area.
  - The proposal is not small-scale, value-added agriculture, agriculture services, natural resource extraction, or a business defined in relevant federal or provincial legislation.
- 14.21 Applications to redesignate land for business uses outside of a business area shall provide a rationale that justifies why the proposed development cannot be located in a business area (e.g. requirement for unique infrastructure at the proposed location).
  - The Applicant indicated that there is a need for a larger yard with good access and parking/storage. Large parcels of land within business areas are not affordable;
  - The rationale provided does not provide good planning rationale for its location outside of the business area.
- 14.22 Proposals for business development outside of a business area should:
  - a. be limited in size, scale, intensity, and scope;
    - The incremental development of the subject land is not limited in size, scale, intensity, and scope. The proposed redesignation, in conjunction with development that has previously occurred within the quarter section, is not limited in size, scale, intensity, and scope and creates an ad hoc business area without the benefit of comprehensive planning.
  - b. have direct and safe access to a paved County road or Provincial highway;
    - The proposed parcel would gain access from a shared mutual approach off Yankee Valley Boulevard, which is within the City of Airdrie's jurisdiction. The City requested that the application not be approved.
  - c. provide a traffic impact and intersection assessment; and
    - The Applicant provided a Traffic Impact Assessment.
  - d. minimize adverse impacts on existing residential, business, or agricultural uses.
    - The proposed uses may have adverse impacts on existing business and agricultural uses as the proposed uses may have an effect on the safety, use, amenity, or enjoyment of adjacent or nearby sites due to appearance, noise, odour, emission of contaminants, fire or explosive hazards, or dangerous goods.



#### CONCLUSION:

Administration evaluated the application based on the applicable policies within the County Plan. The proposal does not meet the policy requirements of Section 14 of the County Plan for Other Business Developments, and the proposed industrial use could be incompatible with surrounding agricultural and business uses. Therefore, Administration recommends refusal in accordance with **Option # 2**.

#### **OPTIONS:**

Option #1:	Motion #1	THAT Bylaw C-7767-2018 be given first reading.
	Motion #2	THAT Bylaw C-7767-2018 be given second reading.
	Motion #3	THAT Bylaw C-7767-2018 be considered for third reading.
	Motion #4	THAT Bylaw C-7767-2018 be given third and final reading.
Option #2:	THAT application PL20170018 be refused.	

Respectfully submitted,

Concurrence,

Interim County Manager

"Chris O'Hara"

"Kent Robinson"

**General Manager** 

AB/rp

#### APPENDICES:

APPENDIX 'A': Application Referrals APPENDIX 'B': Bylaw C-7767-2018 and Schedule A APPENDIX 'C': Map Set APPENDIX 'D': Landowner Comments



#### **APPENDIX A: APPLICATION REFERRALS**

AGENCY	COMMENTS	
School Authority		
Rocky View Schools	No objection.	
Calgary Catholic School District	No objection. CCSD anticipates that municipal reserve is still outstanding and will be dedicated at subdivision stage.	
Public Francophone Education	No comment.	
Catholic Francophone Education	No comment.	
Province of Alberta		
Alberta Environment	Not required for circulation.	
Alberta Transportation	Not required for circulation.	
Alberta Sustainable Development (Public Lands)	No comment.	
Alberta Culture and Community Spirit (Historical Resources)	No comment.	
Energy Resources Conservation Board	No comment.	
Alberta Health Services	No comment.	
Public Utility		
ATCO Gas	No comment.	
ATCO Pipelines	ATCO PIPELINES has no objection.	
AltaLink Management	No comment.	
FortisAlberta	No comment.	
Telus Communications	No objection.	
TransAlta Utilities Ltd.	No comment.	
Other External Agencies		
EnCana Corporation	No comment.	
City of Airdrie	In reference to the recently provided Transportation Impact Assessment relating to the application, the City of Airdrie appreciates being afforded the opportunity to review the report.	



AGENCY	COMMENTS
	Please note, insofar that a specific use for the subject lands was not assigned to the lands during the traffic impact assessment; the City was unable to effectively evaluate the potential impact to our roads. As such we would like to reiterate our original concerns as noted in our previous letter dated March 9, 2017; with specific reference to the following concerns:
	<ol> <li>The current County Plan (Bylaw C-7280-2013) identifies areas within the County where business uses, including industrial uses, would be encouraged. However the subject lands are outside these areas and are therefore not in keeping with the County's goals and objectives for business development in the County.</li> </ol>
	2. Insufficient information has been provided regarding the proposed use or uses for the site. However, we do note that the proposed redesignation opens the door for a variety of heavy industrial uses on the site. Potential conflict between the proposed land uses and the operations of the Airdrie Airpark are therefore likely to exist.
	Additionally, the City of Airdrie is currently in the process of preparing a <i>Twelve Thousand Acres Plan</i> to determine the "high-level" land uses and development sequencing for all parcels within the lands that had been annexed from Rocky View County in 2012. Prior to the completion of this planning exercise, it is presumed that conflicts between the proposed industrial land uses on the subject property and the land uses for the parcels adjacent to the applicable portion of the inter- municipal boundary will exist.
	3. The existing quarter-section currently has two other parcels, both designated for business uses, which have been subdivided out of the quarter (7 acres and 8 acres in size, respectively). The creation of this third parcel would increase the density and intensity of the business uses on the quarter- section all without the benefit of long-term planning.
	Given the above concerns, the City of Airdrie respectfully requests that the application to redesignate the lands <b>not be <u>approved.</u></b> The City looks forward to working with the County regarding land use planning adjacent to our boundaries.
Rockyview Gas Co-op	No objection.
Rocky View County Boards and Committees	
ASB Farm Members and Agricultural Fieldmen	No comment.
Rocky View Central Recreation	No comments.



AGENCY	COMMENTS	
District Board		
Internal Departments		
Agricultural Services	The redesignation of a parcel of land from Ranch and Farm District (RF) to industrial – Industrial Activity District is not supported by policy. If this application were to be approved, the application of the Agricultural Boundary Design Guidelines would be beneficial in buffering the commercial land use from the agricultural land uses surrounding the parcel. The guidelines would help mitigate areas of concern including: trespass, litter, pets, noise and concern over fertilizers, dust & normal agricultural practices.	
Municipal Lands	The Municipal Lands Office has no concerns at this time; however, comments pertaining to reserve dedication will be provided at any future subdivision stage.	
Development Authority	No comment.	
GeoGraphics	No comment.	
Building Services	No comment.	
Emergency Services	Enforcement has no concerns at this stage.	
Infrastructure and Operations - Engineering Services	<ul> <li>General</li> <li>The review of this file is based upon the application submitted. These conditions/recommendations may be subject to change to ensure best practices and procedures;</li> <li>As a condition of future DP, the applicant will be required to submit a construction management plan addressing noise mitigation measures, traffic accommodation, sedimentation and dust control, management of stormwater during construction, erosion and weed control, construction practices, waste management, firefighting procedures, evacuation plan, hazardous material containment and all other relevant construction management details;</li> <li>At time of subdivision or DP, the applicant shall be responsible to dedicate all necessary easements and ROWs for utility line assignments and provide for the installation of all underground shallow utilities with all necessary utility providers to the satisfaction of the County.</li> </ul>	

• ES has no requirements at this time;



AGENCY	

#### COMMENTS

 As a condition of future DP, the applicant may be required to conduct an onsite geotechnical investigation, conducted by a qualified geotechnical professional, to make recommendations for the pond liner of the future stormwater pond required to support the future development.

Transportation:

- The applicant provided a Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by EASL Transportation Consultants Inc. dated February 27, 2017. The TIA analyzed the impacts of the proposed development on the local road network as well as a site access location onto TWP Road 270. The TIA concludes that the addition of the proposed development (equipment storage facility – Industrial Business Park Type), in addition to the existing industrial development on the subject lands, will have minimal impact to the road network and the existing site access will continue to operate at an acceptable level in the post development condition. ES has reviewed the findings of the TIA and has no further concern;
- As a condition of future subdivision or DP, the applicant will be required to provide payment of the Transportation Off-Site Levy in accordance with the applicable levy at time of approval for the total gross acreage of the lands proposed to be subdivided or developed. The total levy to be collected will be calculated at time of subdivision based on the plan of survey or at DP stage based on the site development plan. Should the application be approved and move the subdivision stage, the estimate levy payment owed at time of subdivision endorsement is \$45,950;
- As per the TIA, the applicant is proposing to use the existing paved approach onto TWP Road 270 (approx. 30m in width) to access the subject lands. As a condition of future subdivision or DP, the applicant will be required to provide an access easement and associated access ROW plan to place on title of the adjacent parcels to the west and subject lands for the use of the existing approach.

Sanitary/Waste Water:

- ES has no requirements at this time;
- In accordance with County Policy 449, it is recommended that commercial and industrial developments shall utilize holding tanks with a trucked service to dispose of wastewater when connection to a regional system is not feasible.



AGENCY

#### COMMENTS

Water Supply And Waterworks:

- ES has no requirements at this time;
- ES generally recommends the use of cisterns with a trucked service for the supply of potable water for commercial and industrial developments when connection to a regional system is not feasible;
- As a condition of future DP, the applicant will be required to address all fire suppression requirements for the proposed development in accordance with the requirements of NFPA 1142 and all applicable County standards and bylaws.

Storm Water Management:

- As part of the application, the applicant provided a Stormwater Management Plan for the proposed development prepared by Western Water Resources Inc. dated December 21, 2017. The report provides a conceptual stormwater management concept for the site which consists of bioswales and rain gardens to attenuate post development stormwater flows. ES has reviewed the report and has no further concerns;
- As a condition of future DP, the applicant is required to submit detailed engineering drawings for the stormwater management system (SSIP), prepared by a qualified professional, in accordance with the Stormwater Management Plan prepared by Western Water Resources Inc. dated December 21, 2017 and County Servicing Standards;
- As a condition of future DP, the applicant is required to provide a sediment and erosion control plan, prepared by a qualified professional, addressing ESC measures to be implemented during construction in accordance with the requirements of the County's Servicing Standards.

Environmental:

 As per the Stormwater Management Plan prepared by Western Water Resources Inc. dated December 21, 2017, an ephemeral wetland exists along the eastern boundary of the area proposed to be rezoned to I-IA. The current concept for the development proposes the use of the ephemeral wetland as an outlet from the proposed rain gardens under emergency conditions. At time of future DP, the applicant will be required to obtain all necessary approvals from AEP if the wetland is to be disturbed or altered.

Infrastructure and Operations - Maintenance

No issues.



AGENCY	COMMENTS
Infrastructure and Operations - Capital Delivery	No concerns.
Infrastructure and Operations - Operations	Recommend applicant confirm proposed use of the land given that the land is being redesignated to Industrial Activity. The intended use may generate traffic volumes that may require possible upgrade of Twp Rd 270 or Rge Rd 285. How does the Applicant plan to access the subject lands? Will require County approval for new access off Twp Rd 270 or Rge Rd 285.
Infrastructure and Operations – Utility Services	No concerns.

Circulation Period: February 16, 2017 to March 10, 2017.



# **BYLAW C-7767-2018**

## A Bylaw of Rocky View County to amend Bylaw C-4841-97, being the Land Use Bylaw.

The Council of Rocky View County enacts as follows:

#### PART 1 – TITLE

This Bylaw shall be known as Bylaw C-7767-2018.

#### **PART 2 – DEFINITIONS**

In this Bylaw, the definitions and terms shall have the meanings given to them in Land Use Bylaw C-4841-97 and the Municipal Government Act.

#### PART 3 – EFFECT OF BYLAW

- **THAT** Part 5, Land Use Map No.73 of Bylaw C-4841-97 be amended by redesignating a portion of SE 6-27-28-W4M from Ranch & Farm District to Industrial – Industrial Activity District as shown on the attached Schedule 'A' forming part of this Bylaw.
- **THAT** A portion of SE 6-27-28-W4M is hereby redesignated to Industrial Industrial Activity District, as shown on the attached Schedule 'A' forming part of this Bylaw.

#### PART 4 – TRANSITIONAL

Bylaw C-7767-2018 is passed when it receives third reading, and is signed by the Reeve/Deputy Reeve and the Municipal Clerk, as per Section 189 of the *Municipal Government Act*.

**Division:** 7 **File:** 07306001/PL20170018

PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD IN COUNCIL this	day of	<i>, 20</i> 18
READ A FIRST TIME IN COUNCIL this	day of	, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME IN COUNCIL this	day of	, 2018
UNANIMOUS PERMISSION FOR THIRD READING	day of	, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME IN COUNCIL this	day of	, 2018

Reeve

CAO or Designate

Date Bylaw Signed

Page 1 of 1

### AGENDA Page 100 of 410









# C-2 **APPENDIX 'C': Map Set** Page 16 of 24 CITY OF AIRDRIE **RGE RD 285 TWP RD 270**

Contours are generated using 10m grid points, and depict general topographic features of the area. Detail accuracy at a local scale cannot be guaranteed. They are included for reference use only.

TOPOGRAPHY Contour Interval 2 M

# Lot:3 Block:1 Plan:1411819 SE-06-27-28-W04M

Date: Jan 31, 2017

Division #7

File: \_07306001

AGENDA Page 105 of 410








**AIRDRIE AIRPARK LTD.** P. O. Box 68086, Crowfoot R.P.O. Calgary, Alberta T3G 3N8 c/o Ph.: (403) 228-4020; Fax: (403) 228-5655



March 9, 2017

Ms. Andrea Bryden Rocky View County, Planning Services 911 32 Avenue NE Calgary, AB T2E 6X6 Email: <u>abryden@rockyview.ca</u>

Dear Andrea:

RE: Comments /Letter of Objection from Airdrie AirPark, Airdrie, AB in regard to Application Number PL20170018 – Proposal for Land Use Redesignation

Airdrie AirPark landowners recently received information from Planning Services at Rocky View County on notice of an application for proposed Land Use Redesignation and subdivision of a 10 acre parcel of land, located in Rocky View County, directly north of/adjacent to the Airdrie AirPark lands. The application is a request for Redesignation of current designation of Ranch and Farm land use to 'Industrial – Industrial Activity District' land use.

Airdrie AirPark appreciates the opportunity to provide comments and concerns on this application for proposed Redesignation and subdivision. We would like to state our objection to this application for the following reasons:

#### Information from Rocky View County (RVC) regarding this proposal:

<b>Application Number:</b>	PL20170018
Roll Number:	07306001
Owner(s):	J. Kenneth and Sharon Chitwood
Proposal:	To redesignate the subject lands from Ranch and Farm District to
	Industrial - Industrial Activity District in order to facilitate the creation of
	$\pm 4.05$ hectare (10.0 acre) parcel with $\pm 53.05$ hectare (131.09 acre) remainder.
Location:	Located at the northwest junction of Range Road 285 and Township Road 270.
Legal:	Within Lot 3, Block 1, Plan 1411819, SE-06-27-28-W04M

AGENDA Page 110 of 410

#### Page 2

The Airdrie AirPark property and Airport facility at over 600 acres in area (and legally described as portions of the W ½ Sec 35-26-29-W4M and of the E ½ Sec 36-26-29-W4M) is located within the City of Airdrie, in the south east corner. Airdrie AirPark was annexed by Airdrie in March 2012. The location of the (10 acre parcel of) land/area proposed for land use Redesignation and subdivision is located within Rocky View County and lies directly north of the Airdrie AirPark/Airport lands.

1. Airdrie AirPark Owners have invested heavily in the Airdrie AirPark over the past number of years and want to protect their investment in the Airport facility and plans for development from being eroded by potential competition from other non-residential development presently being applied for in areas of Rocky View County that are not defined as a 'suburban' area, nor are identified by Rocky View County as a key area for business development.

Since being annexed into the City of Airdrie, Airdrie AirPark have – and continue to - work closely with Airdrie in the updates/revisions recently made to Airdrie's documents to incorporate planning for the annexed lands. Airdrie AirPark plans to continue investing additional significant amounts into the Airdrie AirPark development based on the Airport facility/lands being within the City boundaries and the existing land use designation of Airport District/Employment land use.

In contrast, it is our understanding that the 10 acre parcel being applied for Redesignation from Ranch and Farm District to Industrial Land Use, is located in an area <u>not</u> identified as a future 'business use' area. Proposed unplanned for and undetermined Industrial/Non-Residential uses in this area of Rocky View County would compete directly with the Non-Residential uses proposed/planned by Airdrie and the Airdrie AirPark. As well, should the land use Redesignation and subdivision of this parcel be approved, it could set an unnecessary precedent for Redesignation applications of other future parcels.

- 2. There are little/no details of the proposed uses of the land use Redesignation of 'Industrial Industrial Activity' provided. The AirPark requests that any Industrial development uses proposed be compatible with Airport District Land use and aviation activity. They must not create emissions that would interfere with Airport activity, lighting must be sensitive to aircraft activity, heights must comply with the Airport's Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS) requirements, etc.
- 3. There have been prior challenges with stormwater drainage in areas located north of the Airdrie AirPark/Yankee Valley Blvd (TWP 270); the area to the north is slightly higher in elevation and the overland drainage flows south. We would request that RVC adds a requirement for an evaluation of the Stormwater Management (under the Planning Services Form 2.5 Part B in application) to ensure excess/post development stormwater volumes are contained within the applicant's property/development and are not directed towards the Airdrie AirPark lands.

#### Page 3

4. The location of the 10 acre parcel is directly adjacent to one of the AirPark's main entrance roads leading south into Airdrie AirPark property off Yankee Valley Blvd/TWP 270. As this location is very important in giving the public a good first impression when they enter the AirPark (i.e. in the future, once development occurs on the east side/east of the AB Pallet Company), we would request proper screening of Industrial uses.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns.

Please contact Cory Meyer and/or Lesley Neaves, c/o Airdrie AirPark Ltd. if you have any questions or require additional supporting information.

Regards

#### AIRDRIE AIRPARK LTD.

Cory Meyer Lesley Neaves

c.c. Stephen Utz, Senior Planner, City of Airdrie Mayor Peter Brown, City of Airdrie

#### AGENDA Page 112 of 410

From:	Bernie Biever
Sent:	Saturday, March 18, 2017 6:24 AM
To:	Andrea Bryden
Subject:	Development Proposal PL20170018
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up
Flag Status:	Flagged

Andrea Bryden

We have no issues with the proposed Development, File number 07306001, application Number PL20170018 and are in favour of the applicants request.

At this time we request that the building and development codes be enforced. The previous development on parcel 07306009 installed lighting that broadcasts all over the neighbourhood. The code specifically states downward lighting. Their lights are very bright, bright white in color (not the soft yellow other neighbours installed). Please have the development officer or appropriate person make the owner of 07306009 replace and install the proper allowed lighting. Regards Bernie Biever



# PLANNING SERVICES

TO:	Council	
DATE:	April 24, 2018	DIVISION: 5
TIME:	Afternoon Appointment	
FILE:	03329006	APPLICATION: PL20170114
SUBJECT:	Redesignation Item – Ranch and Farm District to Industr Public Services District	ial – Industrial Activity District and
<sup>1</sup> ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:		

Motion #1	THAT Bylaw C-7766-2018 be given first reading.
Motion #2	THAT Bylaw C-7766-2018 be given second reading.
Motion #3	THAT Bylaw C-7766-2018 be considered for third reading.
Motion #4	THAT Bylaw C-7766-2018 be given third and final reading.

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The purpose of the application is to redesignate the subject lands from Ranch and Farm District to Industrial - Industrial Activity District and Public Services District to facilitate the creation of two ± 1.29 hectare ( $\pm$  3.19 acre) parcels, four  $\pm$  1.0 hectare ( $\pm$  2.50 acre) parcels, two  $\pm$  1.86 hectare ( $\pm$  4.6 acre) parcels, and a  $\pm$  3.82 hectare ( $\pm$  9.44 acre) remainder.

Servicing, stormwater management, and access were evaluated and were found to be acceptable. The evaluation details are available in the Background section of this report.

The lands are located within the policy area of the Janet Area Structure Plan (ASP), and as a result, the application was evaluated in accordance with this statutory document. Other policy documents, such as the Rocky View/Calgary Intermunicipal Development Plan, were considered as well. Administration determined that:

- The proposal meets the Industrial development provisions of the Janet ASP;
- The proposal meets the provisions of Policy 8.1.2 of the Rocky View/Calgary IDP; and •
- The proposed land use district is appropriate for the type of use proposed.

Therefore, Administration recommends approval in accordance with Option #1.

#### DATE APPLICATION DEEMED COMPLETE: July 13, 2017

To redesignate the subject lands from Ranch and Farm District to Industrial - Industrial Activity District and Public Services District to facilitate the creation of two ± 1.29 hectare ( $\pm$  3.19 acre) parcels, four  $\pm$  1.0 hectare ( $\pm$  2.50 acre) parcels, and two  $\pm$  1.86 hectare ( $\pm$  4.6 acre) parcels, and a  $\pm$  3.82 hectare ( $\pm$  9.44 acre) remainder.

#### **LEGAL DESCRIPTION:**

**PROPOSAL:** 

A portion of NW-29-23-28-W04M

<sup>1</sup> Administration Resources Jamie Kirychuk, Planning Services Gurbir Nijjar, Engineering Services

> AGENDA Page 114 of 410



#### **GENERAL LOCATION:**

	Highway 560 (Glenmore Trail) and on the east side of Range Road 285 (Garden Road).
APPLICANT:	Terradigm Development Consultants Inc.
OWNERS:	Joseph Bleile
EXISTING LAND USE DESIGNATION:	Ranch and Farm District (RF)
PROPOSED LAND USE DESIGNATION:	Industrial Activity District and Public Services District
GROSS AREA:	± 16.19 hectares (± 40.00 acres)
SOILS (C.L.I. from A.R.C.):	Class 1 - No significant limitations.

Located approximately 1.6 kilometers (1 mile) north of

#### **PUBLIC & AGENCY SUBMISSIONS:**

The application was circulated to 42 adjacent landowners, and no responses were received. The application was also circulated to a number of internal and external agencies. Those responses are available in Appendix 'A'.

#### **HISTORY:**

1987

Plan 8810698 is registered, resulting in the separation of the parcel to the south.

#### BACKGROUND:

The purpose of the application is to redesignate the subject lands from Ranch and Farm District to Industrial - Industrial Activity District and Public Services District to facilitate the creation of two  $\pm$  1.29 hectare ( $\pm$  3.19 acre) parcels, four  $\pm$  1.0 hectare ( $\pm$  2.50 acre) parcels, two  $\pm$  1.86 hectare ( $\pm$  4.6 acre) parcels, and a  $\pm$  3.82 hectare ( $\pm$  9.44 acre) remainder.

The subject lands are located within the Janet ASP, east of the city of Calgary, and southwest of the city of Chestermere. This is an area of the County that primarily consists of business, commercial, and industrial development, but also features a mix of land uses. The majority of business uses are found to the west, where numerous Commercial, Industrial, and Direct Control Districts are located. To the east, lands are predominantly agricultural, with scattered pockets of country residential development. Lands immediately to the north are located within the Emcor Business Park Conceptual Scheme. The Heather Glenn Golf Course is located south of the subject lands.

The lands are developed with an existing homestead and agricultural operation that cultivates grain crops. Servicing for the proposed development would include the usage of sewage holding tanks, and potable water cisterns. Stormwater is to be directed to the proposed stormwater evaporation pond on the remainder lot, which would act as a Public Utility Lot (PUL). Access would be achieved via a newly constructed approach and internal road network along the northern boundary of the subject property.

The topography of the subject site does not pose significant concerns with regard to developability, and significant slopes are not featured.

#### POLICY ANALYSIS:

The subject lands are located within the Janet Area Structure Plan (ASP); the application was evaluated with the policies of that plan. The lands are also located within the Rocky View/Calgary Intermunicipal Development Plan, so that document was considered from an Intermunicipal perspective. The Land Use Bylaw was assessed for appropriate uses within the proposed land use district.



#### Janet Area Structure Plan

The County Plan identifies the Janet area as being appropriate for the development of a Regional Business Centre. The intent of the Janet ASP is to provide for "general industrial development catering to uses that do not require municipal-owned utility servicing."

Policy 10.5 states that local plans "*shall be required to support applications for industrial development*," and includes a number of criteria to be included in prospective plans. It also provides direction in Policy 26.1, that a local plan may not be required subject to the determination of the County.

The County Plan's Business Development goals require Administration to "support business development that meets the County's community and environmental goals." While the merits of local plans in commercial and industrial development are certainly recognized, a key consideration in this instance is the location of the subject lands and surrounding development. Approved local plans exist to the north and west of the subject lands, while lands to the south include a Direct Control District and the Heather Glenn Golf Course. In this case, Administration finds that the submission of a local plan is not necessary at this time as the scope would be limited to the subject lands. Furthermore, the Applicant provided all the necessary technical studies to demonstrate that the lands are suitable for development and are capable of being integrated into the transportation network.

#### Rocky View/Calgary Intermunicipal Development Plan

As the subject lands are located within the Policy Area of the Rocky View County/City of Calgary Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP), Section 27 of the Janet ASP requires that the IDP be considered in the evaluation of this application. One of the goals of the IDP is, "*to provide more certainty for planning and development decisions within a broad policy framework.*" The subject lands are located adjacent to an area identified on Map 2 as "*Highway 560 (Glenmore Trail) Joint Industrial Corridor*", and within an Industrial *Rocky View County Growth Corridor* on Map 4. These maps indicate that both municipalities identify the area as being generally appropriate for industrial development.

Generally, the IDP supports this application. Policy 8.1.2 requires that development within growth corridors proceed in accordance with "other Rocky View County statutory and local area plans." Policy 8.1.4 requires that Rocky View County "evaluate applications within identified City of Calgary Growth Areas against this Plan, the Rocky View County Municipal Development Plan and the Rocky View County Land Use Bylaw." This indicates that industrial development in this area would be supported by the IDP as long as it proceeds in accordance with the County Plan and other statutory policy, such as the Janet ASP. The application complies with the policies within the Janet ASP; therefore, the IDP is satisfied.

#### Land Use Bylaw

The application proposes to redesignate the subject lands from Ranch and Farm District to Industrial -Industrial Activity District and Public Services District for the creation of two  $\pm$  1.29 hectare ( $\pm$  3.19 acre) parcels, four  $\pm$  1.0 hectare ( $\pm$  2.50 acre) parcels, two  $\pm$  1.86 hectare ( $\pm$  4.6 acre) parcels, and a  $\pm$  3.82 hectare ( $\pm$  9.44 acre) remainder. As the minimum parcel size of the districts would be met for each proposed lot, and the intent of each district is consistent with the Land Use Bylaw, Administration has no further concerns.

#### CONCLUSION:

This land use amendment proposes the redesignation of a Ranch and Farm District parcel to Industrial -Industrial Activity District and Public Services District. Administration evaluated the proposal in accordance with the Statutory Policy found within the Janet ASP and determined that it is in accordance with the policies contained therein. Therefore, Administration recommends approval of the application in accordance with **Option #1**.



#### **OPTIONS:**

Option # 1:	Motion #1	THAT Bylaw C-7766-2018 be given first reading.
	Motion #2	THAT Bylaw C-7766-2018 be given second reading.
	Motion #3	THAT Bylaw C-7766-2018 be considered for third reading.
	Motion #4	THAT Bylaw C-7766-2018 be given third and final reading.

Option # 2: THAT application PL20170114 be refused.

Respectfully submitted,

Concurrence,

"Chris O'Hara"

"Kent Robinson"

General Manager

Interim County Manager

JK/rp

#### **APPENDICES:**

APPENDIX 'A': Application Referrals APPENDIX 'B': Bylaw C-7766-2018 and Schedule A APPENDIX 'C': Map Set



#### APPENDIX A: APPLICATION REFERRALS

AGENCY	COMMENTS
School Authority	
Rocky View Schools	Rocky View Schools has no objection to this circulation.
Calgary Catholic School District	Calgary Catholic School District (CCSD) has no objection to the above-noted circulation (PL2017-0114) located just south of Chestermere. As per the circulation, Municipal Reserves are still outstanding and will be considered at the subdivision stage.
Public Francophone Education	No comments received.
Catholic Francophone Education	No comments received.
Province of Alberta	
Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development (Public Lands)	No comments received.
Alberta Transportation	Not required for circulation.
Alberta Culture and Community Spirit (Historical Resources)	No comments received.
Energy Resources Conservation Board	No comments received.
Alberta Health Services	Alberta Health Services (AHS) understands that this application is proposing to re-designate the subject lands from Ranch and Farm District to Industrial - Industrial Activity District and Public Services District to facilitate the creation of two $\pm 1.29$ hectare ( $\pm 3.19$ acre) parcels, four $\pm 1.0$ hectare ( $\pm 2.50$ acre) parcels, two $\pm 1.86$ hectare ( $\pm 4.6$ acre) parcels, with a $\pm 3.82$ hectare ( $\pm 9.44$ acre) remainder.
	AHS provides the following comments for your consideration:
	<ol> <li>The application indicates that the potable water source for this development will be hauled water that is stored in a cistern. AHS supports connection to existing Alberta Environment and Parks-approved municipal or regional drinking water and wastewater systems wherever possible. If cisterns are utilized, please note that the Alberta Public Health Act specifies that:</li> </ol>
	The owner of a cistern that is used to hold a potable water supply intended for consumption by the public shall ensure that the cistern
	a. is maintained in a clean and sanitary condition, and
	b. is not used for any other purpose (AR 243/2003s14).
	Routine bacteriological sampling of the potable water supply



AGENCY	COMMENTS
	may be required.
	2. Any private sewage disposal systems installed on the subject lands must be completely contained within the property boundaries and must comply with the setback distances outlined in the most recent Alberta Private Sewage Systems Standard of Practice. Prior to installation of any sewage disposal system, a proper geotechnical assessment should be conducted by a qualified professional engineer and the system should be installed in an approved manner.
	3. AHS recommends that any development that has the potential to adversely impact neighbouring receptors (e.g. noise, odours, emissions etc.) not be located in close proximity to residential or sensitive land use areas (e.g. child care facilities, schools, adult care facilities, etc.). AHS would welcome the opportunity to participate in reviewing future land use and development applications in the area.
	4. AHS would like an opportunity to review and comment on any building permit applications to construct public facilities (e.g. food establishments, swimming facilities, daycares, adult care facilities, personal service establishments, etc.). Building plans for these facilities should be forwarded to our department for review and approval before the building permit is granted or construction commences.
	5. Throughout the construction and operation of the facility, the property must be maintained in accordance with the Alberta Public Health Act, Nuisance and General Sanitation Guideline 251/2001, which stipulates:
	No person shall create, commit or maintain a nuisance. A person who creates, commits or maintains any condition that is or might become injurious or dangerous to the public health or that might hinder in any manner the prevention or suppression of disease is deemed to have created, committed or maintained a nuisance
Public Utility	
ATCO Gas	No objections.
ATCO Pipelines	The Engineering Department of ATCO Pipelines (a division of ATCO Gas and Pipelines Ltd.) has reviewed the above named plan and has no objections subject the following conditions.
	<ol> <li>Any existing land rights shall be carried forward in kind and registered on any newly created lots, public utility lots, or other properties.</li> <li>Ground disturbances and surface works within 30 meters require prior written approval from ATCO Pipelines before commencing any work</li> </ol>



AGENCY	COMMENTS
	<ul> <li>Municipal circulation file number must be referenced; proposed works must be compliant with ATCO Pipelines requirements as set forth in the company's conditional approval letter.</li> <li>Contacting ATCO Pipelines Land Department at 1-888- 420-3464 for more information.</li> </ul>
	<ol><li>Road crossings are subject to Engineering review and approval.</li></ol>
	<ul> <li>Road crossing (s) must be paved and cross at a perpendicular angle.</li> <li>Parallel roads are not permitted within ATCO Pipelines right (s) – of – way.</li> <li>If the road crossing (s) requires a pipeline alteration, the cost will be borne by the developer / owner and can take up to 18 months to complete.</li> </ul>
	<ol> <li>Parking and/ or storage is not permitted on ATCO Pipelines pipeline (s) and/or right(s)-of-way.</li> </ol>
	5. ATCO Pipelines recommends a minimum 15 meter setback from the centerline of the pipeline (s) to any buildings.
	<ol> <li>Any changes to grading that alter drainage affecting ATCO Pipelines right-of-way or facilities must be adequate to allow for ongoing access and maintenance activities.</li> </ol>
	<ul> <li>If alterations are required, the cost will be borne by the developer/owner.</li> </ul>
	<ol><li>Any revisions or amendments to the proposed plan(s) must be re-circulated to ATCO Pipelines for further review.</li></ol>
AltaLink Management	No comments received.
FortisAlberta	No comments received.
Telus Communications	Please be advised that TELUS has no objection to the redesignation request, however, we will need to review the circulation for the proposed development/subdivision.
TransAlta Utilities Ltd.	No comments received.
Rockyview Gas Co-op Ltd.	No comments received.
Other External Agencies	
City of Calgary	The City of Calgary has reviewed the below noted circulated application referencing the Rocky View/Calgary Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP) and other applicable policies.
	The City of Calgary has no comments regarding Application # PL20170114 – To redesignate the subject lands from Ranch and

AGENDA Page 120 of 410



AGENCY	COMMENTS
	Farm District to Industrial - Industrial Activity District and Public Services District to facilitate the creation of two $\pm$ 1.29 hectare ( $\pm$ 3.19 acre) parcels, four $\pm$ 1.0 hectare ( $\pm$ 2.50 acre) parcels, two $\pm$ 1.86 hectare ( $\pm$ 4.6 acre) parcels, with a $\pm$ 3.82 hectare ( $\pm$ 9.44 acre) remainder.
EnCana Corporation	No comments received.
Western Irrigation District	WID has no objections to the Redesignation; however WID does require that the Landowner contact our office to discuss the irrigation acres currently on this parcel.
Rocky View County Boards and Committees	
ASB Farm Members and Agricultural Fieldman	Agricultural Services Staff Comments: this parcel falls within the Janet Area Structure Plan and therefore Ag Services has no concerns.
Recreation Board	The Chestermere-Conrich Board had no comments on this circulation.
Internal Departments	
Municipal Lands	The Municipal Lands Office has no concerns with this application.
Development Authority	No comments received.
GeoGraphics	Please ensure a Road Naming application is provided at subdivision approval stage.
Building Services	No comments received.
Emergency Services	Enforcement Services:
	No concerns at this stage.
	Fire Services:
	No comments.
Infrastructure and Operations -	General
Engineering Services	• At Future Subdivision and/or Development Permit stage, the Owner is required to enter into a Development Agreement pursuant to Section 655 of the Municipal Government Act respecting provision of the following:
	<ul> <li>a) Construction of a public internal road system (Industrial/Commercial standard) complete with temporary cul-de-sacs and any necessary easement agreements, as shown on the Tentative Plan, in</li> </ul>



AGENCY	COMMENTS
	accordance with the County Servicing Standards;
	<ul> <li>b) Construction of off-site improvements as identified in the final approved TIA;</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Mailbox locations are to be located in consultation with Canada Post to the satisfaction of the County;</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>d) Fire servicing via a drafting hydrant system to the satisfaction of the County;</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>e) Construction of storm water facilities in accordance with the recommendations of an approved storm water Management Plan and the registration of any overland drainage easements and/or restrictive covenants as determined by the storm water Management Plan.</li> </ul>
	f) Installation of power, natural gas, and telephone lines;
	Geotechnical - Section 300.0 requirements:
	<ul> <li>As part of the application, the applicant provided a Geotechnical Investigation, prepared by Lone Pine Geotechnical Ltd. dated January 17, 2018. The report provided the subsurface conditions of the subject lands and provided various recommendations for the development of the subject lands. The report concludes that the onsite soils are generally suitable to support the proposed development. ES has reviewed the report and has no further concerns at this time;</li> <li>As a condition of future subdivision and as recommended in the Geotechnical Investigation, the applicant will be required to implement a groundwater measurement program to determine the level of the seasonal groundwater table within the subject lands. The applicant may also be able to conduct further geotechnical investigation to better establish the loading capacity of the onsite soils for stormwater irrigation purposes as stormwater irrigation is integral to the stormwater management strategy for the development. If the onsite soils are deemed to be inadequate, the report is to provide recommendations (ie. topsoil thicknesses) to allow for the adequate loading and absorption of stormwater irrigation</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Transportation - Section 400.0 requirements:</li> <li>The applicant has submitted a Transportation Impact Assessment by JCB Engineering dated May 24, 2017. The TIA indicates that all impacted intersections analyzed in the TIA shall operate at acceptable levels of service at the opening day however intersectional improvements along Range Road 285 are warranted at future horizons based on the growth of background traffic and build out of the Janet</li> </ul>

ASP. The TIA also indicates that the future widening of



AGENCY	COMMENTS
	<ul> <li>Range Road 285 to a four lane cross section and the implementation of a traffic signal at Range Road 285 and Bluegrass Drive warrants the closure of the site access from RR 285 at 2040 horizon due to inadequate spacing. At that time, access to the development will come via an eastward extension of Bluegrass Drive across RR 285 utilizing the N/S road allowance provided for in the site plan. At that horizon, it is also recommended that a westbound left turn lane be added at the intersection of Bluegrass Drive and Range Road 285;</li> <li>It is to be noted that the land required for future roadways does not need to be dedicated at this time. Rather, a Road Acquisition Agreement is recommended to be taken at future subdivision stage so that the lands may be acquired in future for the construction of a road (30m width). Ultimately this future roadway connection will serve as primary access into and out of the proposed development;</li> <li>Ultimately, the Janet ASP shows that Bluegrass Drive will be extended east across Range Road 285 south of the proposed site. As recommended in the TIA, at such time in the future that this extension is constructed, the existing access off of Garden Road to the business park should be removed and reclaimed, and the Road Acquisition Agreements may be acted on for the site to gain access directly to Bluegrass Drive;</li> <li>The City of Calgary, with the involvement of both AT and the County, have conducted a Functional Planning Study for an all directional interchange at the intersection of RR 285 &amp; Glenmore Trail. The Study also includes an interim, at-grade intersectional improvement which will increase the current capacity for approx. Let years. The Study is currently in draft form and is expected to be brought forward to City and County Council in the spring/summer of 2018. At that time, the County should have a better idea of the implementation strategy of the intersectional improvements which could be a combination of the following:</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Levy payment toward the interim solution;</li> <li>Levy payment towards the ultimate solution;</li> <li>Front end the interim improvement;</li> <li>Pay a cost recovery payment to others as others would have front ended the interim improvement.</li> </ul>
	The necessary requirements can be determined at time of subdivision through appropriate subdivision conditions:
	<ul> <li>As a condition of future subdivision, the applicant will be required to enter into a Development Agreement for the construction of an internal Industrial/Commercial subdivision road in accordance with the County Servicing Standards and the TIA. As well, the applicant will be required to enter into a</li> </ul>



AGENCY	COMMENTS
	<ul> <li>DA for all other offsite infrastructure upgrades required to accommodate the development as outlined in the final approved TIA or as required by Rocky View County and Alberta Transportation. If acquisition of any additional right of way is necessary to implement the TIA recommendations, this will be the responsibility of the applicant;</li> <li>As a condition of future subdivision, 8m is required to be dedicated along the entire west boundary of the subject site for future road widening in accordance with the requirements of the SE Industrial Growth Study;</li> <li>The Transportation Offsite Levy will be collected in accordance with the TOL bylaw at the time of a future Subdivision and/or Development Permit stage. At this time, the estimated levy payment owed at time of subdivision endorsement is \$580,400 (Base + Special Area #3 + Special Area #8).</li> </ul>
	Sanitary/Waste Water - Section 500.0 requirements:
	<ul> <li>The applicant has proposed to utilize sewage holding tanks to service the proposed lots aligning with County Policy 449 and the Janet ASP. ES has no further concerns</li> </ul>
	Water Supply And Waterworks - Section 600.0 & 800.0 requirements:
	<ul> <li>The applicant has proposed to utilize potable water cisterns to service the proposed lots which aligns with the policies of the Janet ASP. ES has no further concerns;</li> <li>The applicant has indicated they will provide a drafting hydrant system from the proposed stormwater pond to service the proposed development. As a condition of future subdivision and DP, the applicant will be required to further detail the fire suppression system, prepared by a qualified professional, providing the detailed design of the fire suppression infrastructure for the proposed development.</li> </ul>
	Storm Water Management – Section 700.0 requirements:
	• The applicant has provided a conceptual level storm water management plan prepared by Integrated Environments dated May 24, 2017. The report proposes storm water infrastructure to support the development including a storm water evaporation pond (located on a PUL) and irrigation disposal infrastructure meeting the zero-release requirement of the Janet Master Drainage Plan. The applicant has proposed that the future Lot Owners Association be responsible for the ownership, operation and maintenance of the irrigation disposal system. It is to be noted that this system be managed by a qualified 3 <sup>rd</sup> party operator (under the supervision of a Lot Owner's association) to the satisfaction of the County;

# AGENDA Page 124 of 410



AGENCY	COMMENTS
	<ul> <li>As a condition of future subdivision, the applicant will be required to enter into a Development Agreement for the construction of storm water infrastructure required as a result of the development and outlined in the final Storm water Management Plan including access from the internal road through the panhandle all in accordance with the County Servicing Standards. The applicant will be responsible for the registration of any required easements, utility right of ways and/or public utility lots is required as a condition of subdivision;</li> <li>As a condition of future subdivision, the County will require a right of way of 12 m along the entire east boundary of the site for future regional conveyance for the CSMI consistent with what was requested for the cARMEK Business Park lands (immediately north of the subject lands);</li> <li>As a condition of future subdivision, the Applicant will be required to obtaining all AEP approvals and licensing for the storm water management infrastructure.</li> </ul>
	Environmental – Section 900.0 requirements:
	<ul> <li>The applicant provided a Desktop Environmental Assessment and Initial Wetland Evaluation for the subject lands prepared by Tannas Conservation Services Ltd. dated February 06, 2018. The assessment took into consideration the significance of the existing onsite soils, vegetation, wildlife, historical resources and wetlands and concludes that there are no wildlife, plant, or historical resources of concern on the property. The assessment does indicate that there appears to have been a temporary impact of water on the landscape, but it does not appear to be due to a naturally formed wetland.</li> <li>As the Assessment provided was solely a desktop study, as a condition of future subdivision, the applicant will be required to conduct a field assessment at the appropriate time of year using acceptable soil and vegetation survey assessment in accordance with the Alberta Wetland Policy. Should any wetlands or areas of environmental significance be discovered, the applicant shall be responsible to obtain all necessary AEP approvals the disturbance to these areas.</li> </ul>
Infrastructure and Operations - Maintenance	Does bulb design meet Rocky View County standard?
Infrastructure and Operations - Capital Delivery	No concerns.
Infrastructure and Operations – Road Operations	Concerns with location of proposed access point for subdivision onto Range Road 285. It is too close to existing Bluegrass Drive intersection to the south. This will create traffic movement safety

# AGENDA Page 125 of 410



#### AGENCY

COMMENTS

given the high volume of truck traffic that area sees.

Infrastructure and Operations - No issues. Utility Services

Circulation Period: August 2, 2017 – September 2, 2017



# **BYLAW C-7766-2018**

## A Bylaw of Rocky View County to amend Bylaw C-4841-97, being the Land Use Bylaw

The Council of Rocky View County enacts as follows:

#### PART 1 – TITLE

This Bylaw shall be known as Bylaw C-7766-2018.

#### **PART 2 – DEFINITIONS**

In this Bylaw, the definitions and terms shall have the meanings given to them in Land Use Bylaw C-4841-97 and the Municipal Government Act.

#### PART 3 – EFFECT OF BYLAW

- **THAT** Part 5, Land Use Maps No. 33 and 33-NW of Bylaw C-4841-97 be amended by redesignating a portion of NW-29-23-28-W4M from Ranch & Farm District to Industrial Industrial Activity District and Public Services as shown on the attached Schedule 'A' forming part of this Bylaw.
- **THAT** A portion of NW-29-23-28-W4M is hereby redesignated to Industrial Industrial Activity District and Public Services as shown on the attached Schedule 'A' forming part of this Bylaw.

#### **PART 4 – TRANSITIONAL**

Bylaw C-7766-2018 comes into force when it receives third reading, and is signed by the Reeve/Deputy Reeve and CAO or Designate, as per the *Municipal Government Act*.

Division: 5

File: 03329006- PL20170114

PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD IN COUNCIL this	day of	<i>, 20</i> 18
READ A FIRST TIME IN COUNCIL this	day of	, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME IN COUNCIL this	day of	, 2018
UNANIMOUS PERMISSION FOR THIRD READING	day of	, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME IN COUNCIL this	day of	, 2018

Reeve

CAO or Designate

Date Bylaw Signed











Date: <u>Feb 28, 2018</u>

Division #5

File: 03329006

Page 132 of 410











# PLANNING SERVICES

TO: Council

**DATE:** April 24, 2018

TIME: Afternoon Appointment

**FILE:** 06731002

APPLICATION: PL20170145

**DIVISION:** 9

**SUBJECT:** Redesignation Item – Ranch and Farm District to Natural Resource Industrial District Note: This application should be considered in conjunction with application PL20170184, amendment to the Summit Master Site Development Plan (MSDP) in support of a land use redesignation proposing Natural Resource Industrial District.

#### <sup>1</sup>ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:

Motion #1	THAT Bylaw C-7739-2017 be given first reading.
Motion #2	THAT Bylaw C-7739-2017 be given second reading.
Motion #3	THAT Bylaw C-7739-2017 be considered for third reading.
Motion #4	THAT Bylaw C-7739-2017 be given third and final reading.

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The purpose of this application is to redesignate the remainder of the subject lands from Ranch and Farm District to Natural Resource Industrial District to provide for an aggregate operation on the subject lands. The intent of the redesignation is to remove the need for a redesignation application at each phase of the development, thereby simplifying the future development processes. In order to accommodate this redesignation, amendments to the adopted MSDP (PL20170184) were submitted and are to be considered in conjunction with this application.

This report outlines the matters relating directly to the land use redesignation application, including a statutory and non-statutory policy assessment, a land use compatibility assessment, and an overview of how the policies of the MSDP would be implemented. The corresponding MSDP amendment report (PL20170184) addresses matters such as noise, air quality, stormwater, groundwater, visual and landscape impacts, reclamation, and traffic impacts.

Although the County does not currently have a comprehensive set of performance standards or spatial policies against which aggregate extraction and processing can be assessed, the Applicant has demonstrated that the potential effects of the development could be reduced to an acceptable level in accordance with existing County and provincial requirements. The proposed aggregate operation is located in an area of the County that contains large gravel deposits and is in proximity to similar gravel mining operations. The supporting MSDP and associated technical assessments provide the necessary information to satisfy Section 29 of the County Plan and, if approval is granted, give sufficient assurance that technical considerations can be adequately addressed through Development Permits. Administration reviewed the application and determined that:

• It is consistent with the overall goal of the County Plan with respect to natural resource extraction;



- It is consistent with the policies of Section 15 of the County Plan with respect to minimizing adverse impacts on adjacent lands, working collaboratively with the County and associated agencies, and using identified haul routes;
- It is consistent with the development review criteria provided in Section 29 of the County Plan through the adopted MSDP; and
- The technical aspects of the proposal will be addressed at Development Permit stage.

Consequently, Administration recommends approval in accordance with Option #1.

## DATE APPLICATION DEEMED COMPLETE: November 23, 2017 (Received: August 25, 2017)

PROPOSAL:	To redesignate a portion of the subject lands from Ranch and Farm District to Natural Resource Industrial District to accommodate aggregate extraction.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	NW-31-26-03-W05M
GENERAL LOCATION:	Located at the southeast junction of Hwy 567 and Rge Rd 40, approximately 3.0 miles northeast of Cochrane.
APPLICANT:	B & A Planning Group – Jonathan Schmidt
OWNERS:	1410266 Alberta Ltd.
EXISTING LAND USE DESIGNATION:	Natural Resource Industrial District (NRI) and Ranch and Farm District (RF)
PROPOSED LAND USE DESIGNATION:	Natural Resource Industrial District (NRI)
GROSS AREA:	± 66.27 hectares (± 163.76 acres)
SOILS (C.L.I. from A.R.C.):	<b>4H, F, P</b> - Severe limitations to cereal crop production due to temperature limiting factors, excessive wetness/poor drainage, low natural fertility and excessive surface stoniness.

### PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS:

The application was circulated to 16 adjacent landowners to which 24 letters in objection and six letters in support of the application were received in response (Appendix 'D'). The application was also circulated to a number of internal and external agencies. Those responses are available in Appendix 'A'.

### **HISTORY:**

September 26, 2017	A Master Site Development Plan (PL20150100) was approved to provide a policy
	framework for future redesignation and development on the subject lands.

July 11, 2017 An application (PL20150101) was approved to redesignate 25.00 acres of the subject quarter to Natural Resource Industrial District (NRI).

## BACKGROUND:

The purpose of this application is to redesignate the remainder of the subject lands from Ranch and Farm District to Natural Resource Industrial District to provide for the development of a gravel pit on the subject lands. A land use application to redesignate 25.00 acres of the subject quarter was approved in July 2017, and in accordance with the policies of the County Plan, a Master Site Development Plan (MSDP) was adopted to provide a policy framework for future redesignation and development on the subject lands. In order to accommodate this redesignation, and to simplify the future development permit



processes on this site, amendments to the adopted MSDP (PL20170184) were submitted and are to be considered in conjunction with this application.

The lands currently contain a dwelling that is serviced by a well and private sewage treatment system. The remainder of the quarter is currently used for pasture. Access is provided via an existing approach from Highway 567 and Range Road 40. The lands are located in an area of the County that is primarily agricultural in nature; however, there is an existing gravel operation less than ½ mile to the west and two new gravel operations proposed to the west and north.

The topography in the project area is undulating. The high point is located in the upper northeast portions of the subject lands. The subject lands slope towards the south and east. The majority of the northern portion of the site is relatively flat with a slight southwest facing aspect.

Predominant land uses in the area are agricultural and ranching operations. A recreational vehicle campground and service area is located at the junction of Highway 22 and Highway 567, and an existing gravel operation is located less than 0.5 kilometers to the west. The nearest residential community is the hamlet of Cochrane Lake, approximately 3.5 km to the west.

The proposed gravel pit is located in an area that contains large gravel deposits and is in proximity to similar gravel mining operations. An existing gravel pit to the west has been operating since the 1970s; a redesignation application to support an expansion was approved by Council in December 2012. Another large gravel pit, operated by Lafarge and Rocky View County, is located 3 kilometers to the southeast, east of Big Hill Springs Provincial Park. Council approved a redesignation application in June 2005 to support its business expansion.

In addition, there are two recently approved gravel operations and one Development Permit application in process for gravel pits in the vicinity of the subject lands.

#### POLICY ANALYSIS:

The application was evaluated in accordance with the County Plan and Land Use Bylaw.

#### County Plan C-7280-2013

Section 15.0 Natural Resources of the County Plan states that the County is responsible for approving land use and issuing development permits for all aggregate extractions. Additionally, aggregate pits of all sizes are subject to provincial legislation.

The goal of the Natural Resource policies is to support the extraction of natural resources in a manner that balances the needs of residents, industry, and society, and to support environmentally responsible management. A number of policies are provided and were used to evaluate this application:

15.1. Minimize the adverse impact of aggregate resource extraction on existing residents, adjacent land uses, and the environment.

The County currently does not have a comprehensive set of performance standards or spatial policies against which aggregate development can be assessed. However, the technical assessments provided and resulting policies presented in the adopted MSDP effectively address how any adverse impact of aggregate extraction on existing residents, adjacent land uses, and the environment would be managed and mitigated. The adopted MSDP provides specific policies to address potential off-site impacts of the operation including hours of operation, dust control, noise mitigation, and access improvements. In addition, policies are provided to require continuous monitoring of site conditions and response strategies should the operations exceed the agreed upon limitations.



15.2. Encourage collaboration between the County, the aggregate extraction industry, and affected residents to development mutually agreeable solutions to mitigate impacts of extraction activities.

The Applicant worked with stakeholders to develop policies to effectively address the concerns of adjacent landowners. The Applicant submitted their proposal in accordance with the County's Servicing Standards and the mutually agreed-upon solutions with respect to access and highway improvements.

15.4. Direct all aggregate related traffic to identified major haul routes that are monitored and appropriately maintained.

The Applicant proposed two haul routes, both of which would use highway infrastructure on routes that are currently classified as major haul routes for traffic.

15.6. Until such time as a County aggregate extraction policy is prepared, applications for aggregate extraction shall prepare a master site development plan that addresses the development review criteria identified in section 29.

The adopted MSDP addresses each of the development review criteria provided in section 29, and includes an overview of the development proposal, operation details, community consultation and mitigation measures with support of technical reports to address specific items including traffic, water quality, stormwater, vision, noise, and air quality, etc. Minor amendments to the adopted MSDP (PL20170184) were submitted and are to be considered in conjunction with this application.

#### Land Use Bylaw C-4841-97

The Natural Resource Industrial District is the appropriate land use for the intended operations. A Development Permit is required to approve the use, design, and servicing for the aggregate operations.

#### **PROVINCIAL APPROVALS REQUIRED:**

#### Alberta Transportation

A Roadside Development Permit would be required from Alberta Transportation as the proposed development is within 800 m of a provincial highway. The Transportation Impact Assessment was submitted to Alberta Transportation for their review, and the location and type of intersection upgrades were prepared in discussions with Alberta Transportation.

#### Alberta Environment and Parks (Code of Practice for Pits)

All pits greater than 5.0 hectares (12.35 acres) on private land require approval from Alberta Environment through the Code of Practice for Pits. The Code of Practice addresses a number of items including pit operations, reclamation, and environmental monitoring. The Applicant completed their application for Alberta Environment and Parks and would submit it upon approval of the land use and MSDP applications.

#### Alberta Culture Historic Resources

Historic Resource Act Clearance from Alberta Culture would be required prior to development on the site. This approval was granted on September 16, 2014.

#### MASTER SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN:

The adopted MSDP provides a policy framework that will guide future Development Permit applications on the subject lands and address matters such as noise, air quality, stormwater, groundwater, visual and landscape impacts, reclamation and traffic impacts. The proposed amendments are intended to provide for the redesignation of the remainder lands, and include a revised phasing plan and the removal of the previously identified undisturbed natural area. All other policies in the MSDP, including performance



standards, would remain unchanged.

#### CONCLUSION:

The proposed application is consistent with the County Plan and the Land Use Bylaw. The proposed aggregate operation is located in an area of the County that contains large gravel deposits and where similar gravel mining operations are situated. All technical aspects of the proposed operation are addressed through the supporting MSDP and would be further implemented through a Development Permit. Administration reviewed the application and determined that:

- It is consistent with the overall goal of the County Plan with respect to natural resource extraction;
- It is consistent with the policies of Section 15 of the County Plan with respect to minimizing adverse impacts on adjacent lands, working collaboratively with the County and associated agencies, and using identified haul routes;
- It is consistent with the development review criteria provided in Section 29 of the County Plan through the adopted MSDP; and
- The technical aspects of the proposal would be addressed at Development Permit stage.

Consequently, Administration recommends approval in accordance with Option #1.

#### **OPTIONS:**

Option #1:	Motion #1	THAT Bylaw C-7739-2017 be given first reading.
	Motion #2	THAT Bylaw C-7739-2017 be given second reading.
	Motion #3	THAT Bylaw C-7739-2017 be considered for third reading.
	Motion #4	THAT Bylaw C-7739-2017 be given third and final reading.
Option #2:	THAT applica	tion PL20170145 be refused.

Respectfully submitted,

Concurrence,

"Chris O'Hara"

**General Manager** 

Interim County Manager

"Kent Robinson"

JA/rp

#### **APPENDICES:**

APPENDIX 'A': Application Referrals APPENDIX 'B': Bylaw C-7739-2017 and Schedule A APPENDIX 'C': Map Set APPENDIX 'D': Landowner Comments



#### APPENDIX A: APPLICATION REFERRALS

AGENCY	COMMENTS
School Authority	
Rocky View Schools	No comments provided.
Calgary Catholic School District	Calgary Catholic School District (CCSD) has no objection to the above-noted circulation (PL2017-0145) located northeast of Cochrane.
Public Francophone Education	No comments provided.
Catholic Francophone Education	No comments provided.
Province of Alberta	
Alberta Environment	No comments provided.
Alberta Transportation	This will acknowledge receipt of the above referenced proposal to accommodate an aggregate extraction
	operation at the above noted location. Due to the required access to and proximity of Highway 567, Alberta
	Transportation has the following comments and observations:
	<ol> <li>Alberta Transportation understands that the intersection of Highway 567 and Range Road 40 is to be upgraded as a condition of development permit approvals as contemplated within the Master Site Development Plan.</li> <li>The department further acknowledges that the development proposed will occur as generally contemplated within the Master Site Development Plan, and should be advised in writing should there be changes to this Plan.</li> <li>Design and construction of highway improvements to support the proposed development is to be completed at no cost to Alberta Transportation to the satisfaction of Alberta Transportation and Rocky View County.</li> <li>The existing highway access must be removed and reclaimed as part of the intersection improvement noted above.</li> <li>A Roadside Development Permit will be required from Alberta Transportation for the proposed development, as well as the upgrade to the intersection of Highway 567 and Range Road 40.</li> </ol>
	the MSDP and has no concerns or requirements.
Alberta Sustainable Development (Public Lands)	No comments provided.



AGENCY	COMMENTS
Alberta Culture and Community Spirit (Historical Resources)	No comments provided.
Energy Resources Conservation Board	No comments provided.
Alberta Health Services	It is our understanding that this is an amendment for the Summit Pit Master Site Development Plan (MSDP) to update the phasing plan, environmental area policies and mapping. AHS has had opportunities to review the original MSDP and relevant applications, including PL20150100-MSDP (dated September 25 2015), PL20150101-Redesignation (dated January 2016) and PL 20170145 – Redesignation (dated September 2017). Based on the new information provided in the referenced application, AHS has no additional comments to those listed in our previous letters.
Public Utility	
ATCO Gas	ATCO Gas has no objection to the proposed.
ATCO Pipelines	ATCO PIPELINES has no objection.
AltaLink Management	No comments provided.
FortisAlberta	FortisAlberta has a power line within the area to be re- designated, going to the residence. The developer can contact 310-WIRE(9473) to make arrangements to have the power line relocated or safety orientation.
Telus Communications	No comments provided.
TransAlta Utilities Ltd.	No comments provided.
Rockyview Gas Co-op Ltd.	No comments provided.
Other External Agencies	
EnCana Corporation	No comments provided.
Rocky View County Boards and Committees	
Agricultural Services Staff	If this application were to be approved, the application of the Agricultural Boundary Design Guidelines would be beneficial in buffering the Natural Resource Industrial District land use from the agricultural land uses surrounding the parcel. The guidelines would help mitigate areas of concern including: trespass, litter, pets, noise and concern over fertilizers, & dust.

AGENCY	COMMENTS
Ranch Lands Recreation Board	As Municipal Reserves are not required pursuant to Section 663 of the MGA, the Ranch Lands Recreation District Board has no comments about this circulation.
Internal Departments	
Municipal Lands	The Municipal Lands Office has no concerns with this application.
Development Authority	No comment.
GeoGraphics	No comment.
Building Services	No comment.
Emergency Services	Having reviewed the circulation, the Fire Service has no comments at this time.
Infrastructure and Operations - Engineering Services	<ul> <li>General</li> <li>The review of this file is based upon the application submitted. These conditions/recommendations may be subject to change to ensure best practices and procedures</li> <li>It is to be noted that there are two (2) other Council adopte Master Site Development Plans (MSDPs) and one (1) activ Development Permit (DP) application for gravel pits in near vicinity of the subject lands. The applicant, together with the other gravel operators in the area, are referred to as the Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group (BHSAPG) for which all operators share a joint set of operating standards which have been identified in their respective MSDPs. The requirements from the council approved MSDP for this application including the joint operating standards have beer reflected in the comments below;</li> <li>At time of extraction activities within the Phase IV area (southwest corner of the subject lands), the applicant will b required to apply to close and consolidate the undeveloped road allowance prior to proceeding with any extraction activities;</li> <li>The current version of the MSDP for the Mountain Ash Gravel Pit (formerly known as Summit Gravel) had indicate that each phase of the gravel pit was to be redesignated individually. The current application is to redesignate the remainder of the quarter section to the NRI district and to allow a maximum of 40 acres of open pit area at any given time (previously 25 – 33 acres);</li> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant, in conjunctio with the other members of the BHSAPG, will be required to provide a detailed Joint Operations Plan which provides an implementation and operations plan for the Joint</li> </ul>


AGENCY	COMMENTS
	Commitments stated in the MSDPs. This plan shall include:
	<ul> <li>Joint noise, emissions, dust and air quality monitoring plans providing the location of any offsite monitoring stations, monitoring intervals, mitigation practices and procedures to be followed by the pit operators if prescribed limits have been exceeded;</li> <li>Methods of communication of joint coordination of pit activities for any loud work;</li> <li>Joint dust control plan showing the location of any offsite air quality measurement stations including procedures to be followed if air quality limit exceedances have occurred;</li> <li>Emissions Mitigation Plan addressing air quality and dus mitigation practices, monitoring intervals and locations; and</li> <li>Creation of BHSAPG website which is to provide updated monitoring information on noise, dust, air qualit and groundwater measurements including all reported exceedances. The site is also include up-to-date pit information and all other pertinent resources for the public.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>As a permanent condition of the future DP, the applicant will be required to provide the County with the EPEA registration for the proposed pit;</li> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant is required to provide a Construction Management for the construction of the Type IVa intersectional improvement and paving of Range Road 40 which shall address noise mitigation measures, traffic accommodation, sedimentation and dust control, management of stormwater during construction, erosion and weed control, construction practices, waste management, firefighting procedures, evacuation plan, hazardous material containment and all other relevant construction management details;</li> <li>As a condition of future DP, the applicant will be required to provide a detailed Weed Control Plan which meets the requirements of the Weed Control Act and the County's Land Use Bylaw. The recommendations of the plan are to b implemented during extraction activities;</li> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant will be require to provide a detailed reclamation plan for the Phase I area in accordance with the MSDP and the requirements under the Code of Practice for Gravel Pits published by AEP. The plar shall address:</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>the progressive reclamation of the pit in terms of operating and un-reclaimed areas compared to</li> </ul>

 the progressive reclamation of the pit in terms of operating and un-reclaimed areas compared to reclaimed areas to ensure a maximum open pit area of 25 acres at any given time;



AGENCY	COMMENTS
	<ul> <li>the reclamation monitoring and maintenance plan to ensure the success of the reclamation activities; and</li> <li>implementation of the recommendations of the slope stability assessment prepared in support of reclamation activities;</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant is required to provide a comprehensive landscaping plan, prepared by a qualified Landscape Architect, for the Phase I area showing the landscaping elements that are to be incorporated into th berm, setback and entrance areas;</li> <li>The applicant previously provided a Biophysical Impact Assessment (BIA) prepared by Ghostpine Environmental Services dated November 2014. The assessment took into consideration the environmental significance and historical resource values for the subject lands. As a condition of future DP, the applicant will be required to obtain clearance under the Historical Resources Act prior to commencing with mining activities;</li> <li>The applicant previously submitted a Noise Impact Assessment, prepared by SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd. dated January 27, 2016. The assessment concludes that the predicted cumulative sound level from normal operation of the proposed facility, provided that appropriate noise mitigation measures are implemented, is expected to meet AER Directive 038 at the nearby residences of concern. As condition of the future DP, the applicant is required to provide a revised Noise Impact Assessment, prepared by Ster Consulting compliance with the Alberta Energy Regulator's 'Directive 038'. The plan shall also provide details of the integration strategy into the joint monitoring requirements as outlined in the Joint Operations Plan for the BHSAPG;</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>The applicant previously provided a Dust Control Plan prepared by Ghostpine Environment Services Ltd which provides various dust mitigation measures such as berming landscaping, watering, seeding and limiting crushing activities to the approved operating locations and times. The MSDP for the proposed gravel pit also contain numerous commitments in regards to dust mitigation and control to be implemented by the members of the BHSAPG including the applicant. As a condition of the future DP, the applicant will be required to provide the County with details of the dust suppression measures to be implemented as part Phase I o the pit all in accordance with the MSDP and the County Servicing Standards. The plan shall also provide details of the integration strategy into the joint monitoring requirement as outlined in the Joint Operations Plan for the BHSAPG;</li> </ul>

 The applicant previously provided an Air Quality Assessment prepared by Millennium EMS Solutions Ltd. dated March



### COMMENTS

2015. The assessment concluded that the proposed mining operation is not expected to exceed air quality objectives beyond the subject lands and have minimal impact to nearby residences however, the study did not take into consideration the gravel pits in the area of the BHSAPG. As a condition of future DP, the applicant will be required to provide an updated Air Quality Assessment, prepared by a qualified professional, for Phase I of the proposed pit taking into consideration the other pits in the area and provide a strategy that will allow the pit to remain in compliance with the Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and Alberta Ambient Air Quality Objectives (AAAQO). The plan shall also provide details of the integration strategy into the joint monitoring requirements as outlined in the Joint Operations Plan for the BHSAPG.

### **Geotechnical**

- The applicant previously provided a Hydrogeological Assessment Report prepared by SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd. dated February 2015. The report concludes that the mining of the aggregate resources will be extracted to a maximum of 1.0m above the maximum level of the groundwater table. As a condition of future DP, the applicant will be required to implement a groundwater measurement program and provide the County with new groundwater readings at the boundaries of the Phase I area to record all fluctuations in groundwater levels to ensure gravel extraction activities remain a minimum of 1.0m above the highest recorded groundwater reading at all times;
- As a permanent condition of the DP, the applicant is required to implement a groundwater measurement program for which the applicant is to install piezometers within the open pit area to take regular readings of the groundwater levels to ensure mining activities remain a minimum of 1.0m above the recorded groundwater levels at all times. The applicant will be required to keep a log to record the readings and be able to provide the County with the log upon request and include the log in the Annual Operations Report;
- As a condition of future DP, the applicant will be required to provide a Geotechnical Assessment which provides slope stability recommendations for Phase I of the gravel pit. The assessment is to provide recommendations for slope design and setbacks in active pit areas as well as for final reclaimed conditions;
- As a condition of the future DP, the applicant is required to provide a geotechnical report, prepared by a qualified geotechnical professional, providing a pavement structure design for the Type IVa intersectional improvement at Range Road 40 and Highway 567 and for the paving of Range



AGENCY	COMMENTS
	Road 40 to the satisfaction of AT and the County
	Transportation
	<ul> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant will be required to enter into a Development Agreement with the County for:</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>The upgrade of Range Road 40 to a regional transitional paved standard (400.10) at a minimum from Highway 567 to the site;</li> <li>Upgrade of the intersection of Range Road 40 and Highway 567 to a Type IVa standard including all signage and any other roadside indicators to the satisfaction of AT;</li> <li>Implementation of the recommendations of the geotechnical report and pavement structure design;</li> <li>Implementation of the recommendations of the Construction Management Plan; and</li> <li>Implementation of the recommendations of the illumination and climbing lane warrants;</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant is required to provide an intersection illumination warrant analysis, prepared by a qualified professional, to determine if any illumination is warranted at the Type IVa intersection of Range Road 40 and Highway 567;</li> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant is require to provide a climbing lane warrant, prepared by a qualified professional, to determine if there is a need for a climbing lane to allow for the safe entrance of truck traffic onto the highway 567;</li> <li>As a condition of future DP, the applicant is required to allow for the safe entrance of truck traffic onto the highway from the intersection of Range Road 40 and Highway 567;</li> <li>As a condition of future DP, the applicant is required to obtain a Roadside DP from AT and implement the intersectional improvement at Range Road 40 and Highway 567 to the satisfaction of AT;</li> <li>As a condition of future DP, the existing access from Highway 567 is required to be removed and reclaimed to the satisfaction of AT;</li> <li>As a condition of future DP, the applicant will be required to provide a Traffic Management Plan which shall address:</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>measures to control driving behavior of aggregate haulers;</li> <li>use and monitoring of in-vehicle monitoring systems;</li> <li>turning movements onto the Highway to provide recommendations to optimize safety of Highway users; and</li> <li>measures to be implemented to prevent the transfer of aggregate and other detritus materials onto the Highway</li> </ul>



AGENCY	COMMENTS		
	<ul> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant will be required to provide a transportation network assessment, prepared by a qualified professional, of the haul routes to the proposed aggregate markets taking into consideration the truck traffic from proposed pit and the BHSAPG. The assessment shall take into consideration the existing constraints of the haul routes and provide recommendations to improve road safety to the satisfaction of the County and AT. The applicant may be required to implement the necessary highway safety improvements along its identified haul routes as identified by the County and AT prior to issuance of the future development permit;</li> <li>As a condition of future DP, the applicant will be required to provide payment of the Transportation Offsite Levy, in accordance with the current levy at time of DP, for the total gross acreage of the gravel pit and areas associated with gravel extraction activities.</li> </ul>		
	Sanitary/Waste Water		
	• ES has no concerns at this time. As per policy 449, the county recommends the use of sewage holding tanks and a trucked service for all industrial, commercial and institutional lands.		
	Water Supply And Waterworks		
	<ul> <li>ES has no concerns at this time however recommends the use of cisterns and a trucked service for all industrial, commercial and institutional applications.</li> </ul>		
	Storm Water Management		
	The applicant previously provided a Conceptual Stormwater Management Report prepared by SLR Global Environmental Solutions dated May 2015 which provided the overall stormwater management concept for the gravel pit. As a condition of future DP, the applicant will be required to provide a detailed stormwater management plan for the Phase I pit area which follows the stormwater management concepts outlined in the SLR Global Environmental Solutions dated May 2015 and meets the requirements of the County Servicing Standards. As the concept relies on the discharge of stormwater via groundwater discharge sumps, the applicant will be required to provide confirmation of AEP approval for the implementation of the discharge sumps or for any release to the environment:		
	<ul> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant will be required to provide an Erosion &amp; Sedimentation Control Plan (ESC) prepared by a qualified professional, providing the ESC measures to be implemented onsite during the operation of the pit in accordance with the MSDP and the requirements of the County Servicing Standards;</li> </ul>		



AGENCY	COMMENTS		
	<ul> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant will be required to provide an Erosion &amp; Sedimentation Control (ESC) Plan prepared by a qualified professional, providing the ESC measures to be implemented for the construction of the Type IVa intersectional improvement and paving of Range Road 40</li> </ul>		
	Environmental		
	• The applicant previously provided a Biophysical Impact Assessment (BIA) prepared by Ghostpine Environment Services Ltd. dated November 2014. The report indicates that there are existing Wetlands identified within the overall proposed mining area. As a condition of the future DP, the applicant will be required to provide a wetland impact assessment, prepared by a qualified professional, identifying the classification and all other relevant characteristics of the impacted wetlands within the Phase I area. The applicant will be required to obtain all permits and approvals from AEP under the Water Act for the loss of the wetlands due to the gravel extraction activities.		
Infrastructure and Operations - Maintenance	As per road operations comments.		
Infrastructure and Operations - Capital Delivery	No concerns.		
Infrastructure and Operations - Operations	Applicant to confirm how they intend to access the proposed gravel pit. If using Rge. Rd. 40, recommend applicant prepare a Traffic Impact Assessment to determine if any road upgrade work is required to be completed by the Applicant along Rge. Rd. 40 and what if any intersection treatment requirements at Hwy 567.		

Circulation Period: September 1, 2017 to September 22, 2017



# **BYLAW C-7739-2017**

### A Bylaw of Rocky View County to amend Land Use Bylaw C-4841-97

The Council of Rocky View County enacts as follows:

### PART 1 – TITLE

This Bylaw shall be known as Bylaw C-7739-2017.

### PART 2 – DEFINITIONS

In this Bylaw, the definitions and terms shall have the meanings given to them in Land Use Bylaw C-4841-97 and the Municipal Government Act.

### PART 3 – EFFECT OF BYLAW

- **THAT** Part 5, Land Use Map No. 67 of Bylaw C-4841-97 be amended by redesignating a portion of NW-31-26-03-W05M from Ranch and Farm District to Natural Resource Industrial District as shown on the attached Schedule 'A' forming part of this Bylaw.
- **THAT** A portion of NW-31-26-03-W05M is hereby redesignated to Natural Resource Industrial District as shown on the attached Schedule 'A' forming part of this Bylaw.

### **PART 4 – TRANSITIONAL**

Bylaw C-7739-2017 is passed when it receives third reading, and is signed by the Reeve/Deputy Reeve and the Municipal Clerk, as per Section 189 of the *Municipal Government Act*.

#### **Division:** 9

File: 06731002/ PL20170145

PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD IN COUNCIL this	day of	<i>, 20</i> 18
READ A FIRST TIME IN COUNCIL this	day of	, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME IN COUNCIL this	day of	, 2018
UNANIMOUS PERMISSION FOR THIRD READING	day of	, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME IN COUNCIL this	day of	, 2018

Reeve

CAO or Designate

Date Bylaw Signed











## NW-31-26-03-W05M

Date: Aug 28, 2017

Division # 9

File: 06731002

AGENDA Page 156 of 410



Page 157 of 410







Deputy Clerk's Office, Rocky View County 911 – 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE, Calgary, Alberta, T2E 6X6

### Subject: Public Hearing for Bylaw C-7739-2017

I am writing to express my opposition to the redesignation application for the expansion of the Summit gravel pit on Big Hill Springs Road.

Summit was one of three gravel pits along Big Hill Springs Road the approvals for which were rushed through just before the end of the last Council. At that time, many residents raised very serious concerns about all three of those gravel pit applications. I will not repeat them – they are all still completely valid. I sincerely hope that the new Council will take these concerns much more seriously than did the previous Council.

The past Council had made a pretence of acknowledging the serious cumulative impacts of approving three additional gravel pits in close proximity to each other and to the one existing pit in that location. However, they then chose to ignore those concerns and approve the applications after the gravel operators failed to follow through on Council's direction to address residents' concerns about those cumulative impacts. Summit's current application presents information on cumulative effects as if it had been agreed to by local residents. This is blatantly misleading as can be confirmed by any of those residents.

At the public hearing for its original redesignation and in the material originally submitted for this expansion application, Summit presented an operating plan that promised to bring forward applications for the redesignation of additional land on an as-needed basis. They have provided no explanation for why they have now abandoned this more responsible approach.

Summit has not yet begun operating its gravel pit on the land that has already been redesignated. As a result, there is no purpose in redesignating additional land at this point. The fact that Summit is bringing this application forward raises serious questions about the validity of the promises they are now making – they seem quite willing to ignore past promises made as part of their initial redesignation.

The timing of this application is also very objectionable because the County is in the middle of public consultations on the revised draft for its Aggregate Resource Plan. In fact, it is hard to find any explanation for Summit's sudden change in strategy for its land redesignation applications other than a desire on its part to rush through before the ARP is in place.

.../2

### AGENDA Page 161 of 410

- 2 -

Considering yet another gravel application while the County's gravel policy is being developed raises doubts about the County's commitment to that policy initiative and its commitment to listen to residents in this round of consultations. It would be far more appropriate to delay considering this application until the new Council has had an opportunity to consider the Aggregate Resource Plan at the public hearing for it which is planned for later this spring.

There are additional reasons why it is highly objectionable to consider this application at this time. There is an ongoing judicial review of the validity of Summit's original redesignation application, along with the other two approved at the same time last year. The outcome of that legal challenge is highly relevant for any assessment of the appropriateness of this application. From Council's perspective, it would be reasonable to wait for a resolution of the fate of the earlier redesignations before moving forward with this application. To do otherwise is imprudent and very disrespectful of the residents sponsoring the court challenge.

Very serious environmental concerns have been raised about all of the gravel pits along Big Hill Springs Road. The Summit pit is located closest to the Big Hill Springs Provincial Park and, as a result, is the gravel pit that puts the Park's fragile and critically important ecosystem at most risk. If there were not already ample reasons to reject this application, these concerns on their own should be sufficient.

Traffic safety is another issue that again, on its own, should be enough to reject this application. Big Hill Springs Road is a road of questionable safety – no shoulders, long and steep curving hills, blind intersections, multiple daily school bus trips, significant tourist traffic during peak gravel transport season. People have already been killed by gravel trucks on this road. It has recently been confirmed that the traffic safety concerns from increased gravel truck traffic are valid. As a result, it is unacceptable to add to those risks by considering this application.

In closing, I would ask Council to reject this application for all of the reasons outlined above. Any one of these reasons is adequate grounds for rejection. In combination, they are overwhelming.

Yours sincerely,

Untipe

Janet Ballantyne

AGENDA Page 162 of 410

March 12, 2018

### Deputy Clerk's Office, Rocky View County 911 – 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE, Calgary, Alberta, T2E 6X6

Subject: Public Hearing for Bylaw C-7739-2017

As a resident and business owner in the immediate vicinity of this application, I strongly object to the redesignation application for the expansion of the Summit gravel pit on Big Hill Springs Road.

Summit was one of the three gravel pits along Big Hill Springs Road approved in the dying days of the last Council. As did many others, I expressed my opposition to those applications. All of those objections remain. I am not going to repeat the detailed concerns I expressed about the health impacts from reduced air quality, the serious traffic safety issues from the increased gravel truck traffic, and the negative impact on my retail business. An expansion of the Summit pit will make all of these worse. As well, it will make the cumulative impacts from so many pits in one place dramatically more damaging.

At the public hearing for its original redesignation, Summit left the impression that it would only bring forward further applications once additional land was needed for its operations. Given that it has not yet started operating a gravel pit on the land that was redesignated last year, I cannot understand why the County should even consider this application. The fact that Summit is bringing this application forward after having provided assurances that it would not do so raises serious questions about the validity of any of its claims.

The three gravel pit redesignations that were approved last year are all the subject of an ongoing court challenge. The outcome of that court challenge is extremely relevant for the evaluation of the reasonableness of this application. It makes no sense for the County to allow this application to more forward while that court challenge remains unresolved. To do so flaunts the judicial system and is disrespectful of the residents who have brought forward the court challenge.

The timing of this application is also objectionable because the County is in the middle of public consultations on the revised draft for its Aggregate Resource Plan. Attempting to push through yet another gravel application while that policy is being developed raises serious doubts about the County's commitment to that policy initiative and its commitment to listen to residents in this round of consultations. It would be far more appropriate to delay considering this application until the new Council has had an opportunity to consider the Aggregate Resource Plan at its public hearing which appears to be planned for later this spring.

In closing, I would ask Council to reject this application as inappropriate both in terms of its content and its timing.

Yours sincerely, Nanoa

Brandi Edge

From: Bill & Sharon Corbett Sent: Sunday, March 25, 2018 8:38 AM To: PAA\_ LegislativeServices Subject: Bylaw C-7739-2017

We are long time residents of, and property owners in, Rocky View County and wish to register our opposition to the aforementioned Bylaw. Our property is situated at and is not physically in close proximity to the property subject to the Bylaw. However we use Highway 567 on a regular basis and are concerned about the proliferation of aggregate operations through out the County and the safety and health ramifications of that proliferation.

We will leave the detailed review of the technical limitations of the application to others although traffic, environmental and health concerns always occur with an aggregate development. At this stage we have 2 process issues that Council needs to carefully consider.

The first is that the current application is proceeding in the face of an outstanding legal challenge arising from the original rediesignation application. While we are not privy to all of the details of the challenge it is being pursued by a group of committed residents who have retained a well known and respected legal firm and consulted with experts in the required areas. Not only is it disrespectful to County residents as a whole and the legal challenge residents in particular, it is a waste of both County resources and resources of the residents. In addition some significant legal problems could be created if the application proceeds and the challenge is successful.

Secondly the County is in the midst of ongoing public consultations in relation to the revised Aggregate Resource Plan. A moratorium on these sorts of applications would seem to be appropriate until an ARP is either approved or rejected. Otherwise there will be a proliferation of applications (as we have seen) by applicants attempting to be grandfathered prior to what is hoped will be stricter requirements for aggregate developments in the County.

Thank you for your consideration.

William T. Corbett/Sharon D. Corbett

April 3, 2018

Dear Sir:

RE: Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017. OBJECTION

Me and my family are against yet another gravel pit in Bearspaw for the following reasons and more:

Summit's original redesignation, for which this is an expansion, is the subject of an ongoing court challenge. To allow the expansion application to move forward while the court challenge remains unresolved is, at best, disrespectful of the residents sponsoring the court challenge.

To allow yet another gravel application to come forward in the middle of the County's ongoing public consultations on the revised Aggregate Resource Plan defies understanding. It raises serious questions about the County's commitment to listen to residents in this round of consultations.

There are the ongoing and very serious traffic safety concerns along Big Hill Springs Road from what appears to be an ever-increasing volume of heavy gravel truck traffic. Not to mention the growing concerns about the cumulative impact from so many gravel pits in one location.

A good number of these gravel trucks keep short-cutting through bearspaw to their dumping location destroying our roads, dropping gravel onto the roadway which destroy our windshields. A good number of these trucks are paid by the load which means they quite often drive like lunatics to save time and get in as many loads as possible. I have personally had close calls due to them running stop signs and blocking attempts to overtake them.

Sincerely,

Darrin Durda

From: Peter Dobbie [mailto:
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2018 3:02 PM
To: PAA\_ LegislativeServices
Subject: Bylaw C-7739-2017. Support for Landowner concerns and objections relating to Bylaw C-7739-2017 for expansion to 40 acres of an existing 23 acre gravel pit.

### **Rocky View County**

911 - 32 Avenue NE Calgary, Alberta T2E 6X6 <u>Via email only</u>

### Attention: Deputy Municipal Clerk and Legislative Services re: Bylaw C-7739-2017

Our office has been contacted by farmers, ranchers and landowners living in Rocky View County in relation to their concerns over and objections to the bylaw proposed in the recently advertised notice of Bylaw C-7739-2017 for expansion to 40 acres of an existing 23 acre gravel pit.

I understand that a previous Rocky View County approval for rezoning of the same 23 acre parcel is currently before the courts by way of a judicial review application. As well, I understand that Rocky View County is currently on the process of creating and seeking public input on a new Aggregate Resource Plan that would inform the permit application and approval process for gravel extraction and processing in future.

In the circumstances, I believe that strong consideration and great weight should be given to the concerns, opinions and objections of landowners, farmers and ranchers who believe that it would be appropriate, just and equitable for Rocky View County to defer a decision on, or to refuse to approve Bylaw C-7739-2017 pending completion of the requisite impact studies, public engagement process including public hearings, and adoption by Council of a new Aggregate Resource Plan and pending the issuance of a judicial decision on the related judicial review application presently before the courts.

Regards,

**Peter J. Dobbie, Q.C.** Farmers' Advocate for Alberta

Advice provided by the Farmers' Advocate Office, including this email, is provided for general information only. This information may not be relied upon as legal advice or as substitute for it. You are responsible for applying any general information provided to your particular situation, if appropriate, and deciding upon a course of action. The Farmers' Advocate Office and Alberta Agriculture and Forestry make no warranty, expressed or implied, and do not assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information provided to you. For all important business and personal matters, you should consider obtaining independent legal and other professional advice to properly assess and understand your options and obligations.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail.

From: Foss, Tom

Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2018 8:25 AM To: Division 1, Mark Kamachi; Division 2, Kim McKylor; Division 3, Kevin Hanson; Division 4, Al Schule; Division 5, Jerry Gautreau; Division 6, Greg Boehlke; Division 7, Daniel Henn; Division 8, Samanntha Wright; Dominic Kazmierczak; Division 9, Crystal Kissel; PAA\_ LegislativeServices Cc: 'Mike Edwards'; 'IVAN STARK'; 'Bill & Sharon Corbett'; 'Mike Edwards'; 'Keith Koebisch'; 'Gary Moroz'; 'Martyn Griggs'; 'Maggie'; 'Doug Rosholt'; 'Julia Garvin'; 'ALF GARVIN'; 'Mardelle Gamble'; 'Chris Waterhouse'; 'Harry Hodgson' Subject: Crystalline Silica and Killing my Bees!!!!

Folks

I have been a beekeeper for some twenty years. My friends in the city lost 25% of their hives. Sadly at my place on RR #35, downwind from the Hillside Pit I lost 75% and am hoping that is all as winter is not over. Granted it was a cold winter but as I inspected the hives, the cold was not a factor in all the losses.

Please see the link to a letter to the editor, it shows the bias and one side thought process of those who stand to gain and make millions and those who already have millions and want to make more. These people do not care about our health and only care about making millions more while our health and enjoyment of our property is jeopardized. I point this out as it is the lone voice of selfishness and is that of a gravel pit owner.

Terry Raymond's rant against Gravel Watch in yesterday's Cochrane Eagle. Please read the one sided uninformed letter to the editor. Based on no science only seeking to make the landowner (already one of the wealthiest Alberta due to an inheritance) even richer.

Here is a link to the letter: <u>http://www.cochraneeagle.com/article/Gravel-concerns-are-overblown-20180315</u>

I am hopeful that council will take close notice of the dangers of having so many pits, so close together and close to Big Hill Springs Provincial Park. You cannot undo the damage that previous government has done but you can consider the risk that all residents will be exposed to. Please read the one sided uninformed letter to the editor. Based on no science only seeking to make the landowner (already one of the wealthiest Alberta due to an inheritance) even richer.

AGENDA Page 169 of 410



Here is wording from the first paragraph in the ASGA Silica and Dust Control Handbook. "Silicosis is a progressive, irreversible and potentially fatal lung disease.

It is shocking that anyone would not recognize workers need protective respirators but our own children are expected to play unprotected in the same area?

Thanks for considering my concerns and if you are ever interested in seeing the devastation of my bees, please do not hesitate to contact me. Without bees there is no pollination, without pollination we all starve. Bees are the canary in the mine. Gravel pits and crystalline silica are causing harm to the environment. As we do not currently need these pits, why not wait and develop a policy to keep us safe.

Tom Foss

Respecting your privacy and preferences for electronic communications is important to us. If you would prefer not to receive emails from me, please reply with "UNSUBSCRIBE" in the subject line or body of the email. If you would also prefer not to receive emails from our firm, please cc: <u>unsubscribeRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u> in your reply. Please note that you will continue to receive messages related to transactions or services that we provide to you. To speak to us about how your preferences are managed, please email: <u>contactRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u>.

This email may be privileged and/or confidential, and the sender does not waive any related rights and obligations. Any distribution, use or copying of this email or the information it contains by other than an intended recipient is unauthorized. If you received this email in error, please advise the sender (by return email or otherwise) immediately.

From: Foss, Tom

Sent: Friday, March 23, 2018 11:08 AM

To: Division 1, Mark Kamachi; Division 2, Kim McKylor; Division 3, Kevin Hanson; Division 4, Al Schule; Division 5, Jerry Gautreau; Division 6, Greg Boehlke; Division 7, Daniel Henn; Division 8, Samanntha Wright; Dominic Kazmierczak; Division 9, Crystal Kissel; PAA\_ LegislativeServices
Cc: 'Mike Edwards'; 'IVAN STARK'; 'Bill & Sharon Corbett'; 'Mike Edwards'; 'Keith Koebisch'; 'Gary Moroz'; 'Martyn Griggs'; 'Maggie'; 'Doug Rosholt'; 'Julia Garvin'; 'ALF GARVIN'; 'Mardelle Gamble'; 'Chris Waterhouse'; 'Harry Hodgson'

**Subject:** Collisions and deaths from gravel trucks and opposition to the Summit Application Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017.

I had sent this earlier email and did not receive a reply from anyone so am thinking that I should have designated it as my input to be booked in as my comments to the open houses that have been held. I will also forward another submission with the appropriate title. Thanks for all your concern and attention and I appreciate your effort and time and consideration and for listening to the concerns of the residents whose lives will be most greatly affected by an unregulated gravel development.

Please count this as a documented submissions to the ARP process and in opposition to the Summit Application Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017.

Thanks

Tom

From: Foss, Tom Sent: Thursday, March 22,2018 8:48 AM To:

Subject: Collisions and deaths from gravel trucks

Rocky View Council

I had written the past premier and then received correspondence from the minister of transportation. I was confirmed that Alberta Transportation only requires construction of "eft turn lanes and acceleration/deceleration lanes" at the intersections on Highway 567 and whatever range road a gravel pit accesses the highway. On the surface this makes sense but what it does not take into consideration is the cumulative effect and the general increase in traffic on the highway. There soon could be applications for

AGENDA Page 171 of 410 gravel pits on just about every range road east of Highway 22. Highway 567 needs upgrading and until that is completed, no new pits should be allowed. My property is on Highway 567 and RR #35 and it is already too dangerous and continues to worsen. Alberta Transportation has erected additional signage but increased traffic and in particular gravel trucks will make that stretch of highway a death trap. There are numerous school bus routes there as well.

I would also urge council to increase the presence and checking of the current gravel truck traffic on highway 567, Lochend Road and into the Glendale pit. Most trucks do not respect the stop signs on Lochend and Glendale road. Many speed in excess of 120km to climb the hill going west from Lochend on highway 567. There used to be an officer sitting in my approach on RR 35# almost daily and now there is none. I am assuming cutbacks are the reason for this. Not sure who is enforcing or checking on the gravel truck drivers.

To your knowledge, I am wondering?

1. Has there been a recent study of the highway 567 east of #22? Either by the county or jointly with the province?

2. Has there been discussion with the province regarding future plans in regards to the upgrading of 567 to accommodate the growing traffic as well as the gravel truck traffic?

3. Has there been direction to reduce patrols and enforcement along highways 567/22/Lochend Road?

4. Has there been direction to reduce checking/compliance/routine checks of gravel trucks from the Glendale and Hillside pits? It is my understanding from the truck drivers that they feel any enforcement presence has been reduced. I would have expected just the opposite that since the September death. I would have assumed that it would have been increased. Can you confirm if there has been any discussion between council and administration? Thanks

If none of you are able to answer my questions, could you please be so kind as to direct me to the department that might be able to? Thanks.

Please feel free to contact me at that stretch of road.

if you wish to discuss the current dangerous situation on

Tom Foss

Let's learn from the recent collisions with gravel trucks. This one happened on Sept 17, 2017 at 7:30am in our own community, when a 72 year old man lost his life on Big Hill Springs Rd and Bearspaw Rd . A Rockyview school bus doing it's morning run was one of the first vehicles on the scene.



A couple of weeks ago on March 7, 2018, 60km northeast of Edmonton a gravel truck rear ended a school bus and a 15 year old girl lost her life. One gravel pit means 400-600 more gravel trucks on our roads. This increases trauma risk for ourselves and our children.

Please come to the Open House at Rockpointe Church tomorrow between 6-8pm and let Rockyview know that this is unacceptable. If you are unable to attend please click on the link <u>https://www.rockyviewgravelwatch.com</u> for the form letter from Rockyview Gravel Watch and submit it to Dominic Kazmierczak by April 13, 2018. Feel free to share this email -Julia

### AGENDA Page 173 of 410

# VIDEO | Teenage girl killed when school bus rear-ended by gravel truck north of Redwater

"We had heavy fog here this morning which would be a contributing factor,' says RCMP officer

CBC News Posted: Mar 07, 2018 9:55 AM MT | Last Updated: Mar 07, 2018 2:13 PM MT



A teenaged girl died after a semi-trailer struck a school bus northeast of Edmonton Wednesday morning. (CBC)



Police say heavy fog at the time of the collision may be a contributing factor to crash that killed Maisie Watkinson, 15, near Redwater, AB on March 7. (CBC)



The truck which hit the school bus ended up in the ditch on Opal Road. (CBC)

Respecting your privacy and preferences for electronic communications is important to us. If you would prefer not to receive emails from me, please reply with "UNSUBSCRIBE" in the subject line or body of the email. If you would also prefer not to receive emails from our firm, please cc: <u>unsubscribeRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u> in your reply. Please note that you will continue to receive messages related to transactions or services that we provide to you. To speak to us about how your preferences are managed, please email: <u>contactRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u>.

This email may be privileged and/or confidential, and the sender does not waive any related rights and obligations. Any distribution, use or copying of this email or the information it contains by other than an intended recipient is unauthorized. If you received this email in error, please advise the sender (by return email or otherwise) immediately.

Le respect de votre vie privée et de vos préférences pour les communications électroniques est important pour nous. Si vous ne souhaitez plus que je vous envoie des courriels, veuillez répondre en inscrivant « DÉSABONNER » dans la ligne d'objet ou dans le corps de votre message. Si vous ne voulez non plus recevoir des courriels de notre société, veuillez indiquer : « <u>unsubscribeRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u> » en copie conforme (Cc) dans votre réponse. Veuillez toutefois noter que vous continuerez de recevoir des messages liés aux opérations effectuées ou aux services que nous vous fournissons. Si vous avez des questions sur la façon dont sera géré votre préférence, veuillez nous les envoyer par courriel, à l'adresse <u>contactRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u>.

Ce courrier électronique est confidentiel et protégé. L'expéditeur ne renonce pas aux droits et obligations qui s'y rapportent. Toute diffusion, utilisation ou copie de ce message ou des renseignements qu'il contient par une personne autre que le (les) destinataire(s) désigné(s) est interdite. Si vous recevez ce courrier électronique par erreur, veuillez m'en aviser immédiatement, par retour de courrier électronique ou par un autre moyen.

From: Foss, Tom

Sent: Friday, March 23, 2018 11:06 AM

To: Division 1, Mark Kamachi; Division 2, Kim McKylor; Division 3, Kevin Hanson; Division 4, Al Schule; Division 5, Jerry Gautreau; Division 6, Greg Boehlke; Division 7, Daniel Henn; Division 8, Samanntha Wright; Dominic Kazmierczak; Division 9, Crystal Kissel; PAA\_ LegislativeServices Cc: 'Mike Edwards'; 'IVAN STARK'; 'Bill & Sharon Corbett'; 'Mike Edwards'; 'Keith Koebisch'; 'Gary Moroz'; 'Martyn Griggs'; 'Maggie'; 'Doug Rosholt'; 'Julia Garvin'; 'ALF GARVIN'; 'Mardelle Gamble'; 'Chris Waterhouse'; 'Harry Hodgson' Subject: ARP submission - Open House and opposition to the Summit Application Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017.

I had sent this earlier email and did not receive a reply from anyone so am thinking that I should have designated it as my input to be booked in as my comments to the open houses that have been held. I will also forward another submission with the appropriate title. Thanks for all your concern and attention and I appreciate your effort and time and consideration and for listening to the concerns of the residents whose lives will

Please count this as a documented submissions to the ARP process and in opposition to the Summit Application Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017.

Thanks

Tom

From: Foss, Tom Sent: Tuesday, March 20,2018 8:25 AM

be most greatly affected by an unregulated gravel development.

AGENDA Page 176 of 410 To:

Subject: Crystalline Silica and Killing my Bees!!!!

Folks

I have been a beekeeper for some twenty years. My friends in the city lost 25% of their hives. Sadly at my place on RR #35, downwind from the Hillside Pit I lost 75% and am hoping that is all as winter is not over. Granted it was a cold winter but as I inspected the hives, the cold was not a factor in all the losses.

Please see the link to a letter to the editor, it shows the bias and one side thought process of those who stand to gain and make millions and those who already have millions and want to make more. These people do not care about our health and only care about making millions more while our health and enjoyment of our property is jeopardized. I point this out as it is the lone voice of selfishness and is that of a gravel pit owner.

Terry Raymond's rant against Gravel Watch in yesterday's Cochrane Eagle. Please read the one sided uninformed letter to the editor. Based on no science only seeking to make the landowner (already one of the wealthiest Alberta due to an inheritance) even richer.

Here is a link to the letter: <u>http://www.cochraneeagle.com/article/Gravel-concerns-are-overblown-20180315</u>

I am hopeful that council will take close notice of the dangers of having so many pits, so close together and close to Big Hill Springs Provincial Park. You cannot undo the damage that previous government has done but you can consider the risk that all residents will be exposed to. Please read the one sided uninformed letter to the editor. Based on no science only seeking to make the landowner (already one of the wealthiest Alberta due to an inheritance) even richer.

AGENDA Page 177 of 410



Here is wording from the first paragraph in the ASGA Silica and Dust Control Handbook. "Silicosis is a progressive, irreversible and potentially fatal lung disease.

It is shocking that anyone would not recognize workers need protective respirators but our own children are expected to play unprotected in the same area?

Thanks for considering my concerns and if you are ever interested in seeing the devastation of my bees, please do not hesitate to contact me. Without bees there is no pollination, without pollination we all starve. Bees are the canary in the mine. Gravel pits and crystalline silica are causing harm to the environment. As we do not currently need these pits, why not wait and develop a policy to keep us safe.

### Tom Foss Landowner RR #35 and Highway 567, directly downwind from the proposed pit.

Respecting your privacy and preferences for electronic communications is important to us. If you would prefer not to receive emails from me, please reply with "UNSUBSCRIBE" in the subject line or body of the email. If you would also prefer not to receive emails from our firm, please cc: <u>unsubscribeRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u> in your reply. Please note that you will continue to receive messages related to transactions or services that we provide to you. To speak to us about how your preferences are managed, please email: <u>contactRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u>.

This email may be privileged and/or confidential, and the sender does not waive any related rights and obligations. Any distribution, use or copying of this email or the information it contains by other than an intended recipient is unauthorized. If you received this email in error, please advise the sender (by return email or otherwise) immediately.

From: Foss, Tom

Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 8:21 AM

To: Division 1, Mark Kamachi; Division 2, Kim McKylor; Division 3, Kevin Hanson; Division 4, Al Schule; Division 5, Jerry Gautreau; Division 6, Greg Boehlke; Division 7, Daniel Henn; Division 8, Samanntha Wright; Division 9, Crystal Kissel; PAA\_ LegislativeServices; health.minister@gov.ab.ca

**Cc:** Ruth Ludwig; Bertha Staddon; Jim Maki; Sarwan Nabal; Liba Levicek; Mark Baedker; 'Doug Rosholt'; 'IVAN STARK'; 'Keith Koebisch'; 'Martyn Griggs'; 'Bill & Sharon Corbett'; 'Maggie'; 'Julia Garvin'; 'ALF GARVIN'; info@radarscan.com; 'Harry Hodgson'; Enrique Masssot; Kyle Petryshen; Wally Batarseh; Gianna Bloomer; Janet Jones; Jerry Arshinoff; Mardelle Gamble; Chris Waterhouse; liba.levicek@gmail.com; 'Gary Moroz '; Mike Edwards; Janet Ballantyne; 'Mardelle Gamble'

Subject: Some interesting reading on Crystalline Silica.

Please find enclosed two government documents and an industry handbook identifying crystalline silica issues.

After reading through each document there are some interesting points and I have tried to identify four points out of hundreds of pages of documentation:

- 1. On page 16, 86% of the aggregate mining and crushing were above the OEL. (Occupational Exposure Limits). What testing and results have Rocky View determined in the pits within the county? Do you have site specific data on any testing within in the county?
- 2. On Page 31 "concentrations of quartz silica were higher in downwind locations compared to upwind locations. Only 3 cases where OEL was exceeded in the downwind cases." My property is downwind of one pit. How safe will things be if there is another pit approved upwind? How safe will my property be if a pit is approved on my south border? Have staff studied the effect of a grouping of pits. It would seem more dangerous should a landowner have several pits in close proximity. There are two pits with a few miles of Big Hill Springs Provincial Park and my property. If you consider the Caron Pit and the Parker lands there could be five or six. Do you consider the risks of each pit separately or have you considered the cumulative risks of so many pits operating in one area?
- 3. On page 19 of the Silica and Dust Control Handbook of the Alberta Sand and Gravel Association of Alberta you will see the formula that illustrates how much dust a worker may be exposed to. Dose= Concentration of airborne respirable silica X time (duration) of exposure. In the government report it was stated that most companies surveyed indicated that silica exposure may occur at their work site. If an employee is exposed there is health issues and government has safeguards in place. Is it worse if a landowner who lives close by is exposed 24 hours a day? Plus there are no safeguards in place to protect the adjacent landowner.
- 4. The ASGA-ARHCA handbook is 68 pages long. A technical and long read but if you skip to pages 28 to 37 you will see pictures of what gravel pit equipment looks like and how and why contamination is difficult to contain. Particularly in windy conditions.

After reading the Silica Project Overview done by the Government of Alberta in 2011/2012, are there any other studies that council or staff have considered. Has there been further studies that you are aware, perhaps completed by the county, the provincial government or even industry? Has administration commented on these reports or dismissed their relevance? Do your think it possible that government and industry's concerns are overblown.

One can see dust being blown around by our chinook winds but is there a possibility that these fine particles are not easily identified? There are mitigation strategies to capture fugitive dust, but watering when temperatures are deeply below zero, rarely happens.

I look forward to your thoughts and would appreciate if you might skim through to the pages that I have highlighted. If your interest and concern is peaked as has been the case for me, you might find yourself reading the entire report. I recognize this must be one of the biggest concerns that administration and council is worried about in allowing gravel pits to abound in the county of Rocky View.

Thanks and I appreciate your attention to this concern.

Tom Foss





Respecting your privacy and preferences for electronic communications is important to us. If you would prefer not to receive emails from me, please reply with "UNSUBSCRIBE" in the subject line or body of the email. If you would also prefer not to receive emails from our firm, please cc: <u>unsubscribeRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u> in your reply. Please note that you will continue to receive messages related to transactions or services that we provide to you. To speak to us about how your preferences are managed, please email: <u>contactRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u>.

This email may be privileged and/or confidential, and the sender does not waive any related rights and obligations. Any distribution, use or copying of this email or the information it contains by other than an intended recipient is unauthorized. If you received this email in error, please advise the sender (by return email or otherwise) immediately.

Le respect de votre vie privée et de vos préférences pour les communications électroniques est important pour nous. Si vous ne souhaitez plus que je vous envoie des courriels, veuillez répondre en inscrivant « DÉSABONNER » dans la ligne d'objet ou dans le corps de votre message. Si vous ne voulez non plus recevoir des courriels de notre société, veuillez indiquer : « <u>unsubscribeRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u> » en copie conforme (Cc) dans votre réponse. Veuillez toutefois noter que vous continuerez de recevoir des messages liés aux opérations effectuées ou aux services que nous vous fournissons. Si vous avez des questions sur la façon dont sera géré votre préférence, veuillez nous les envoyer par courriel, à l'adresse <u>contactRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u>.

Ce courrier électronique est confidentiel et protégé. L'expéditeur ne renonce pas aux droits et obligations qui s'y rapportent. Toute diffusion, utilisation ou copie de ce message ou des renseignements qu'il contient par une personne autre que le (les) destinataire(s) désigné(s) est interdite. Si vous recevez ce courrier électronique par erreur, veuillez m'en aviser immédiatement, par retour de courrier électronique ou par un autre moyen.
From: Foss, Tom
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2018 11:01 AM
To: Division 1, Mark Kamachi; Division 2, Kim McKylor; Division 3, Kevin Hanson; Division 4, Al Schule; Division 5, Jerry Gautreau; Division 6, Greg Boehlke; Division 7, Daniel Henn; Division 8, Samanntha Wright; Division 9, Crystal Kissel; PAA\_ LegislativeServices; Dominic Kazmierczak
Cc: 'Mike Edwards'; 'IVAN STARK'; 'Bill & Sharon Corbett'; 'Mike Edwards'; 'Keith Koebisch'; 'Gary Moroz'; 'Martyn Griggs'; 'Maggie'; 'Doug Rosholt'; 'Julia Garvin'; 'ALF GARVIN'; 'Mardelle Gamble'; 'Chris Waterhouse'; ; 'Harry Hodgson'; Foss, Tom
Subject: Opposition and submission to the Summit Application Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017.

March 8, 2018

Attention: Rocky View County Council Members

Re: Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017.

I am the land owner tax roll

and my quarter is located at . We are a half mile

to the east, or downwind from the Summit Aggregate application. I am dismayed that they have not approached me about this application but perhaps due to my previous concerns they have chosen to ignore me. As I understand there is an ongoing court challenge it is at best disrespectful to residents to move forward until the issue has been settled in the courts.

Council and staff, along with ongoing public consultations on the revised Aggregate Resource Plan are trying to come up with a framework to allow development while protecting the safety, the health and wellbeing of the residents. Even hearing any current applications questions the County's commitment to listen to the residents and all the public input. Please know that I am a home owner that resides in Rocky View County and have been involved in the community for the last 20 years. I am also a beekeeper and farm on my quarter and have planted over 25,000 spruce and pine trees on that property in the past six years. I am involved in several conservation organizations and our family is interested in preserving wildlife habitat while ensuring that we protect the environment for future generations.

I applaud the Rocky View Council for their ongoing management of aggregate development within the County and hope that this will ensure our safety. In particular, I commend the Council's effort to "support environmentally sensitive and sustainable aggregate development to meet local, regional, and provincial resource needs... Through the establishment of performance standards, and the guiding of aggregate development towards appropriate locations, the potential for conflict with adjoining landowners will be minimized."

With this in mind, I would like to take this opportunity to outline the different risks that come with gravel operations particularly the Summit pit due to its proximity. I would stand against this pit for the following reasons:

## Property value and tax assessments

Aggregate operations negatively impact property value due to the noise, vibration, dust and airborne contaminants, traffic, water quality and quantity caused by pit activities. As a result, very few people prefer to live near a gravel pit - resulting in deteriorating property value for home owners. A 2006 study shows properties located within a half a kilometer can reduce property value by 25% while properties located within one kilometer can reduce property value by 15%.<sup>[1]</sup> Even a mere permit for gravel extraction can deter future residential investment and further decrease property value for current owners.

Properties currently less than 1 and 0.5 kilometers away in distance from an aggregate site, should have their properties reassessed to account for the 25% and 15% decreased value respectively. Properties in a 5-kilometer radius should be evaluated accordingly to account for the declining property value so that their property tax assessment reflects that number. Financial remediation should be provided to property owners and the lowering of property tax thresholds should be conducted as a result of the deteriorating property value.

# **Financial Assurance**

Presently, financial assurance regulations only apply to mines and oil sands but not aggregates. Without an effective inspection process, operations responsible for reclamation may not remediate the land disturbance or environmental damage they

inflict throughout the gravel extraction process. The lack of financial assurance regulation places an unnecessary risk onto taxpayers in the event of proponent insolvency. This phenomenon was already evidenced during the years of 2009 to 2013 when 93,000 acres of gravel operations were unable to meet reclamation practices since the cost of reclamation was not accounted for during the permitting process. <sup>[2]</sup> A resource plan that fails to include a financial assurance strategy is incomplete to say the least.

The County must establish criteria to ensure financial assurance is met before operations commence. Financial assurance should be accounted for during the permitting process to prevent unnecessary burdens to the public in the event of proponent insolvency. Using cross industry principles found in oil and gas and mining should be applied equally to aggregates to ensure closure and reclamation practices are accounted for prior to operating.

## Traffic and Safety

The increased volume of gravel trucks overburdens public roads resulting in deteriorating road conditions and increased traffic on public roads. An increased volume of road traffic correlates with a growing number of safety concerns to the public. Gravel companies accessing public roads should be required to conduct road studies and publish the study's results prior to receiving a permit to operate. Proponents should be responsible for the infrastructure and maintenance of municipal roads of which they utilize. Safety measures such as speed bumps and stop signs should be enforced near pits. Levies should be established in Road Use Agreements after a road study is complete. Finally, all levies should be linked to usage; for example, if a proponent expects a 50 percent increase to traffic, then they should pay 50 cents per tonne to the County. In particular, highway 567 is not safe in its present state, even though Alberta Transportations it is fine. Alberta Transportation is aware of the grave dangers east of the proposed pit and have erected signage in an attempt to improve safety.

More traffic and gravel trucks will only increase the danger. Anyone travelling east to west can appreciate the grave dangers these gravel trucks present. Last year I witnessed a near miss as a gravel truck almost took out a school bus. The drive had attained a speed in excess of 120km as it attempted to climb the hill towards RR #35. Sadly, there was a gravel truck that hit a school bus in the Edmonton area,

killing a twelve year old girl. The near miss and at the speed the gravel truck driver was going, could have killed everyone on that bus.

## Dust

Dust from open pit activities such as blasting, crushing, screening and stacking have potentially harmful impacts to the human population. When particulate matter is inhaled, or settles on tissue, the health implications can be lethal since there is no biological mechanism for clearing it from the body. Once human contact is made with particulate matter those who suffer from cardiopulmonary disease, asthma, bronchitis, emphysema and pneumoconiosis will exhibit an increase of symptoms and can lead to premature death amongst those who are predisposed to those conditions. <sup>[3]</sup>

Considering the severe consequences caused by inhaling particulate matter, dust should be eliminated (not just reduced) on gravel sites in order to mitigate health impacts. Further studies, reports and ongoing sampling should be conducted to ensure that air quality is protected. The federal government has set out a *Canadian Air Ambient Standard* which are now being implemented by some provincial jurisdictions. For example, Ontario regulates containments released in the air to limit exposure to substances that can affect human health and the environment. <sup>[4]</sup> Rocky View County should look to other jurisdictions that prove to be more progressive when it comes to air regulations as a way to ensure that human health is not impacted in a negative manner at the hands of industry.

The current operating pit is bad enough, adding / expanding another one will make it even worse.

## Noise

Noise caused by trucking, crushing and equipment necessary for gravel operations are burdensome for residential users. When windy, noise can substantially worsen especially when the wind is blowing from the direction of an operation towards a residence. To decrease the noise burden for residents the operation should be 1 kilometer in distance measured from the operating site to the resident's property line, as already mentioned. Furthermore, best management practices should include buffer zones that are strategically placed around an operation from privately owned properties and other areas of human activity such as schools, playgrounds and recreational areas. Fixed operating hours should be set in a manner that accommodates normal human activity, and these hours should be posted on signage on the front of the gravel property to ensure transparency.

# **Closure and Reclamation Best Management Practices**

Lack of conservation of reclamation materials has been a common management failure amongst aggregate sites. Operational practices often trump adherence to reclamation practices. Best management practices are not always implemented, causing further impacts to human activity and the environment. Proponents should be required to consult on reclamation practices to ensure the aesthetics and natural habitat is restored to the previous condition; furthermore, recessed areas should be filled in completely. Prior to receiving an operating permit, proponents should be required to have in place closure and reclamation best management practices. The County should be responsible for ensuring that these plans are completed so that normal habitat and human activity can thrive again off the impacted area. Why not finish with the current mine and then reclaim it and only then allow another one if it can be demonstrated to be safe and not harmful to those residents who live nearby.

## **Cumulative effects**

Cumulative impacts on a habit as a result of a gravel pit can cause irreversible damages to the environment, this only multiplies as the volume of pits increase in a set proximity. Right now, the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency* is in the pre-consultation stages of their CEAA amending regulation. Without a final decision from CEAA, any enacted regulation surrounding cumulative effects would be incomplete in nature. Thusly, the Council should await the CEAA panel's decision to ensure that provincial regulations align with federal regulations. CEAA should be used as a regulatory framework before approving permits or any further studies completed by proponents in the Rocky View County. Studies should outline cumulative impacts to local habitat, as well as the cumulative effects of multiple aggregate pits within a certain radius.

As is stands we are in the middle of several gravel pits. One more could be the tipping point. Plus the land to the south of me is the hands of a gravel company and a previous council denied their application as they determined it was unsafe, and too close to the Big Hill Springs Provincial Park. Does anyone really know if adding additional pits or grouping them increase their effect on people and the environment in an incremental or exponential factor?

# Conclusion

Once again, I would like to be noted that I recognize council for their commitment to finding a balance for residents, industry and society while also renewing their commitment to environmental stewardship. I trust that they will work to protect my enjoyment of our property I am also equally concerned that we are directly north of

the previous submission that council voted down, the Caron place (Burnco) and I understand that a new company has purchased the ranch owned by Pearl Parker. We really need council to protect us from being surrounded by gravel pits. It is sad to learn that a twelve year old girl was killed as a tandem gravel truck struck a school bus. If council approves all these gravel pits, then I am afraid this will be putting you many people's lives, needlessly at risk.

Could you all be so kind as to acknowledge that you have received my email, thanks.

I would be happy to meet with you to discuss the broader concerns and especially in the eventuality that another application is made on the Caron/Parker property.

Sincerely,

Tom Foss

Respecting your privacy and preferences for electronic communications is important to us. If you would prefer not to receive emails from me, please reply with "UNSUBSCRIBE" in the subject line or body of the email. If you would also prefer not to receive emails from our firm, please cc: <u>unsubscribeRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u> in your reply. Please note that you will continue to receive messages related to transactions or services that we provide to you. To speak to us about how your preferences are managed, please email: <u>contactRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u>.

This email may be privileged and/or confidential, and the sender does not waive any related rights and obligations. Any distribution, use or copying of this email or the information it contains by other than an intended recipient is unauthorized. If you received this email in error, please advise the sender (by return email or otherwise) immediately.

Le respect de votre vie privée et de vos préférences pour les communications électroniques est important pour nous. Si vous ne souhaitez plus que je vous envoie des courriels, veuillez répondre en inscrivant « DÉSABONNER » dans la ligne d'objet ou dans le corps de votre message. Si vous ne voulez non plus recevoir des courriels de notre société, veuillez indiquer : « <u>unsubscribeRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u> » en copie conforme (Cc) dans votre réponse. Veuillez toutefois noter que vous continuerez de recevoir des messages liés aux opérations effectuées ou aux services que nous vous fournissons. Si vous avez des questions sur la façon dont sera géré votre préférence, veuillez nous les envoyer par courriel, à l'adresse <u>contactRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u>.

Ce courrier électronique est confidentiel et protégé. L'expéditeur ne renonce pas aux droits et obligations qui s'y rapportent. Toute diffusion, utilisation ou copie de ce message ou des renseignements qu'il contient par une personne autre que le (les) destinataire(s) désigné(s) est interdite. Si vous recevez ce courrier électronique par

erreur, veuillez m'en aviser immédiatement, par retour de courrier électronique ou par un autre moyen.

[1] http://gravelwatch.org/property-values/

AGENDA Page 187 of 410 From: Foss, Tom

Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2018 11:01 AM

**To:** Division 1, Mark Kamachi; Division 2, Kim McKylor; Division 3, Kevin Hanson; Division 4, Al Schule; Division 5, Jerry Gautreau; Division 6, Greg Boehlke; Division 7, Daniel Henn; Division 8, Samanntha Wright; Division 9, Crystal Kissel; PAA\_ LegislativeServices; Dominic Kazmierczak Cc: 'Mike Edwards'; 'IVAN STARK'; 'Bill & Sharon Corbett'; 'Mike Edwards'; 'Keith Koebisch'; 'Gary Moroz'; 'Martyn Griggs'; 'Maggie'; 'Doug Rosholt'; 'Julia Garvin'; 'ALF GARVIN'; 'Mardelle Gamble'; 'Chris ; 'Harry Hodgson'; Foss, Tom Waterhouse'; Subject: Opposition and submission to the Summit Application Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017.

March 8, 2018

Attention: Rocky View County Council Members

Re: Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017.

I am the land owner tax roll

and my quarter is located at . We are a half mile to the east, or downwind from the Summit Aggregate application. I am dismayed that they have not approached me about this application but perhaps due to my previous concerns they have chosen to ignore me. As I understand there is an ongoing court challenge it is at best disrespectful to residents to move forward until the issue has been settled in the courts.

Council and staff, along with ongoing public consultations on the revised Aggregate Resource Plan are trying to come up with a framework to allow development while protecting the safety, the health and wellbeing of the residents. Even hearing any

current applications questions the County's commitment to listen to the residents and all the public input.

Please know that I am a home owner that resides in Rocky View County and have been involved in the community for the last 20 years. I am also a beekeeper and farm on my quarter and have planted over 25,000 spruce and pine trees on that property in the past six years. I am involved in several conservation organizations and our family is interested in preserving wildlife habitat while ensuring that we protect the environment for future generations.

I applaud the Rocky View Council for their ongoing management of aggregate development within the County and hope that this will ensure our safety. In particular, I commend the Council's effort to "support environmentally sensitive and sustainable aggregate development to meet local, regional, and provincial resource needs... Through the establishment of performance standards, and the guiding of aggregate development towards appropriate locations, the potential for conflict with adjoining landowners will be minimized."

With this in mind, I would like to take this opportunity to outline the different risks that come with gravel operations particularly the Summit pit due to its proximity. I would stand against this pit for the following reasons:

# Property value and tax assessments

Aggregate operations negatively impact property value due to the noise, vibration, dust and airborne contaminants, traffic, water quality and quantity caused by pit activities. As a result, very few people prefer to live near a gravel pit - resulting in deteriorating property value for home owners. A 2006 study shows properties located within a half a kilometer can reduce property value by 25% while properties located within one kilometer can reduce property value by 15%.<sup>[1]</sup> Even a mere permit for gravel extraction can deter future residential investment and further decrease property value for current owners.

Properties currently less than 1 and 0.5 kilometers away in distance from an aggregate site, should have their properties reassessed to account for the 25% and 15% decreased value respectively. Properties in a 5-kilometer radius should be evaluated accordingly to account for the declining property value so that their property tax assessment reflects that number. Financial remediation should be provided to property owners and the lowering of property tax thresholds should be conducted as a result of the deteriorating property value.

# **Financial Assurance**

Presently, financial assurance regulations only apply to mines and oil sands but not

aggregates. Without an effective inspection process, operations responsible for reclamation may not remediate the land disturbance or environmental damage they inflict throughout the gravel extraction process. The lack of financial assurance regulation places an unnecessary risk onto taxpayers in the event of proponent insolvency. This phenomenon was already evidenced during the years of 2009 to 2013 when 93,000 acres of gravel operations were unable to meet reclamation practices since the cost of reclamation was not accounted for during the permitting process. <sup>[2]</sup> A resource plan that fails to include a financial assurance strategy is incomplete to say the least.

The County must establish criteria to ensure financial assurance is met before operations commence. Financial assurance should be accounted for during the permitting process to prevent unnecessary burdens to the public in the event of proponent insolvency. Using cross industry principles found in oil and gas and mining should be applied equally to aggregates to ensure closure and reclamation practices are accounted for prior to operating.

# Traffic and Safety

The increased volume of gravel trucks overburdens public roads resulting in deteriorating road conditions and increased traffic on public roads. An increased volume of road traffic correlates with a growing number of safety concerns to the public. Gravel companies accessing public roads should be required to conduct road studies and publish the study's results prior to receiving a permit to operate. Proponents should be responsible for the infrastructure and maintenance of municipal roads of which they utilize. Safety measures such as speed bumps and stop signs should be enforced near pits. Levies should be established in Road Use Agreements after a road study is complete. Finally, all levies should be linked to usage; for example, if a proponent expects a 50 percent increase to traffic, then they should pay 50 cents per tonne to the County. In particular, highway 567 is not safe in its present state, even though Alberta Transportations it is fine. Alberta Transportation is aware of the grave dangers east of the proposed pit and have erected signage in an attempt to improve safety.

More traffic and gravel trucks will only increase the danger. Anyone travelling east to west can appreciate the grave dangers these gravel trucks present. Last year I witnessed a near miss as a gravel truck almost took out a school bus. The drive had

attained a speed in excess of 120km as it attempted to climb the hill towards RR #35. Sadly, there was a gravel truck that hit a school bus in the Edmonton area, killing a twelve year old girl. The near miss and at the speed the gravel truck driver was going, could have killed everyone on that bus.

## Dust

Dust from open pit activities such as blasting, crushing, screening and stacking have potentially harmful impacts to the human population. When particulate matter is inhaled, or settles on tissue, the health implications can be lethal since there is no biological mechanism for clearing it from the body. Once human contact is made with particulate matter those who suffer from cardiopulmonary disease, asthma, bronchitis, emphysema and pneumoconiosis will exhibit an increase of symptoms and can lead to premature death amongst those who are predisposed to those conditions. <sup>[3]</sup>

Considering the severe consequences caused by inhaling particulate matter, dust should be eliminated (not just reduced) on gravel sites in order to mitigate health impacts. Further studies, reports and ongoing sampling should be conducted to ensure that air quality is protected. The federal government has set out a *Canadian Air Ambient Standard* which are now being implemented by some provincial jurisdictions. For example, Ontario regulates containments released in the air to limit exposure to substances that can affect human health and the environment. <sup>[4]</sup> Rocky View County should look to other jurisdictions that prove to be more progressive when it comes to air regulations as a way to ensure that human health is not impacted in a negative manner at the hands of industry.

The current operating pit is bad enough, adding / expanding another one will make it even worse.

## Noise

Noise caused by trucking, crushing and equipment necessary for gravel operations are burdensome for residential users. When windy, noise can substantially worsen especially when the wind is blowing from the direction of an operation towards a residence. To decrease the noise burden for residents the operation should be 1 kilometer in distance measured from the operating site to the resident's property line, as already mentioned. Furthermore, best management practices should include buffer zones that are strategically placed around an operation from privately owned

properties and other areas of human activity such as schools, playgrounds and recreational areas. Fixed operating hours should be set in a manner that accommodates normal human activity, and these hours should be posted on signage on the front of the gravel property to ensure transparency.

# **Closure and Reclamation Best Management Practices**

Lack of conservation of reclamation materials has been a common management failure amongst aggregate sites. Operational practices often trump adherence to reclamation practices. Best management practices are not always implemented, causing further impacts to human activity and the environment. Proponents should be required to consult on reclamation practices to ensure the aesthetics and natural habitat is restored to the previous condition; furthermore, recessed areas should be filled in completely. Prior to receiving an operating permit, proponents should be required to have in place closure and reclamation best management practices. The County should be responsible for ensuring that these plans are completed so that normal habitat and human activity can thrive again off the impacted area. Why not finish with the current mine and then reclaim it and only then allow another one if it can be demonstrated to be safe and not harmful to those residents who live nearby.

# **Cumulative effects**

Cumulative impacts on a habit as a result of a gravel pit can cause irreversible damages to the environment, this only multiplies as the volume of pits increase in a set proximity. Right now, the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency* is in the pre-consultation stages of their CEAA amending regulation. Without a final decision from CEAA, any enacted regulation surrounding cumulative effects would be incomplete in nature. Thusly, the Council should await the CEAA panel's decision to ensure that provincial regulations align with federal regulations. CEAA should be used as a regulatory framework before approving permits or any further studies completed by proponents in the Rocky View County. Studies should outline cumulative impacts to local habitat, as well as the cumulative effects of multiple aggregate pits within a certain radius.

As is stands we are in the middle of several gravel pits. One more could be the tipping point. Plus the land to the south of me is the hands of a gravel company and a previous council denied their application as they determined it was unsafe, and too close to the Big Hill Springs Provincial Park. Does anyone really know if adding additional pits or grouping them increase their effect on people and the environment in an incremental or exponential factor?

# Conclusion

Once again, I would like to be noted that I recognize council for their commitment to

finding a balance for residents, industry and society while also renewing their commitment to environmental stewardship. I trust that they will work to protect my enjoyment of our property I am also equally concerned that we are directly north of the previous submission that council voted down, the Caron place (Burnco) and I understand that a new company has purchased the ranch owned by Pearl Parker. We really need council to protect us from being surrounded by gravel pits. It is sad to learn that a twelve year old girl was killed as a tandem gravel truck struck a school bus. If council approves all these gravel pits, then I am afraid this will be putting you many people's lives, needlessly at risk.

Could you all be so kind as to acknowledge that you have received my email, thanks.

I would be happy to meet with you to discuss the broader concerns and especially in the eventuality that another application is made on the Caron/Parker property.

Sincerely,

Tom Foss

www.fosswealth.ca

This email may be privileged and/or confidential, and the sender does not waive any related rights and obligations. Any distribution, use or copying of this email or the information it contains by other than an intended recipient is unauthorized. If you received this email in error, please advise the sender (by return email or otherwise) immediately.

Respecting your privacy and preferences for electronic communications is important to us. If you would prefer not to receive emails from me, please reply with "UNSUBSCRIBE" in the subject line or body of the email. If you would also prefer not to receive emails from our firm, please cc: <u>unsubscribeRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u> in your reply. Please note that you will continue to receive messages related to transactions or services that we provide to you. To speak to us about how your preferences are managed, please email: <u>contactRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u>.

Le respect de votre vie privée et de vos préférences pour les communications électroniques est important pour nous. Si vous ne souhaitez plus que je vous envoie des courriels, veuillez répondre en inscrivant « DÉSABONNER » dans la ligne d'objet ou dans le corps de votre message. Si vous ne voulez non plus recevoir des courriels de notre société, veuillez indiquer : « <u>unsubscribeRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u> » en copie conforme (Cc) dans votre réponse. Veuillez toutefois noter que vous continuerez de recevoir des messages liés aux opérations effectuées ou aux services que nous vous fournissons. Si vous avez des questions sur la façon dont sera géré votre préférence, veuillez nous les envoyer par courriel, à l'adresse <u>contactRBCDominionSecurities@rbc.com</u>.

From: Julia Garvin
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2018 12:45 PM
To: PAA\_ LegislativeServices
Subject: Public Hearings on Bylaw C-7739-2017 Summit Pit/April 24

To Whom It May Concern:

I am opposed to Rockyview allowing expansion of the Summit Pit for the following reasons:

To allow the expansion application to move forward while the court challenge remains unresolved is, at best, disrespectful of the residents sponsoring the court challenge.

To allow yet another gravel application to come forward in the middle of the County's ongoing public consultations on the revised Aggregate Resource Plan defies understanding. It raises serious questions about the County's commitment to listen to residents in this round of consultations.

The last Council allowed gravel applications to be heard in July when the County didn't have an ARP in place and even Admin recommended that Council wait for the ARP to be finalized. That Council did not listen to their constituents and have not been re elected. Allowing an application to be considered defies the point of the ARP which is to let residents and industry know where gravel can and can not go. As a resident I expect Council will protect me and my family. Essentially, Council works for us and I don't think

you can find a more vocal group opposing open pit mining in our neighbourhood.

Of the three new gravel pits along Big Hill Springs Road, Summit may raise the most serious environmental concerns since it is the closest to Big Hill Springs Provincial Park and to an environmentally sensitive area being preserved by the Nature Conservancy of Canada.

Then there are the ongoing and very serious traffic safety concerns along Big Hill Springs Road from what appears to be an ever-increasing volume of heavy gravel truck traffic. My understanding is that Rockyview bylaw has not been on Big Hill Springs Rd handing out tickets to gravel truck drivers that are speeding. I know someone in the area and they frequently travel that road and they never see enforcement officers present. We all know gravel truck drivers speed and it is a matter of time before we have our own Humboldt tragedy as this is also a school bus route. I want to see more Bylaw enforcement officers on that road. Not to mention the growing concerns about the cumulative impact from so many gravel pits in one location.

Julia Garvin

From:	
To:	Jessica Anderson
Subject:	Fwd: Summit Aggregate Application in Rocky View County File 20170145
Date:	Saturday, December 30, 2017 1:17:17 AM

Jessica(janderson@rockyview.ca),

I am writing to OPPOSE approval of the amendment to Summit Pit Master Site Development Plan (Application PL20170145).

There is currently an injunction before the courts to overturn the existing MSDP and Land Redesignation.

On June 14, 2016, Counsel passed a motion to table these applications sine die until the aggregate resource management plan (ARP) is approved. The only thing that has changed since then is the timing of the ARP since we now know the final ARP will not be considered by Council until March 2018. The applicant, for Summit pit, has not provided any reason for why its MSDP needs to be approved before the new ARP is in place. The administration has evaluated the MSDP and re-designation application against the existing policies on aggregate resources in the County Plan and Land Use By-law. These policies are outdated and inadequate, which is why the new ARP is needed. The applicant has not demonstrated why its MSDP and re-designation applications should be approved under these outdated policies, rather than waiting for the new ARP.

The Administration has stated that the County has a duty to process land use applications and there is an expectation that they will be dealt with in a timely manner. Although, the County has a duty to consider land use applications in a timely manner, it does not have a duty to APPROVE applications in a timely manner. The County has an obligation to consider applications fairly and consistently and keep its commitments to residents. Council approved a motion tabling the applications until they can be considered under the new ARP and it should have kept this commitment.

Harry and Tammy Hodgson Landowners

> AGENDA Page 196 of 410

From:	
To:	Jessica Anderson
Subject:	File 06731002 Land Redesignation App# PL20170145
Date:	Monday, September 25, 2017 2:08:54 PM
Attachments:	df4456b7.png

Jessica,

I OPPOSE the redesignation of the land listed per file 06731002 from Ranch and Farm District to Natural Resource Industrial District.

My family and I will be negatively affected by this change. From property value to peaceful country living.

Increase dust, noise and traffic are not what I moved to the country to enjoy.

The proposed gravel pit will be less than a half mile from my home. It will create unwanted noise and dust. From maps that I have seen, this pit will be directly over the source of my well water.

Without a guarantee that stripping several meters off the surface is not going to affect my well water, how is this going to be permitted?

Regards,

Harry Hodgson

Keith Koebisch

March 12, 2018 Supplemental Letter Bylaw C7739-2017 File PL20170145(06731002

Dear Councillors;

I have written to address this Application two times already and you may have my letters from September 19<sup>th</sup> and Dec.27<sup>th</sup> 2017. I for one am getting pretty sick of all the bait and switch tactics being employed by this applicant. Mostly likely this letter is also in vain, because they AGAIN did not give proper public notice. The fake location they gave for <u>this</u> application is "5 km SW of Cochrane", which is <u>not even</u> in Division 9. These are not mistakes as one might believe, but happen all the time with these scrupulous gravel developers. Summit (Mountain Ash) did it in the past in their original application. The previous council rewarded this kind of behaviour.

The owner of this pit bought the farm as an investment for housing. When he realized that was unlikely to occur and that he had mistakenly bought next to and downwind of LaFarge and Buckley (BRADI) he wrote to RVC to speak out against gravel. Now, because of his mistake, he wants to turn the land into NRI...Anything for a quick buck, while the rest of the neighbourhood suffers a huge financial loss, health risks, environmental damage and severely diminished quality of live. THAT IS NOT FAIR!

I have reviewed B&A's Plan and it is a consultant's blend of half-truths to make you believe something wonderful is happening to our neighbourhood and we're all peachy about it. The truth is quite the opposite. When the group of gravel companies formed their association it only included the new pits yet to become operational. The pit that the neighbourhood always supported, Hill Stone, is not a member. In the September meeting to address Cumulative Effects with neighbours there was little agreement, but B&A reported there was. We informed council of this in writing, but that was swept under the rug. Our then Councillor Kendall was very unsympathetic to residents and preferred schmoozing with pit operators and developers.

Council is being blindsided by this application. They asked for 25 acres and within just a few days they were asking for a full quarter-section. No more 2 acre pit gets talked about now, just generalities of having a nice pit with cumulative effects being managed as if by magic. They don't tell you this is before the courts for a judicial review, because that might suggest there is trouble in paradise.

AGENDA Page 198 of 410 The Judicial Review, which you have been made aware of, focuses almost exclusively on Traffic. As it is we have spent nearly \$100K to do this. Many other problems exist here, but we can't pay to study everything. To give you an example of how inferior the pit's studies have been I want to draw your attention to Water: There are 2 provincial Groundwater test wells in the area which are located on my property since 2013. None of these Einsteins seem to know they are here and neither does RVC's planning department. You only need to go to gwinfo@gov.ab.ca and you can find real time data about two aquafers here. The BRADI pits water consultant didn't even know that we are not in the Red Deer River Water Basin. The test wells provide evidence that the two aquafers tested, which are 100 vertical feet apart, are connected. This means that if these gravel pits have a problem, i.e. spill, it will go into the two upper aquafers that all our drinking water comes from. One mistake and you can't even drill another well, because it will likely be poisoned too. Comforting, is it not?

I ask you to tell Mountain Ash to cool their jets and wait for the Judicial Review and the ARP. In the mean time they should go and make some "Concrete Plans" to address all our concerns. That can be best done by one pit at a time and best pit first. That is how you do cumulative effects!

Sincerely,

Keith

Keith Koebisch

Dec. 27, 2017

Jessica Anderson

janderson@rockyview.ca

Subject: File 06731002 / Application # PL20170184

### Dear Ms. Anderson

I am reiterating my concern with respect to this MSDP for the following reasons:

- The rezoning of this property earlier this year is still being challenged via Appeal and Judicial Review, which will not be heard before the courts until 2018. Keeping in mind that this matter is before the courts what are the legal implications of pursuing a new MSDP prior to this legal challenge running its course?
- 2. Evidence to be presented before the courts has much bearing on the development of a MSDP. This needs to be heard particularly with reference to traffic.
- 3. RVC's development of an ARP is nearing completion and should be implemented before adjusting the MSDP.
- 4. The NCC (Nature Conservancy of Canada) has a caveat on lands within 800m of the subject application. Have you or anyone, notified them as a significant stake holder to this development?
- 5. Much of the original plan presented to council during the rezoning process appears to be changing in scope to be larger and beneficial to the applicant. At what point do you consider this to be misrepresentation?
- 6. During the rezoning process, one of the preconditions that then councillor Kendall made was that all the pits seeking rezoning at that time, including this one, be very forthcoming in community involvement with their development and all pits within a mile and a half needed to have input in many aspects of MSDP development. B & A was the firm that was supposed to do this. I was not informed of these changes by anyone except Harry and Tammy Hodgson. Not RVC and not B&A. So much for the precondition of rezoning and just one example of why this is going to a court.

Sincerely,

Keith Koebisch

14 March 2018

**Rocky View County** 

Re: Bylaw C-7739-2017

To the Council:

We will be unavailable to attend the public hearing for the application to re-designate a portion of N-31-26-03-W05M, and therefore will be submitting notice of our opposition to this application within this letter.

It is our understanding that the applicant has successfully acquired re-designation of 25 acres of the subject property for sand and gravel extraction, and now wishes to acquire re-designation for the rest of the available 163 acres for the same purpose.

We recall that the original application suggested using 53 dBA in accordance with AER Directive 038 measured at dwellings. Now the applicant wishes to re-apply using noise levels limit of 65 dBA, and notes that this is consistent with the City of Calgary noise bylaw for continuous sound measured over one hour duration. Given the relative proximity of at least three residences to the perimeters of the subject property, and the relatively clear line of sight from our property to the proposed development, we are not certain that this is adequate. On the logarithmic scale, 65 dBA is much louder than 53, for example 60 dBA is half as loud as 70 dBA, 50 dBA is one quarter as loud as 70 dBA. A typical ambient noise level for the lowest limit of urban ambient sound is 40 dBA (reference www.webmd.com). It is safe to assume that if this applicant receives re-designation at this noise level, the other three potential applicant will likely attempt the same. The cumulative effect of four gravel pits will likely result in amplified noise levels recorded at off-site dwellings. We submit that the suggested noise levels will be too high for a rural neighbourhood.

The proponent has suggested using 100 ug/m<sup>3</sup> measured as a 24 hour average for  $PM_{10}$ . This is simply <u>unacceptable</u>. When this number was suggested at a stakeholder consultation last year, I was told by one of the gravel proponents that this is an Alberta Ambient Air Quality Objective, which is incorrect. The proponent's number is based on the AAAQ total limit for <u>total suspended solids</u>, which would include  $PM_{10}$  as one of its fractions. Alberta does not have an AAAQ for PM10 yet, but the World Health Organization and the British Columbia Ministry of Health both recommend a 24-hour average limit of 50 ug/m<sup>3</sup> for public health reasons (this was also adopted in the Rocky View ARP). We notice that there are no limits mentioned for airborne silica in the application, which is also a potential severe health risk. Public health and safety should be paramount in areas where people have permanent residences, I would make no allowance for reducing diligence to ensure that health and safety concerns are completely addressed.

Based on personal observations of two gravel pits in our local area, we would raise concerns that the conventional dust controls used in our area are not always effective. We have presented photos to the County before such the one below. The operator depicted in the photo below is a well-recognized,

large, national company. Yet it is not uncommon for us to witness dust plumes that have exceeded an hour in duration.



These fugitive dust events contribute to dust fall levels experienced in our homes and yards, and obviously may have chronic health risks as well. It might make sense to impose more strict monitoring requirements than the routine gravimetic sampling that the gravel pit operators' collective has suggested. This might include the introduction of continuous monitoring networks that included Tapered Element Oscillating Microbalance (TEOM) units or beta attenuation monitors (BAM) and observation of shorter term, say one-hour monitored averages in addition to the 24-hour averages. Similarly, we would expect greater vigilance with silica dust fugitive emissions.

We do not have much confidence in the capabilities of this applicant or the other applicant to regulate the environmental and public safety concerns that will develop through increased heavy truck traffic to Highway 567. Although the proponent indicated at some point in the application that they would clean loose gravel off of trucks prior to leaving, it is still going to be challenging for them to follow through with this program. The number of chipped and cracked windshields we still experience driving on Highway 567 and Lockend Road are testament to the failure to prevent dropping aggregate on the roads. We would like more information about how the operators will be cleaning the trucks before they leave the quarries.

# AGENDA Page 202 of 410

The proponent estimated that the net increase in heavy truck traffic would amount to 6.1 percent compared to the current baseline traffic. This was based on an increase of 143 loaded trucks per day added to Highway 567. This works out to a truck every 5 minutes. This is much less that the traffic estimates that we heard during the hearings in the summer of 2017, in which the estimated number was more like three vehicle trips per minute, which would be 180 vehicles per hour, or over 2100 trips per 12 hour day. Please excuse us for being skeptical, but it feels like we already have more than that level of traffic now! On a recent trip from our residence on Hwy 567 to the Lochend Road intersection (a distance of 5 km), a total of 9 gravel trucks were counted. We, and other residents that must access 567 from county roads are very concerned that the actual heavy truck traffic increase will make access difficult if not dangerous. The intersection improvements proposed by the applicant will not make access from county roads any easier on Hwy 567.

The applicant indicates that they have been in collaboration with the other applicants (Lafarge and McNair) to attempt to address the cumulative effects of what will effectively be, if all of the applicant were to operate simultaneously, a gravel mall. This might be the greatest of our concerns, because any of the noise, air quality or traffic effects associated with just a single pit are amplified by the net fourfold increase in activity in a very localized area. We are certain that the various consultants working on behalf of three clients are not intentionally down-playing the environmental and health and safety effects for the individual projects. It is highly probable that the impact of a single pit can be mitigated to the relative satisfaction of local residents. It is highly doubtful, however, that the consultants have studied the net effects that would be attributed to the combined operation of all of the pits. For instance, the Mountain Ash MSDP indicates that a wetland will be preserved in the northwest corner of their quarter section. We would question how difficult it might prove to maintain a viable wetland when the surrounding property are undermining (no pun intended) their efforts. The water for the wetland had to come from somewhere, which will be vastly altered with the progression of the pits. The mining operations will disrupt prominent surface water routes as well, and to this point, there doesn't seem to be an overall plan to address the entire gravel mall project.

Logically, it doesn't make a lot of sense to assume that a large expanse of land with interconnected aquifers and surface water routing will not be impacted by four separately-operated gravel pits operating in different regions of the same watershed. By the end of the roughly 30 years of excavation, the entire area will look like a single large mine. We have no suggestions for the County to address how they might establish an orderly mining operation that would follow a logical progression and allow for scalable and modular mitigative controls (both engineered and administrative controls). Without basic coordination, such as might be expected in any large construction project, we fear that the local residents will indeed suffer the most, and the damages may be difficult to reverse.

We urge Council to reject the re-designation application at this time. There are too many "holes" in this proposal to make informed decisions.

Regards,

Morley and Linda Kostecky

From: Rod Lipman Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2018 12:00 PM To: PAA\_ LegislativeServices Subject: Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017

I am writing to make my feelings and opinion known about the redesignation of additional land along Big Hill Springs Road for the expansion of Summit's aggregate operations.

I am opposed to this application for the following reasons:

• Summit's original redesignation, for which this is an expansion, is the subject of an ongoing court challenge. To allow the expansion application to move forward while the court challenge remains unresolved is, at best, disrespectful of the residents sponsoring the court challenge.

• To allow yet another gravel application to come forward in the middle of the County's ongoing public consultations on the revised Aggregate Resource Plan defies understanding. It raises serious questions about the County's commitment to listen to residents in this round of consultations.

• Of the three new gravel pits along Big Hill Springs Road, Summit may raise the most serious environmental concerns since it is the closest to Big Hill Springs Provincial Park

and to an environmentally sensitive area being preserved by the Nature Conservancy of Canada.

• Then there are the ongoing and very serious traffic safety concerns along Big Hill Springs Road from what appears to be an ever-increasing volume of heavy gravel truck traffic. Not to mention the growing concerns about the cumulative impact from so many gravel pits in one location.

Thank you.

From: Graham Reiser Sent: Sunday, April 01, 2018 9:42 PM To: PAA\_ LegislativeServices Subject: Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017

A few points to review as I am against further gravel pit applications.

Summit's original redesignation, for which this is an expansion, is the subject of an ongoing court challenge. To allow the expansion application to move forward while the court challenge remains unresolved is, at best, disrespectful of the residents sponsoring the court challenge.

• To allow yet another gravel application to come forward in the middle of the County's ongoing public consultations on the revised Aggregate Resource Plan defies understanding. It raises serious questions about the County's commitment to listen to residents in this round of consultations.

•

• Of the three new gravel pits along Big Hill Springs Road, Summit may raise the most serious environmental concerns since it is the closest to Big Hill Springs Provincial Park and to an environmentally sensitive area being preserved by the Nature Conservancy of Canada.

•

• Then there are the ongoing and very serious traffic safety concerns along Big Hill Springs Road from what appears to be an ever-increasing volume of heavy gravel truck traffic. Not to mention the growing concerns about the cumulative impact from so many gravel pits in one location.

Graham Reiser

From: Fred scharf Sent: Saturday, March 10, 2018 2:55 PM To: PAA\_ LegislativeServices Cc: Rocky View Gravel Watch Subject: Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017

I am sending this note to express my concern regarding the redesignation of additional land along Big Hill Springs Road for the expansion of Summit's aggregate operations. Summit's original redesignation, for which this is an expansion, is the subject of an ongoing court challenge. To allow the expansion application to move forward while the court challenge remains unresolved is, at best, disrespectful of the residents sponsoring the court challenge.

• To allow yet another gravel application to come forward in the middle of the County's ongoing public consultations on the revised Aggregate Resource Plan defies understanding. It raises serious questions about the County's commitment to listen to residents in this round of consultations.

• Of the three new gravel pits along Big Hill Springs Road, Summit may raise the most serious environmental concerns since it is the closest to Big Hill Springs Provincial Park and to an environmentally sensitive area being preserved by the Nature Conservancy of Canada.

• Then there are the ongoing and very serious traffic safety concerns along Big Hill

Springs Road from what appears to be an ever-increasing volume of heavy gravel truck traffic. Not to mention the growing concerns about the cumulative impact from so many gravel pits in one location.

Respectfully

Fred Scharf

AGENDA Page 209 of 410 Rocky View County 911 – 32<sup>nd</sup> Ave. NE Calgary Alberta T2E 6X6 March 08, 2018

**VIA EMAIL** 

# RE: Bylaw Applications C-7739-2017 Application No.: PL20170145 (06731002)

To: Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in **opposition** to the above captioned land redesignation from Ranch and Farm district to Natural Resource Industrial District to facilitate the **creation** of a gravel aggregate extraction operations for reasons stipulated below. It should be noted that the Notice of Public Hearing stated that the purpose was to facilitate the EXPANSION of an aggregate operation. There is currently NO aggregate operation at that location for if there was, a land redesignation would have already taken place.

I am a long term Rocky View County resident (30+ years) residing on the located 1.5 miles south of the location in question on rising terrain that sits approximately 100 ft. above the subject sites. I am currently impacted by two existing gravel extraction operations, one located east of Big Hill Springs Provincial Park, the other located 1 mile east of Range Road 40 immediately south of Highway 567. I oppose the 1410266 Alberta Ltd. application as it relates to noise, airborne particulate matter, highway traffic impact, and cumulate effect of multiple existing gravel pit operations on myself, my family, and existing rate payers in this part of Rocky View County.

I am asking council to view this and future similar applications through the eyes of the residents that will bear the impact. I seriously doubt that anyone would argue that there will be no impact; the question then becomes what is reasonable given the current impact of existing operations? Multiple gravel pit operations in a relatively small area is all about individual company competitive edge, and not about the lack of current aggregate supply. I understand that Rocky View County wants to reflect an "Open For Business" philosophy, however in some cases such as this, the very premise of the rural lifestyle that comprises the vast majority of land within the County, and why most, myself included, moved here to begin with is severely compromised. It is my belief that Open For Business can still be accomplished by limiting gravel operations, and not just trying to govern them with an Aggregate Resource Plan. If we do not say no at this juncture, we will never be able to say no, as long as the intended operations meet the criteria outlined in the ARP, thus opening up the ground to everyone with a shovel. What happened to the saying "the needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few", the few in this case being the gravel operators...who profits, who loses, and who cares?

I suggest that our elected Councilors are obligated to not only look at the big picture, but also the smaller picture as well. Do the right thing for the right reasons, with the understanding that the existing gravel operations are sufficient to satisfy the demands for aggregate in the medium term. Limit gravel operations to minimize impact to residents, and remain "Open For the BEST Business".

Thank you

Larry Stock

AGENDA Page 210 of 410

#### From:

Sent: Wednesday, March 14, 2018 4:25 PM To: PAA\_ LegislativeServices Subject: Opposition to PUBLIC HEARING for Bylaw C-7739-2017

My property is the , less than 1/2 mile to the east of the proposed pit and I oppose the approval of by Bylaw C-7739-2017 on the basis of the below concerns:

There has been a failure by Rocky View County to follow responsible planning practices, and the Municipal Government Act in the approval of multiple redesignation applications that are not within the character of the area. The area is an agricultural area, there has now been three land use redesignation applications approved since September 2017 to pave the way for increased gravel operations in close proximity to each other. There has been no or insufficient consideration of the cumulative effect of these redesignation on the area. There will be excessive and dangerous traffic levels in the area, and an insufficient review of the effect of this traffic to date. Further, there has been none or insufficient consideration of the cumulative effect, and the environment.

I strongly oppose the approval this Bylaw paving the way for further gravel pits in this area which is my family home. If Rocky View County wants to change the character of this area they should do so responsibly by completing an area structure plan or similar, these piece meal approval process and irresponsible planning must stop.

Tammy Hodgson

**Rockyview Resident** 

From: Teri Lipman Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2018 6:12 PM To: PAA\_ LegislativeServices Subject: Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017

I do not agree that Summit should be seeking redesignation of additional land along Big Hill Springs Road, for the purpose of expansion.

I am opposed to this application for the following reasons:

• Summit's original redesignation, for which this is an expansion, is the subject of an ongoing court challenge. To allow the expansion application to move forward while the court challenge remains unresolved is, at best, disrespectful of the residents sponsoring the court challenge.

• To allow yet another gravel application to come forward in the middle of the County's ongoing public consultations on the revised Aggregate Resource Plan defies understanding. It raises serious questions about the County's commitment to listen to residents in this round of consultations.

• Of the three new gravel pits along Big Hill Springs Road, Summit may raise the most serious environmental concerns since it is the closest to Big Hill Springs Provincial Park and to an environmentally sensitive area being preserved by the Nature Conservancy of Canada.

Then there are the ongoing and very serious traffic safety concerns along Big Hill

AGENDA Page 212 of 410 Springs Road from what appears to be an ever-increasing volume of heavy gravel truck traffic. Not to mention the growing concerns about the cumulative impact from so many gravel pits in one location.

Thank you.

Teri Lipman

March 14, 2018

Deputy Clerk's Office, Rocky View County 911 – 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE, Calgary, Alberta, T2E 6X6

Subject: Public Hearing for Bylaw C-7739-2017

I am opposed to the redesignation application for the expansion of the Summit gravel pit on Big Hill Springs Road.

I expressed my opposition to Summit's earlier redesignation application. All the reasons for my opposition to that application are still relevant. The health, traffic safety, and environmental risks all remain legitimate and will be heightened by the approval of yet more redesignation of land for gravel extraction in this area.

I find it offensive that Summit has changed its "story". They had promised incremental redesignation applications to "ensure that Council and the local community are given opportunity for input throughout the life of the operations" – to quote from its original document for this application. I find it difficult to believe any of the assertions it is now making when it has withdrawn that important assurance with no explanation.

Related to this point is the fact that Summit has not yet begun operating its gravel pit on the land that has already been redesignated. There is, therefore, no need to redesignate additional land at this point.

The timing of this application is also objectionable. The County is in the middle of public consultations on the revised draft for its Aggregate Resource Plan. It is difficult to think of a reason for Summit's sudden change in strategy for its applications other than wanting to get approval before the ARP is in place. This is not a reason that should be given any credence by Council.

I hope that the new Council will realize how inappropriate it is to consider this gravel application before it has the opportunity to evaluate the County's overall gravel policy initiative. To do otherwise leaves Council without an agreed-upon foundation from which to evaluate gravel applications. It also raises serious doubts about Council's commitment to listen to residents in this round of ARP consultations.

I am also very concerned about the message Council would be sending if it approved this application now. The approval of Summit's original redesignation application is being legally challenged by local residents. It would be very rude, if nothing else, to ignore the reality of their ongoing court challenge. It would also be irresponsible since the outcome of the legal challenge may well be relevant for the evaluation of this application.

For these reasons and many more that I do not have time to include here, Council should reject this application.

David Jaylov

**David Taylor** 

AGENDA Page 214 of 410 Calgary, AB March 9, 2018

**Rocky View County Legislative Services** 

Attn: Deputy Clerk's Office

Re: Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017

Dear Madam / Sir,

I am writing to express my opposition to the redesignation application being brought forward by Summit Aggregate to expand its gravel operations along Big Hill Springs Road.

I am particularly opposed to allowing yet another gravel application to come forward in the middle of the County's ongoing public consultations on the revised Aggregate Resource Plan. It raises serious questions about the County's commitment to listen to residents in this round of consultations. Not something I would have thought the new Council would desire.

Summit's original redesignation is the subject of an ongoing court challenge. To allow the expansion application to move forward while the court challenge remains unresolved is, at best, disrespectful of the residents sponsoring the court challenge. The County should be waiting until that court challenge is resolved before even considering further redesignations of any of these gravel pits.

Of the three new gravel pits along Big Hill Springs Road, Summit raises the most serious environmental concerns. It is the closest to Big Hill Springs Provincial Park and to an environmentally sensitive area being preserved by the Nature Conservancy of Canada. As a result, its application should not be approved – the environmental risks are too high.

There are very serious traffic safety concerns along Big Hill Springs Road from what is an everincreasing volume of heavy gravel truck traffic. There were also serious concerns about the cumulative impacts from so many gravels pits all in this one location before this application. Allowing Summit to expand its operations would only exacerbate these concerns.

Because of these concerns and all of the serious concerns about the impact of additional gravel pits on the health and quality of life for County residents, this application should be refused.

Sincerely

3

Raymundo Wah

AGENDA Page 215 of 410 -----Original Message-----From: CORNELL WYNNOBEL Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2018 8:49 PM To: Division 9, Crystal Kissel; PAA\_ LegislativeServices Subject: Bylaw C-7739-2017

I wish to bring to your attention that the value in our part of the county has a lot more to offer than gravel.

The natural beauty of the landscape attracts people from all over the world who marvel at what we have here. Gravel pits are a blight on the magnificent land. They also contribute to noise pollution and air pollution to the extent of adversely affecting the quality of life for a multitude of the residents. Both sound and particulate matter carry a long distance and, given that prevailing winds are very often from the north, the drift will affect residents for several miles. The effects of the dust have been proven to cause health problems. There are enough industrial eyesores throughout the world. Approval of these additional gravel pits would also reduce property values.

An additional argument against more gravel pits is the danger on the roads from increased numbers of gravel trucks. From personal experience these trucks are often carelessly and dangerously driven to the detriment of all on the road. The regulations state that loads must be covered, but this is not sufficiently enforced. Many, many gravel trucks have tattered covers which do nothing to reduce the gravel flung onto the road or, in my particular case into my windshield.

One more item of note is that the notice in the paper states that the designated property is approximately 5 km southwest of the Town of Cochrane. It is in fact northwest of Cochrane and this error could mislead interested parties. Someone not reading the notice carefully could easily miss the fact that it directly affects their property, and indeed lifestyle.

I strongly urge you and the county to disallow the applications for development of the gravel pits proposed.

Muriel and Cornell Wynnobel
From:	
To:	Jessica Anderson
Cc:	
Subject:	Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017
Date:	Sunday, March 11, 2018 4:12:01 PM

Attention: Jessica Anderson, Community Planner - Rockyview County

#### Letter of Non-Objection/Support for Summit Land Use Redesignation

As owner of , as well as representing the family interests in several additional quarter sections of land adjacent to SE 1 that are located near to the Summit Pit at NW 31-26-3-W5M; Buckley Ranches Aggregate Development Inc. do not object to the land use application or amended Master Site Development Plan submitted to Rocky View County by Mountain Ash Limited Partnership, as discussed in Public Hearing and Bylaw C-7739-2017.

Our position of non-objection and support is subject to the application, and applicant, being held to the same development criteria and operating standard as ALL other nearby operators, located in Rocky View County.

Sincerely,

Mike Buckley

Buckley Ranches Aggregate Development Inc.

 BURNCO Rock Products Ltd Main Floor, 155 Glendeer Circle SE Box 1480, Station T Calgary, AB, Canada T2H 2P9

**burnco.com** Main 403 255 2600 Fax 403 255 0323

March 13, 2018

Rocky View County 911 – 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE Calgary, Alberta T2E 6X6

#### Attention: Deputy Municipal Clerk

#### Re: Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017

BURNCO Rock Products Ltd., (BURNCO) occupant of the Lands located at **SW 32-26-3-W5M**, **SE 31-26-3-W5M**, **NE 30-26-3-W5M**, does not object to the adjacent proposed Summit Pit, which is owned by Mountain Ash Limited Partnership "MALP" and located at **NW 31-26-3-W5M**.

BURNCO does not object to the land use application or amended Master Site Development Plan submitted to Rocky View County by Mountain Ash Limited Partnership, referencing the aforementioned- Bylaw C-7739-2017.

BURNCO's position of non-objection is subject to the Summit Pit application and MALP being held to the same standard as all other sand and gravel producers within Rocky View County.

Sincerely,

Travis Coates Land & Resource Manager Alberta and Saskatchewan

TC/mg

c.c. Nick Lulic Ulrich Scheidegger Mark Skjaveland

AGGREGATE | READY MIX | ASPHALT | LANDSCAPE CENTRES

AGENDA Page 218 of 410

# LOOKOUT RANCHE CORPORATION

## Box 427

## COCHRANE, AB T4C 1A6

March 12, 2018

Deputy Clerk's Office Legislative Services Rocky View County 911-32<sup>nd</sup> Ave NE Calgary, AB T2E 6X6

Attention: Members of Council

RE: Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017.

The subject land (NW/4 of 31 T26 R3 W5) is separated from our lands (Hartman and Lookout Ranche Corporation) in the East/2 of 6-T27 R3W5 on the north side of Highway 567. Our residence is  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile from the gate entrance at

After reviewing the master site development proposal I do not object to the land use application or amended Master Site Development Plan submitted to Rocky View County by Mountain Ash Limited Partnership, referencing Public Hearing and Bylaw C-7739-2017.

I have also met with Tige Brady of Mountain Ash Limited Partnership; during which he verified the use of berms and the access road and the overall plan. I believe Mountain Ash Limited Partnership will be a responsible operator and be approachable from its neighbours if any concerns arise.

Sincerely,

artuan

William. J. Hartman & Sandra L. Hartman

cc. Tige Brady, Mountain Ash Limited Partnership Jessica Anderson, Community Planner

wjh/sw

AGENDA Page 219 of 410



Deputy Clerk's Office Rocky View County 911 – 32<sup>nd</sup> Ave. NE Calgary, AB T2E 6X6

**E-MAIL** 

#### Attention: Jessica Anderson Community Planner

#### SUBJECT: Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017

As owner and operator of the Hughes Gravel Pit located immediately adjacent to the Summit Pit at NW 31-26-3-W5M; Lafarge Canada Inc. does not object to the land use application or amended Master Site Development Plan submitted to Rocky View County by Mountain Ash Limited Partnership, referencing Public Hearing and Bylaw C-7739-2017.

Lafarge Canada Inc.'s position of non-objection is subject to the application, and applicant, being held to the same operating standard as ALL other operators located in Rocky View County.

Regards,

LAFARGE CANADA INC.,

James Wilson C.Eng. General Manager GCA (Greater Calgary Area) – Aggregates, Asphalt and Recycling Rocky View County 911 – 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE Calgary, Alberta T2E 6X6

Attn: Deputy Clerk's Office, Legislative Services

Re: Public Hearing on Bylaw C-7739-2017

I/we John and Gerard Nugter, owners of the Lands located at **SW 31-26-3-W5M**, support the adjacent proposed Summit Pit, which is owned by Mountain Ash Limited Partnership "MALP", and is located at **NW 31-26-3-W5M**.

As the landowners directly adjacent to the proposed development, we do not object to the land use application or amended Master Site Development Plan submitted to Rocky View County by Mountain Ash Limited Partnership, referencing the aforementioned- Bylaw C-7739-2017. It is our preference that all developers be treated equally and fairly as they navigate through the applicable municipal and provincial processes, specifically related to sand and gravel developments in the area.

As landowners, our position of non-objection and support is subject to the application and the applicant, "MALP", being held accountable and to the same approval standards compared to all other sand and gravel producers, specifically in the Big Hills Springs Area (i.e. Lafarge and McNair Sand and Gravel).

Sincerely,

John Nugter, Landowner

Gerard Nugter, Landowner

#### AGENDA Page 221 of 410

February 7, 2018

Rocky View County 911 – 32 Avenue NE Calgary, Alberta T2E 6X6

Attention: Ms. Jessica Anderson, Municipal Planner

#### RE: Summit Pit Development – Natural Resource Extraction (NRI) Non-Objection to Land Use Re-designate Balance of NW ¼ of 31-26-3-W5M

I am a resident/stakeholder living adjacent and immediately east of the Summit Pit. I have been directly engaged by a representative of Mountain Ash Limited Partnership., on several occasions since July 2014, with regards to their aggregate extraction and development proposal on NW 1/4 of 31-26-3-W5M, adjacent to my property located at NE ¼ of 31-26-3-W5M.

Please be advised that as a stakeholder and resident immediately adjacent to the Summit Pit, I have no objections to Summit proposal or project. My non-objection position is contingent upon the execution of Summit's commitments contained in their amended Master Site Development Plan (MSDP), in conjunction with the other adjacent aggregate producers and their recently approved MSDP's. These commitments were brought to my attention through conversations had with MALP and its representative, namely Tige Brady.

Sincerely,

Calvin Rawn

Kim Rawn

Municipal Address/Legal Land Description

Municipal Address/Legal Land Description

#### AGENDA Page 222 of 410

**DIVISION:** 4



# **ROADS MAINTENANCE**

TO: Council

**DATE:** April 24, 2018

**FILE:** 4020-200

**SUBJECT:** Land Purchase in Langdon to Secure Permanent Right-of-Way

#### <sup>1</sup>ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:

- Motion #1 THAT Administration be authorized to enter into the land purchase of municipal address 509 Railway Avenue NE, Langdon in the amount of \$150,000.
- Motion #2 THAT a budget adjustment of \$150,000 to be funded from the Tax Stabilization Reserve be approved to cover the unbudgeted cost.

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

At the Council meeting on February 27, 2018, Council directed Administration to pursue negotiations with the landowner. Administration now has a sales agreement signed by the landowner in the amount of \$150,000.

The intent of the land purchase is to secure permanent right-of-way for the current access road into the Langdon wastewater treatment plant and the solid waste transfer site.

Administration recommends **Option #1**.

#### BACKGROUND:

The existing access road was built through the property in 2003/2004 subsequent to the approval of the residential Railway Avenue subdivision. At the time of subdivision, a right-of-way easement was registered on the parcel to provide continued access to the County's lands to the east. The Right-of-way easement has no expiry date.

The long term plan for road access to the County lands has been via a new road connecting to Dead Horse Road, which is to be built on the land to the south, and dedicated to the County at time of subdivision of this parcel. This subdivision has experienced delays and is not expected to come forward to Council for several years.

#### **BUDGET IMPLICATION(S):**

The cost of the land purchase is an unbudgeted expense. Administration is requesting a budget adjustment to be funded from the Tax Stabilization Reserve to cover the unbudgeted cost.

#### **OPTIONS:**

Option #1:	Motion #1	THAT Administration be authorized to enter into the land purchase of municipal address 509 Railway Avenue NE, Langdon in the amount of \$150,000.
	Motion #2	THAT a budget adjustment of \$150,000 to be funded from the Tax Stabilization Reserve be approved to cover the unbudgeted cost.

Option #2: THAT alternative direction be provided.



Respectfully submitted,

Byron Riemann

General Manager HB Concurrence,

Kent Robinson

Interim County Manager

#### ATTACHMENTS:

ATTACHMENT 'A' - Location Map ATTACHMENT 'B' - Budget Adjustment





Information as depicted is subject to change, therefore Rocky View County assumes no responsibility for discrepancies after date of printing.



#### Attachment 'B'

# ROCKY VIEW COUNTY BUDGET ADJUSTMENT REQUEST FORM BUDGET YEAR: <u>2018</u>

REVENUES: Transfer from tax stabilization reserve (150,000 TOTAL REVENUE: (150,000 NET BUDGET REVISION: (150,000 NET BUDGET REVISION: To cover unbudgeted land purchase costs for municipal address 509 Railway Avenue NE, Langdon. AUTHORIZATION: Acting County Manager: Kent Robinson Gen. Manager: Byron Riemann Date: Budget AJE No: Posting Date:	Description			Budget Adjustment
TOTAL EXPENSE:       150,000         REVENUES:       Transfer from tax stabilization reserve       (150,000         TOTAL REVENUE:       (150,000         TOTAL REVENUE:       (150,000         TOTAL REVENUE:       (150,000         NET BUDGET REVISION:       (150,000         REASON FOR BUDGET REVISION:       (150,000         To cover unbudgeted land purchase costs for municipal address 509 Railway Avenue NE, Langdon.       (150,000         AUTHORIZATION:       Council Meeting Date:       (150,000         Gen. Manager:       Kent Robinson       Council Motion Reference:       (150,000         Byron Riemann       Date:       (150,000       (150,000         Budget AJE No:       Posting Date:       (150,000         Recen       Recen       (150,000       (150,000		municipal address 509 F	Railway Avenue NE. Langdon	150.000
Transfer from tax stabilization reserve       (150,000         Interview       (150,000         Interview <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
Transfer from tax stabilization reserve       (150,000         International equation of the stabilization reserve       (150,000         International equation of the stabilization reserve       (150,000         International equation of the stabilization reserve       (150,000         Internation of the stabilization reserve       (150,000         Internation of the stabilization reserve       (150,000         Internation of the stabilization of the stabi	TOTAL EXPENSE:			150,000
TOTAL REVENUE: (150,000 NET BUDGET REVISION: REASON FOR BUDGET REVISION: To cover unbudgeted land purchase costs for municipal address 509 Railway Avenue NE, Langdon. AUTHORIZATION: Acting County Manager: Kent Robinson Gen. Manager: Burger Ale No: Burget Ale No: Council Motion Reference: AGEN	REVENUES:			
NET BUDGET REVISION:       (         REASON FOR BUDGET REVISION:       To cover unbudgeted land purchase costs for municipal address 509 Railway Avenue NE, Langdon.         AUTHORIZATION:       Council Meeting Date:         Acting County Manager:       Council Meeting Date:         Kent Robinson       Council Motion Reference:         Byron Riemann       Date:         Budget AJE No:       Posting Date:         AGEN       AGEN	Transfer from tax stabili	zation reserve		(150,000)
REASON FOR BUDGET REVISION:         To cover unbudgeted land purchase costs for municipal address 509 Railway Avenue NE, Langdon.         AUTHORIZATION:         Acting County Manager:       Council Meeting Date:         Kent Robinson         Gen. Manager:       Council Motion Reference:         Byron Riemann       Date:         Budget AJE No:       Posting Date:         AGEEN       Acting County Manager:	TOTAL REVENUE:			(150,000
To cover unbudgeted land purchase costs for municipal address 509 Railway Avenue NE, Langdon.          AUTHORIZATION:         Acting County Manager:       Council Meeting Date:         Kent Robinson       Council Motion Reference:         Gen. Manager:       Date:         Byron Riemann       Date:         Budget AJE No:       Posting Date:         Acting Council Meeting Date:       Council Meeting Date:	NET BUDGET REVISION:			0
Kent Robinson       Council Motion Reference:         Byron Riemann       Date:         Budget AJE No:       Posting Date:         AGEN       AGEN				
Byron Riemann Date: Date: Budget AJE No: Posting Date: AGEN	Acting County Manager:		Council Meeting Date:	
Budget AJE No: Posting Date:	Gen. Manager:	Byron Riemann	Council Motion Reference:	
Posting Date:			Date:	
AGEN			Budget AJE No:	
			Posting Date:	
				AGENI Bage 226 of 4



# **RECREATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES**

TO: Council

DIVISION: All

**DATE:** April 24, 2018

**FILE:** 6060

SUBJECT: Spring 2018 Community Recreation Funding Grant: Operational Funding Requests

#### <sup>1</sup>ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:

THAT recreation operational district funding be approved as recommended by the Recreation District Boards in the amount of \$584,840.58, as per Attachment 'A'.

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

As per Community Recreation Policy 317, Council is the final approving authority for all funding recommendations from Recreation District Boards except where inter-municipal cost-sharing agreements traditionally apply. Annually, \$1,038,900.00 is available from the Recreational Tax Levy for community led programs and initiatives.

Rocky View County funding implications have been included in Attachment 'A'.

Administration reviewed all District Board operational funding recommendations in accordance with Council Policy #317 and is recommending approval as per **Option #1**.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

District community organizations apply for operational funding every year in March. The following table captures the 2018 district funding allocations and Board recommendations:

Recreation Board	2018 District Allocation	Total District Operational Funds Recommended
Bearspaw Glendale	\$159,900.00	\$132,050.00
Beiseker	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00
Bow North	\$169,700.00	\$43,061.58
Madden	\$12,200.00	\$12,200.00
Chestermere-Conrich	\$30,000.00	\$30,000.00
Crossfield	\$30,000.00	\$30,000.00
Ranch Lands	\$123,400.00	\$14,500.00
Rocky View Central	\$94,500.00	\$51,100.00
Rocky View East	\$69,100.00	\$31,085.00
Rocky View West	\$330,100.00	\$220,844.00
TOTAL	\$1,038,900.00	\$584,840.58

<sup>1</sup> Administration Resources

Susan de Caen & Pauli Kruger, Recreation & Community Services



#### **BUDGET IMPLICATION(S):**

All recommended funding is accounted for in the annual operating budget, so no budget adjustment is required.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

Annually, property tax levies provide Recreation District Boards with access to \$1,038,900.00 to fund operational costs incurred by District non-profit organizations.

Administration reviews all grant applications for completeness and eligibility according to the Council approved criteria outlined in Policy #317 and then forwards these applications to the District Board. The District Board reviews the application to ensure the proposed community initiative benefits local residents. County Councillors sit on these District Boards as non-voting members and are involved in discussion regarding the merits of each applicant and project.

County Council has final discretion and authority over all funding recommendations with the exception of Chestermere-Conrich, Beiseker, Crossfield Recreation Districts. In these three areas, intermunicipal cost-sharing agreements between the County and adjacent municipalities have historically taken precedence over Policy #317.

#### **Chestermere Conrich Recreation District Recommendations**

On December 3, 2014, the City of Chestermere terminated the Inter-municipal Cost Sharing Agreement. This impacted local services by ending any County requirement to *mutually* fund recreation services in the Chestermere-Conrich region. Without an active agreement, the annual County contribution is in hiatus. The County, however, is obligated through Rocky View County bylaw number C-6336-2006 to fund Board activities. Council approved a similar request in 2017 for \$30,000.00.

Since there is no cost-sharing agreement in place between Rocky View County and the City of Chestermere, on November 21, 2017, the Chestermere Conrich Recreation District Board (CCRB) made the motion that the "CCRB write a letter to Rocky View County requesting \$30,000.00 from their 2018 Budget for CCRB funds". Given that the \$30,000.00 was tied to an agreement that is no longer in effect, and the adjacent municipality has signing authority, the decision to set funding is at the discretion of Council.

#### **Beiseker and Crossfield Recreation District Recommendations**

The cost-sharing agreements between the County and the Village of Beiseker and Town of Crossfield were allowed to expire on December 31, 2017, until the Municipal Government Act-mandated Intermunicipal Collaborative Frameworks define these relationships. The County is obligated through Rocky View County bylaw C-6638-2008 for the Beiseker Recreation District and Rocky View County bylaw C7470-2015 for the Crossfield Recreation District to fund these Boards' activities.

Funding for these impacted district boards has been approved in the 2018 operational budget. Without agreements setting funding parameters the Board Chairs have written letters requesting access to the funds.

Although funding decisions by Crossfield and Chestermere-Conrich Recreation District Boards are decentralized and not reviewed by Council before final approval, Administration ensures that all approved applications meet the criteria of Policy #317. Therefore, Administration is recommending Option #1.



#### **OPTIONS:**

- Option #1 THAT recreation operational district funding be approved as recommended by the Recreation District Boards in the amount of \$584,840.00, as per Attachment 'A'.
- Option #2 THAT alternative direction be provided.

Respectfully submitted,

Concurrence,

"Chris O'Hara"

"Kent Robinson"

General Manager

Interim County Manager

SD/PK/cm

#### ATTACHMENTS:

ATTACHMENT 'A' 2018 Recreation District Operational Funding Allocation

#### Attachment A 2018 Recreation District Operational Funding Allocation As Approved by Council on 24 April, 2018

Recreation District	Total 2018 District Recreation Funding Available	2018 Operating Grants		2018 Funds Recommended
Bearspaw-Glendale 2-40-30-265-24705	\$ 159,900.00	Bearspaw Glendale Community Association		\$118,850.00 \$12,000.00
2-40-30-203-24703		Town of Cochrane (as per Recreation Cost Sharing Services Agreement) Annual board administration budget		\$1,200.00
				\$132,050.00
Beiseker	\$ 20,000.00	Beiseker and District Agricultural Society		\$2,795.00
		Beiseker Kids 4 Kids Tae Kwon Do & Fitness Club		\$2,205.00
		Village of Beiseker		\$15,000.00
				\$20,000.00
Bow North	\$ 169,700.00	Girl Guides of Canada, Moonlight District (Langdon)		\$2,564.00
2-40-30-265-24715		Indus Figure Skating Indus Minor Hockey Association		\$3,250.00 \$7,975.45
		Indus Ringette Association		\$3,990.00
		Langdon Community Garden		\$4,238.00
		Langdon Little League		\$5,800.00
		Langdon Older Kids Seniors' Club Langdon Theatre Association		\$2,985.50
		North Bow Community Facility Recreation Board		\$2,500.00 \$3,257.68
		South East Rocky View Karate and Kickboxing (SERKKA)		\$1,500.00
		Synergy Youth and Community Development Society		\$3,400.95
		Annual board administration budget		\$1,600.00
				\$43,061.58
Chestermere-Conrich	\$ 30,000.00			\$30,000.00
Crossfield	\$ 30,000.00			\$30,000.00
Madden	\$ 12,200.00	Madden Ag Society		\$8,700.00
2-40-30-265-24740		Madden Curling Club Madden Cubs		\$3,000.00 \$500.00
				\$000.00
			Total	\$12,200.00
Ranch Lands	\$ 123,400.00	•		\$2,500.00
2-40-30-265-24745		Town of Cochrane (as per Recreation Cost Sharing Services Agreement)		\$12,000.00
			Total	\$14,500.00
Rocky View Central	\$ 94,500.00	Airdrie Pro Rodeo		\$25,000.00
2-40-30-265-24700		Butler Park Community Association		\$10,600.00
		Sharp Hill Preservation Society Annual board administration budget		\$12,000.00 \$3,500.00
				\$0,000.00
			Total	\$51,100.00
Rocky View East	\$ 69,100.00	Beiseker Minor Hockey		\$5,000.00
2-40-30-265-24735		Delacour Ag Society		\$5,000.00
		Dalroy UFA Society Keoma Community Society		\$7,000.00 \$8,000.00
		Town of Irricana		\$6,085.00
				A04 005 00
Dealers Views Week	¢ 220.400.00	Bragg Creek Community Association	Total	\$31,085.00
Rocky View West 2-40-30-265-24755	\$ 330,100.00	Bragg Creek Community Association Bragg Creek Snowbirds Seniors Fellowship		\$160,000.00 \$6,000.00
2 40 00 200 24100		Greater Bragg Creek Trails		\$5,000.00
		Springbank Equestrian Society		\$10,500.00
		Springbank Trails and Pathways Association		\$2,344.00
		Jumping Pound Hall		\$5,000.00
		Springbank Heritage Club Town of Cochrane (as per Recreation Cost Sharing Services Agreement)		\$15,000.00 \$12,000.00
		Annual board administration budget		\$12,000.00
			Total	\$220,844.00
TOTALS	\$ 1,038,900.00			\$584,840.58



# **RECREATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES**

TO: Council

DIVISION: All

**DATE:** April 24, 2018

**FILE:** 6060

SUBJECT: Spring 2018 Community Recreation Funding Grant: Capital Funding Requests

#### <sup>1</sup>ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:

- Motion #1: THAT the Bearspaw Glendale Community Association's request for up to \$8,560.00 to install wall padding, a scoreboard, and a shot clock in the gymnasium be approved from the Bearspaw Glendale Recreation District in the Public Reserve.
- Motion #2: THAT the Bow Valley Community Club's funding request for up to \$27,321.81 for locker room and washroom renovations at the Indus Curling Rink be approved from the Bow North Recreation District in the Public Reserve.
- Motion #3: THAT the Langdon Community Association's request for up to \$48,000.00 for enhancements to Fieldhouse greenspace be approved from the Bow North Recreation District in the Public Reserve.

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

Not-for-profit organizations provide and develop a range of cultural, social, recreational, sport, and other community-based services and projects that the County could not provide without their involvement. Community Recreation Policy 317 enables recreational development and ongoing partnerships, enhancing access to recreational facility services and programs for the greatest community impact.

As per Community Recreation Policy 317, Council is the final approving authority for all funding recommendations from Recreation District Boards except where inter-municipal cost-sharing agreements have traditionally applied i.e. Chestermere-Conrich and Crossfield. The resourcing available and Recreation District Boards recommendations are outlined under the 'Budget Implications' section.

Administration has reviewed all Recreation District Board capital funding recommendations in accordance with Council Policy 317, and is recommending funding approval in accordance with **Option #1.** 

#### **BUDGET IMPLICATION(S):**

As of February 28, 2018, the Recreation District Boards held the following amounts in their uncommitted capital reserve accounts:

<sup>1</sup> Administration Resources Susan de Caen & Pauli Kruger, Recreation & Community Services



#### Bearspaw-Glendale Recreation District Board: Reserve Balance - \$769,719.75

APPLICANT	TOTAL PROJECT	AMOUNT SOUGHT	BOARD RECOMMENDATION	RESERVE BALANCE AFTER FUNDING
Bearspaw Glendale Community Association	\$17,120.00	\$8,560.00	\$8,560.00	
TOTAL	\$17,120.00	\$8,560.00	\$8,560.00	\$761,159.75

#### Bow North Recreation District Board: Reserve Balance - \$157,780.07

APPLICANT	TOTAL PROJECT	AMOUNT SOUGHT	BOARD RECOMMENDATION	RESERVE BALANCE AFTER FUNDING
Bow Valley Community Club	\$54,643.62	\$27,321.81	\$27,321.81	
Indus School Council Society	\$349,072.80	\$20,000.00	\$0.00	
Langdon Community Association	\$96,000.00	\$48,000.00	\$48,000.00	
TOTAL	\$150,643.62	\$95,321.81	\$75,321.81	\$82,458.26

#### Rocky View West Recreation District Board: Reserve Balance - \$199,817.18

APPLICANT	TOTAL PROJECT	AMOUNT SOUGHT	BOARD RECOMMENDATION	RESERVE BALANCE AFTER FUNDING
Greater Bragg Creek Trails Association	\$500,000.00	\$331,000.00	\$100,00.00 *conditional upon RVC contributing the remainder of \$231,000	
Springbank Trails and Pathways	\$8,520.00	\$4,260.00	\$0.00	
TOTAL	\$508,520.00	\$335,260.00	\$100,000.00	\$99.817.18

#### **DISCUSSION:**

Recreation District Boards have made the following recommendations for Council's consideration:

The **Bearspaw Glendale Community Association** (BGCA) requested \$8,560.00 to install wall padding, a scoreboard, and a shot clock in gymnasium at the Bearspaw Lifestyle Centre. The total cost of this project is \$17,120.00. The Bearspaw Glendale Recreation District Board recommends approval of funding up to \$8,560.00.

The **Bow Valley Community Club** requested \$27,321.81 to renovate the washrooms and locker rooms at the Indus Curling Rink, a project that will cost \$54,643.62 in total. The Bow North Recreation District Board recommends approval of funding up to \$27,321.81.



At the Bow North Recreation District Board funding meeting, the **Indus School Council Society** amended their request from \$40,000.00 to \$20,000.00. These funds would be used to help replace the existing school playground with an accessible playground. The total cost of the project is \$349,072.80. The Bow North Recreation District Board recommends that the application be denied as a \$20,000.00 grant for this project was approved by Council in October 2017, pending the Society's award of \$125,000.00 Government of Alberta Community Facility Enhancement Program funding.

The **Langdon Community Association** requested \$48,000.00 to renovate the washrooms and locker rooms at the Indus Curling Rink, a project that will cost \$96,000.00 in total. The Bow North Recreation District Board recommends approval of funding up to \$48,000.00.

To meet the County's servicing standards for trail development, the **Greater Bragg Creek Trails Association (GBCTA)** has requested \$331,000.00 to install 472 meters of strong post guardrail and a pedestrian bridge over Bragg Creek, a project that will cost \$500,000.00 in total. GBCTA has received \$169,000.00 (34% of requested funds) from Trans Canada Trails for this project. On March 28, 2018, the Rocky View West Recreation District Board recommended "approving \$100,000.00 of the Greater Bragg Creek Trails Association capital grant request of \$331.000.00, conditional upon Rocky View County contributing the remainder of \$231,000.00."

On March 31, 2017, Administration provided the GBCTA with a letter of support to help the group leverage current County funding to obtain additional resource assistance and/or funds from other organizations. In the letter, Administration noted the County's support of the project through a financial contribution of \$210,000. These funds were provided over four years.

This motion requires special consideration because the request 1) does not meet the fifty percent matching principle and 2) a recreation board has never stipulated a conditional expectation on Council like this before. Instead of opting to fund the entire request from its district reserve, the Board thought it prudent and appropriate that, for a project of this scope and type (non-excludable public infrastructure that provides for regional use and benefit), that the development costs be shared. Long term and ongoing funding was not anticipated and threatens the sustainable funding of other eligible initiatives under current funding levels.

Should Council agree with the Board's rationale, it can address the remaining \$231,000.00 by evoking its right under Community Funding Policy 317, "Council retains the right to approve funding from the Public [General District] Reserve for applications that do not meet some or all of the requirements set out in the policy". Currently, \$993,795.00 is available in the General District Reserve; however Administration does not recommend this option as these funds are generally used for emergency funding requests from facilities in all ten recreation districts.

Alternatively, Council has the discretion to revise any Board recommendations should it see fit and or can send any recommendation back to committee for further deliberation.

Although the Greater Bragg Creek Trails Association is asking for funding to meet the County's servicing standards for trail development, this project does not rank in the Capital Priorities list approved by Council. Should Council not opt to access the general district reserve then the District Board's recommendation is effectively quashed.

The **Springbank Trails and Pathways Association (STAPA)** requested \$4,260.00 to conduct a feasibility assessment for a proposed regional trail, a project that will cost \$8,520.00 in total. The Rocky View West Recreation District Board recommends that the application be denied, as it will duplicated the efforts of the Active Transportation study undertaken by the Municipal Lands department. STAPA understands the decision to deny its request until further information is available in the Active Transportation Plan.

Unless Council provides for alternative direction Administration recommends approval in accordance with **Option #1**.

AGENDA Page 233 of 410



#### **OPTIONS:**

Option #1:	Motion #1:	THAT the Bearspaw Glendale Community Association's request for up to \$8,560.00 to install wall padding, a scoreboard, and a shot clock in the gymnasium be approved from the Bearspaw Glendale Recreation District in the Public Reserve.
	Motion #2:	THAT the Bow Valley Community Club's funding request for up to \$27,321.81 for locker room and washroom renovations at the Indus Curling Rink be approved from the Bow North Recreation District in the Public Reserve.
	Motion #3:	THAT the Langdon Community Association's request for up to \$48,000.00 for enhancements to Fieldhouse greenspace be approved from the Bow North Recreation District in the Public Reserve.
Option #2:	THAT alterna	ative direction be provided.
Respectfully	submitted,	Concurrence,
	"Chris O'Hara'	" "Kent Robinson"

General Manager

Interim County Manager

SdC/PK/cm

#### ATTACHMENTS:

ATTACHMENT 'A'	Bearspaw Glendale Community Association's Capital Application
ATTACHMENT 'B'	Bow Valley Community Club's Capital Application
ATTACHMENT 'C'	Indus School Council Society's Capital Application
ATTACHMENT 'D'	Langdon Community Association's Capital Application
ATTACHMENT 'E'	Springbank Trails and Pathways Association's Capital Application
ATTACHMENT 'F'	Greater Bragg Creek Trails Association's Capital Application

Mr. John Sherban

9 April, 2018

Rocky View Council 911 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE Calgary, Alberta T2E 6X6

Dear Councilors:

Please accept this letter as indication of the Bearspaw Glendale Recreation District Board's formal support for the capital funding request from the Bearspaw Glendale Community Association. This request was discussed during the Recreation Board's March 23, 2018 meeting, and subsequently supported by the voting members.

We recommend that up to \$8,560.00 be approved and provided from the Bearspaw Glendale District Reserve to the BGCA as per their capital request to assist in the installation of wall padding, a scoreboard, and a shot clock in the Bearspaw Lifestyle Centre gymnasium.

Sincerely,

John Sherban Vice-Chair, Bearspaw Glendale Recreation District Board

> AGENDA Page 235 of 410



**Community Recreation Funding** 

# **Capital Assistance Grant**

Please type or print clearly. Applicants must be a district organization serving County residents. All information provided is public.

## **Organization Information**

Organization's Name: <u>Bearspaw-Glendale Community Association</u>			
Incorporation Act Registered Under (If Applicable): Province of Alberta			
Incorporation Number:106780109			
Mailing Address: 253220 Bearspaw Road			
Postal Code: <u>T3L 2P5</u> (All correspondence and cheques will be mailed to this address)			
Primary Contact:			
Name: Siroun Heal			
Telephone: (W) (H) (C)			
Email:			
Alternate Contact:			
Name: Daren Crawford			
Telephone: (W) (H) (C)			
Email:			
Amount Requested:\$ 8,560			



## Facility

Name of Facility: \_\_\_\_\_ Bearspaw Lifestyle Centre

Legal Description / Address: 253220 Bearspaw Road Calgary, AB T3L 2P5

Registered Holder of Land Title: Rocky View County

Please give us a brief description of your organization

We are the community association for the Bearspaw-Glendale district and provide social and recreational programming, community events and rental services. Our services extend to the greater Rocky View County north and west of the district and to a lesser extent Cochrane and the most northwestern neighborhoods of Calgary.

Please describe in detail the work to be carried out and the need for this project

(Please attach a separate piece of paper if you need additional space)

We upgraded our basketball courts last year with the installation of six new basketball hoop systems to replace the two original basketball hoops. This has been a welcome addition and has opened up many new opportunities in our programming and rentals. To complete this upgrade we wish to add permanent protective wall padding on the walls behind each basketball hoop system as well as steel posts and columns in the area. As well, the west gym double doors will be padded. This is needed to ensure the safety of our players with padding in the most likely contact areas. The shot clock and scoreboard will provide the full basketball experience and enhances the initial investment of the 6 basketball hoops.

Describe how the project will benefit your community and the County

As described above the additional new basketball hoops have allowed us to accommodate more registrants in sport programs. The added number of hoops facilitates a variety of ways to run classes by allowing more drills and multiple games to run simultaneously. These new hoops are attracting new interest and possibilities going forward. With the addition of the wall padding for added safety and the scoreboard and shot clock the gym is set up to bring in possible tournaments, training and good guality summer camps.



#### Attachment 'A'

Please indicate the **<u>number of people</u>** who access your facility, amenity or program for which funding is being sought who reside in:

- Within Rocky View County: 4000-5000
- Outside Rocky View County boundaries: 750-1000

Is this project located in a neighbouring municipality?

- Yes
- X No

If yes, how will access to County residents be assured? Is there an existing joint use agreement in place?

What are the annual operating expenses for this facility? \$455,000 (Depreciation excluded)\_\_\_\_\_ How many months of the year does this facility operate? \_12 months\_\_\_\_\_\_ Estimated project start date: \_\_\_\_Summer 2018\_\_\_\_\_

Estimated completion date: \_\_\_\_\_Summer 2018 \_\_\_\_\_\_



# **Project Budget**

#### Revenue

Requested Grant Amount	\$ 8,560	Maximum Rocky View County Funding including grant request cannot exceed 50% of total project costs.
Cash Contributions	\$ 8,560	Please note: <b>Cash contributions</b> and <b>donated in kind</b> represent your matching amount which must equal or exceed grant request.
Donated In Kind	\$ 0	
Other Grant Funding	\$ 0	Attach a detailed list of other grant funding which has been applied for or approved for this project.
Total Revenue	\$ 17,120	

Total Project Cost and Donated Components Breakdown – If you are applying for funding for more than one project, please provide ALL quotes (3 for each project) in the following table. See Appendix C for an EXAMPLE.

Project Description	Quote Cost (A)	Source of Quote	Quote Attached	Quote used for Total Project Cost Calculation Below	Labour* (B)	Equipment (C)
A. Wall Padding	1.\$7,810	Western Gym	X	Х		
	2.\$6,617	SportSystems	X			
	3.					
B. Scoreboard and Shot Clock	1.\$9,310	Nevco(Western Gym)	X	Х		
	2.\$12,385	Longbow Sales Inc.	X			
	3.\$15,491	SportSystems	X			
C.	1.					
	2.					
	3.					

\*Volunteer labour valued at \$12 per hour as per Rocky View County Bylaw C-7551-2016

**Total Project Costs= \$ 17,120\_ (Sum of A + B + C)**  $\rightarrow$  This figure must equal 'Total Revenue' above. Please indicate which quote you are using for this calculation.

- Include quotes. If not included, indicate source of estimates
- Include confirmation of all corporate in kind materials and/or services (i.e. letter from donor)
- Cash contribution should be supported by Financial Statements and letters from donors of larger cash amounts

Capital Assistance Grant – District Fall 2017



 No retroactive funding is permitted for costs that have already been incurred prior to application submission

#### FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

A. If your organization has a current operating surplus, capital reserve or unrestricted cash assets, explain what you plan to do with these funds if they are not being allocated to this project.

As indicated above we are currently contributing \$8,560 of our own unrestricted funds plus \$856 in GST of which we will receive a 50% rebate.

B. If you are unsuccessful in getting approved for the total amount of funds requested, how do you plan on completing the project?

Depending on the outcome of RVC funding approved we may apply for other funding and/or review possible further allocation of our own funds.

C. Have you, or are you planning on receiving funding for this project from another government program, municipality or another level of government?

Yes 🗌 No X

If yes, please explain.

#### Mandatory Attachments

- □ Minimum of three (3) quotes per project
- Audited financial statements
- List of organization's Officers and Directors
- PLEASE NOTE: If you have not heard from us within a week of your application submission, please get in direct contact with Sue de Caen at <u>sdecaen@rockyview.ca</u>.



#### Attachment 'A'

#### **Declaration Statement**

We,	the two rep	presentatives,	certify	that this	application	is com	plete a	ind accurate
-----	-------------	----------------	---------	-----------	-------------	--------	---------	--------------

Name: CHEIS SHARKEY
Title: BECA · BOARD GLAIR,
Date: FEB 28/18
Name: Siroun Heal Scrown Heal
Title: Senior Financial Accountant
Date: February 28, 2018

The personal information on this form is being collected for the purpose of determining eligibility of an applicant to receive a Council grant. This information is collected under the authority of Section 33 (c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and may become public information once it is submitted to Council during a Council meeting. Questions regarding the collection of this information can be directed to the Manager, Recreation and Community Services at 403.520.6307

#### **Obligations Upon Receiving Grant**

Grant recipients will receive a Grant Agreement outlining the approved grant amount, including specific items approved or denied, and the project goals and outcomes expected. Organizations may only spend grant funds on the specific items approved.

Upon completion of the project, recipients must submit a **Project Completion report** detailing how the money was spent and whether or not the stated objectives were achieved. Failure to submit a report may affect future grant application consideration. At any time, grant recipients must permit a representative of Rocky View County to examine records to determine whether the grant funding has been used as intended and approved.

Please see page 15 for evaluation criteria

Do not send appendices back with application form

Capital Assistance Grant – District Fall 2017



April 2, 2018

Chrissy Craig, Chair Bow North Recreation Board



Rocky View County Council,

Following our Recreation Board meeting on March 20, 2018 the Bow North Recreation Board is recommending the following 2018 Capital Community Recreation Grant funding to Council for approval:

Bow Valley Community Club \$27, 321.81

The capital funding request is for locker room and washroom renovations at the Indus Curling

rink. The Recreation Board unanimously supported this request at our March 13 meeting.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

C. Craig

Chrissy Craig, Chair Bow North Recreation Board



**Community Recreation Funding** 

# **Capital Assistance Grant**

Please type or print clearly. Applicants must be a district organization serving County residents. All information provided is public.

### **Organization Information**

Organization's Name: <u>Bow Valley Community Club</u>						
Incorporation Act Registered Under (If Applicable):						
Incorporation Number:						
Mailing Address: <u>255155E, RR 281A Indus, Alberta</u>						
Postal Code: <u>T1X 0H7</u> (All correspondence and cheques will be mailed to this address)						
Primary Contact:						
Name: Mitch Rose						
Telephone: (W) (H)	(C)					
Email:						
Alternate Contact:						
Name: Laura Tustian						
Telephone: (W) (H)	(C)					
Email:						
Amount Requested:\$27,321.81						

Attachment 'B'

## Facility

Name of Facility: Bow Valley Curling Club

Legal Description / Address: Plan 041 3952, Block 1, Lot 1MR

Registered Holder of Land Title: <u>MD of ROCKYVIEW</u>

Please give us a brief description of your organization

Our organization is a non profit which provides a quality facility and service to the community.

Which includes but not limited to seniors, curlers, hockey players and family.

We host numerous events each year as well as rent out our facility to schools and private parties.

Please describe in detail the work to be carried out and the need for this project (*Please attach a separate piece of paper if you need additional space*)

The washroom facilities within our club are becoming overly worn out it is time to refresh and remodel the spaces. We are planning to renovate both our men's and lady's bathroom facilities in the club. We have a smae locker room space which we will also remodel to make it more functional. Included in the renovation we will incorporate handicapped washrooms into the mens and ladies washrooms as opposed to having a stand alone handicapped washroom.

Describe how the project will benefit your community and the County

This work on the washrooms and locker room are intended to refresh the spaces within our club. We have been offering our lounge for event rentals. Over the last few years, with the assistance of Rocky View Capital Grants, we have renovated our lounge space to make it more appealing to our guests. The proposed upgrades to our washroom and locker room will bring the same look and feel as our lounge space.



Page 244 of 410

#### Attachment 'B'

Please indicate the <u>number of people</u> who access your facility, amenity or program for which funding is being sought who reside in:

Within Rocky View County: 90

Outside Rocky View County boundaries: 150

Is this project located in a neighbouring municipality?

- □ Yes
- 🗆 No

If yes, how will access to County residents be assured? Is there an existing joint use agreement in place?

What are the annual operating expenses for this facility?\$181,588.17_	
How many months of the year does this facility operate?6-7 months	
Estimated project start date: June 2018	

# Project Budget

#### Revenue

Requested Grant Amount	\$27,321.81	Maximum Rocky View County Funding including grant request cannot exceed 50% of total project costs.
Cash Contributions	\$27,321.81	Please note: <b>Cash contributions</b> and <b>donated in kind</b> represent your matching amount which must equal or exceed grant request.
Donated In Kind	\$	
Other Grant Funding	\$	Attach a detailed list of other grant funding which has been applied for or approved for this project.
Total Revenue	\$54,643.62	

Total Project Cost and Donated Components Breakdown – If you are applying for funding for more than one project, please provide ALL quotes (3 for each project) in the following table. See Appendix C for an EXAMPLE.

Project Description	Quote Cost (A)	Source of Quote	Quote Attached	Quote used for Total Project Cost Calculation Below	Labour* (B)	Equipment (C)
A. Bathroom	1. \$54,643.62	Enns Woodworking				
Upgrades	2. \$57,356.25	Porch Light Fine Homes				
	3. \$58,800	CAON				
В.	1.					
	2.					
	3.					
C.	1.					
	2.					
	3.					

\*Volunteer labour valued at \$12 per hour as per Rocky View County Bylaw C-7551-2016

Total Project Costs= \_\_54,643.62\_\_\_ (Sum of A + B + C)  $\rightarrow$  This figure must equal 'Total Revenue' above. Please indicate which quote you are using for this calculation.

- Include quotes. If not included, indicate source of estimates
- Include confirmation of all corporate in kind materials and/or services (i.e. letter from donor)
- Cash contribution should be supported by Financial Statements and letters from donors of larger cash amounts



• No retroactive funding is permitted for costs that have already been incurred prior to application submission

#### FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

A. If your organization has a current operating surplus, capital reserve or unrestricted cash assets, explain what you plan to do with these funds if they are not being allocated to this project.

B. If you are unsuccessful in getting approved for the total amount of funds requested, how do you plan on completing the project?

We will need to amass cash over 1-2 year period to enable spending on this project

C. Have you, or are you planning on receiving funding for this project from another government program, municipality or another level of government?

Yes 🗆 No 🗆

If yes, please explain.

#### Mandatory Attachments

- □ Minimum of three (3) quotes per project
- □ Audited financial statements
- □ List of organization's Officers and Directors
- PLEASE NOTE: If you have not heard from us within a week of your application submission, please get in direct contact with Sue de Caen at <u>sdecaen@rockyview.ca</u>.

Page 247 of 410

#### **Declaration Statement**

We, the two representatives, certify that this application is complete and accurate

Name:Mitch Rose	
Title: _President	
Date: _March 1, 2018	_
Name: _Marty Baxter	_
Title: _Vice-President	
Date:March 1, 2018	

The personal information on this form is being collected for the purpose of determining eligibility of an applicant to receive a Council grant. This information is collected under the authority of Section 33 (c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and may become public information once it is submitted to Council during a Council meeting. Questions regarding the collection of this information can be directed to the Manager, Recreation and Community Services at 403.520.6307

#### **Obligations Upon Receiving Grant**

Grant recipients will receive a Grant Agreement outlining the approved grant amount, including specific items approved or denied, and the project goals and outcomes expected. Organizations may only spend grant funds on the specific items approved.

Upon completion of the project, recipients must submit a **Project Completion report** detailing how the money was spent and whether or not the stated objectives were achieved. Failure to submit a report may affect future grant application consideration. At any time, grant recipients must permit a representative of Rocky View County to examine records to determine whether the grant funding has been used as intended and approved.

Please see page 15 for evaluation criteria

Do not send appendices back with application form



#### **Community Recreation Funding**

# **Capital Assistance Grant**

Please type or print clearly. Applicants must be a district organization serving County residents. All information provided is public.

Organization Information
Organization's Name: Indus School Council Society
Incorporation Act Registered Under (If Applicable): Societies Act of Alberta
Incorporation Number: 508129301
Mailing Address: #7 Indus Court, Indus, Alberta
Postal Code: T1X 0H7
Primary Contact:
Name: Monique Williams
Telephone: (W) (H)
Email:
Alternate Contact:
Name: Cindy Robinson
Telephone: (W) (H)
Email:

Amount Requested: \$40,000

AGENDA

Page 249 of 410

## Facility

Name of Facility: Indus School \_\_\_\_

Legal Description / Address: #7 Indus Court, Indus, Alberta T1X 0H7\_\_\_\_\_

Registered Holder of Land Title: Rocky View School Division

#### Please give us a brief description of your organization

The Indus School Council Society's mandate is "Healthy Minds, Bodies and Relationships." We focus on enhancing opportunities for total development- intellectual, social, emotional and physical.

ISCS's main activities are to provide planning and funds for equipment, bussing or experiences that are not covered by the school division. We organize fundraising activities to make these purchases happen. We have provided funds for:

-Yearly subscription for the Accelerated Reading Program

-Busing for field trips, band and learning activities

-Musical instruments

-Equine assisted learning

-Required computers for students

-Organize community events like Terry Fox Run, Duelling Pianos, Movie nights, etc.

# Please describe in detail the work to be carried out and the need for this project (please attach a separate piece of paper if you need additional space)

Indus School K-9 is needing to replace their expired playground equipment. This equipment has many pieces that no longer function or are a concern: there is a great deal of rusting that has produced sharp metal flaking, the wooden platforms have extensive weathering and splinters, and have spaces between that are potential finger entrapment risk, the wooden edging is rotting and splintered, and most of all is not accessible to anyone with mobility issues.

The core of the playground planning is accessibility, safety, increased participation and most of all FUN. The Capital Assistance Grant would go towards the addition of

- accessible playground surfacing. The current pea gravel makes it impossible for users requiring wheelchairs or walkers to access the play area. The new engineered wood fibre is better suited for wheelchair access, while remaining cost conscious.

- ramps from the ground into the play structure. All users can access the structure instead of being confined to ground level activities.

- transfer stations will allow some users requiring a wheelchair or walker with enough strength and mobility to leave their assistive device, to climb up into some appropriately designed sections of a play structure.

- slides that do not disrupt cochlear implants.

- components and activities at ground level that are interactive and surrounded by an accessible surface that allows all users, regardless of age or ability, to play.

· U-Swings that allow for everyone to swing, regardless of strength and mobility. They also allow more than one person to swing at a time.

• sensory activities that encourage exploration and discovery and are a necessary part of development for anyone including those with autism or sensory processing impairments. Our playground design considers all facets of the sensory experience that include auditory, visual, kinesthetic, smell and tactile. Sensory stimulating activities include the use of bright

AGENDA

Page 250 of 410

colours, a spinning cup, colourful gears, labyrinth and kaleidoscope panels, the use of different textures, drums, and musical instruments.

#### (See attached for To-do and Timeline)

#### Describe how the project will benefit your community and the County

The Indus School places great emphasis on inclusiveness. The installation of accessibility within the playground was never thought of as an "option"- at Indus we know that there is no decision to he made. Higher needs students are drawn to the expertise and smaller class sizes at our school. Of the approximately 220 students a year, ~50 children will have mobility, sensory or developmental delays, of which ~10 will have severe mobility issues requiring wheelchairs or walking aids.

Our vision is a fun, barrier-free, multi-sensory playground that is accessible for everyone in our community. The proximity to the Indus Recreation Centre, maximizes the number of users to the playground. Indus is the only recreation facility to service Langdon and the South East Rocky View area. Statistics Canada 2017 showed Langdon's population increased to 5060 people (a 20.2% from the 2011 Census.) Of this population, 28.9% are children 0<sup>-</sup>14. All of these children and their families will benefit from an accessible and inclusive playground.

Ultimately, we expect our playground to be fully accessible to the benefit of all. This is life changing to those that are now unable to take part in fun with others their age. It will offer a rich variety of opportunities to children both with and without disabilities, based on an overall site design that will draw the children into inclusive experiences. We want it to be fun and functional, and increase participation for all ages and abilities. It will also allow parents and caregivers with physical disabilities to safely supervise and interact with their children.

This community built playground will also be a priceless legacy of community spirit in Indus and the South East Rocky View area. It will be a rally point for the community members. Everyone can work together towards this common goal, regardless of age, ability, sex, economic background, race or culture. With this goal comes the pride of ownership, that will stay with the community and discourage vandalism.

# Please indicate the **number of people** who access your facility, amenity or program for which funding is being sought who reside in:

Within Rocky View County: 1000+

Outside Rocky View County boundaries: 500+

Is this project located in a neighbouring municipality?

- Yes
- X No



If yes, how will access to County residents be assured? Is there an existing joint use agreement in place?

NA	
_	
What are the annual operating expenses for this facility? N/A	
How many months of the year does this facility operate? Playground is open year-round _	
Estimated project start date: July 25, 2018	
Estimated completion date: July 28, 2018	
# **Project Budget**

Revenue	-	
Requested Grant Amount	\$ 40,000	Maximum Rocky View County Funding including grant request cannot exceed 50% of total project costs.
Cash Contributions	\$3,132.80	Please note: <b>Cash contributions</b> and <b>donated in kind</b> represent your matching amount which must equal or exceed grant request.
Donated In Kind	\$20,940	
Other Grant Funding	\$285,000	Attach a detailed list of other grant funding which has been applied for or approved for this project.
Total Revenue	\$349,072.80	

Total Project Cost and Donated Components Breakdown – If you are applying for funding for more than one project, please provide ALL quotes (3 for each project) in the following table. See Appendix C for an EXAMPLE

Project Description	Quote Cost (A)	Source of Quote	Quote Attached	Quote used for Total Project Cost Calculation Below	Labour* (B)	Equipment (C)
A.Playground Equipment and	1.188,163.30	BDI	X□	X□	18,000	2,940
Volunteer Supervisor	2.155,851.84	Play- works	X□		6,720	
Package	3.182,664.85	Park N Play	X□		4,200	1,541
B.Pour-in-place (only 2 quotes-as	1.151,879.75	BDI	X□			
these are the only 2 that are	2.139,969.50	GPI	X□	X□		
approved by RVS and the AB Recycling Grant)	3.					
C.	1.					
	2.					
	3.					

\*Volunteer labour valued at \$12 per hour as per Rocky View County Bylaw C-7551-2016

Total Project Costs= \_\_\_\_\_\$349,072.80 \_\_\_\_ (Sum of A + B + C)  $\rightarrow$  This figure must equal 'Total Revenue' above. Please indicate which quote you are using for this calculation.

- Include quotes. If not included, indicate source of estimates
- Include confirmation of all corporate in kind materials and/or services (i.e. letter from donor)
- Cash contribution should be supported by Financial Statements and letters from donors of larger cash amounts

 No retroactive funding is permitted for costs that have already been incurred prior to application submission

### FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

A. If your organization has a current operating surplus, capital reserve or unrestricted cash assets, explain what you plan to do with these funds if they are not being allocated to this project.

<u>All available funds will potentially be used for this Accessible Playground Project. We are applying for several grants to try to offset the impact. In the 2018-19 school year we will still need available for the Accelerated Reading Program, field trip busing, etc.</u>

B. If you are unsuccessful in getting approved for the total amount of funds requested, how do you plan on completing the project?

This pro	oject still n	needs to g	o ahead.	We will	continue	fund raising	, completing	grants and
looking for donations and	d sponsor	ship.						

C. Have you, or are you planning on receiving funding for this project from another government program, municipality or another level of government?

Yes 🗆 x No 🗆

If yes, please explain.

Rocky View School Division \$15,000

Community Facility Enhancement Program \$125,000

#### Mandatory Attachments

- □ Minimum of three (3) quotes per project
- Audited financial statements
- List of organization's Officers and Directors
- PLEASE NOTE: If you have not heard from us within a week of your application submission, please get in direct contact with Sue de Caen at <u>sdecaen@rockyview.ca</u>.

#### **Declaration Statement**

We, the two representatives, certify that this application is complete and accurate

Name:Monique Williams	_
Title:President	
Date:2017/09/13	
Name:Cindy Robinson	
Title:Treasurer	
Date:2017/09/13	

The personal information on this form is being collected for the purpose of determining eligibility of an applicant to receive a Council grant. This information is collected under the authority of Section 33 (c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and may become public information once it is submitted to Council during a Council meeting. Questions regarding the collection of this information can be directed to the FOIP Coordinator at 403.520.8199

#### **Obligations Upon Receiving Grant**

Grant recipients will receive a Grant Agreement outlining the approved grant amount, including specific items approved or denied, and the project goals and outcomes expected. Organizations may only spend grant funds on the specific items approved.

Upon completion of the project, recipients must submit a **Project Completion report** detailing how the money was spent and whether or not the stated objectives were achieved. Failure to submit a report may affect future grant application consideration. At any time, grant recipients must permit a representative of Rocky View County to examine records to determine whether the grant funding has been used as intended and approved.

Please see page 16 for evaluation criteria

Do not send appendices back with application form

Page 255 of 410

April 2, 2018

Chrissy Craig, Chair Bow North Recreation Board



Rocky View County Council,

Following our Recreation Board meeting on March 20, 2018 the Bow North Recreation Board is recommending the following 2018 Capital Community Recreation Grant funding to Council for approval:

Bow Valley Community Club \$48 000

The capital funding request is for landscaping of the fieldhouse green space. The Recreation Board unanimously supported this request at our March 13 meeting.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

C. Craig

Chrissy Craig, Chair Bow North Recreation Board



**Community Recreation Funding** 

# **Capital Assistance Grant**

Please type or print clearly. Applicants must be a district organization serving County residents. All information provided is public.

## **Organization Information**

Organization's Name: <u>Langdon Community Association</u>					
Incorporation Act Registered Under (If Applicable):					
Incorporation Number:502133862					
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 134 Langdon, AB					
Postal Code: <u>T0J1X0</u> (All correspondence and cheques will be mailed to this address)					
Primary Contact:					
Name: Chrissy Craig					
Telephone: (W) (H) (C)					
Email:					
Alternate Contact:					
Name: Renee Durieux					
Telephone: (W) (H) (C)					
Email:					
Amount Requested:\$_48,000					

#### Attachment 'D'

#### D-3 Page 28 of 46

## Facility

Name of Facility: Langdon Park\_\_\_\_\_

Legal Description / Address: <u>344 Centre St</u>

Registered Holder of Land Title: Rockyview County

Please give us a brief description of your organization

The Langdon Community Association (LCA) mission is to rejuvenate and enliven the park, creating a central

gathering place and community spirit within Langdon. The LCA also maintains and operates the Field House which

establishes a community centre and promotes social, educational, and recreational interests in the community

Please describe in detail the work to be carried out and the need for this project (*Please attach a separate piece of paper if you need additional space*)

Langdon Park is a very vibrant and active park. Within the park is the Langdon Fieldhouse, outdoor ice rink, two ball diamonds, a playground, and a skatepark. In the last two years the LCA has built a new deck of the Fieldhouse and a new garage. This has caused the current pathways to lead to nowhere and the access off this deck and the garage are not useable. They would like to provide an inviting and natural setting with shelter from the north winds, as well providing finishing touches to the Fieldhouse greenspace, through flowerbeds, trees, natural boulders and pathways.

Describe how the project will benefit your community and the County.

In the 2018 Household Survey done by BNRD, outdoor space development in natural pathways, trails and useable areas were mentioned many times by the community. And that the number one activity by respondents was social gatherings, BBQ and picnics. As well Langdon Park was used by 78% of the respondents. The development of this area will enhance Langdon Park and provide a natural gathering place for the many users of the Park.

Please indicate the <u>number of people</u> who access your facility, amenity or program for which funding is being sought who reside in:

- Within Rocky View County: ~4000
- Outside Rocky View County boundaries: ~1000

Is this project located in a neighbouring municipality?

Yes

X No

Page 258 of 410

#### Attachment 'D'

If yes, how will access to County residents be assured? Is there an existing joint use agreement in place?

What are the annual operating expenses for this facility? \$53000	) (all LCA leased area)
How many months of the year does this facility operate?	12 months
Estimated project start date:Spring 2018 (May)	
Estimated completion date:Spring 2018 (June)	

# Project Budget

#### Revenue

Requested Grant Amount	\$48000	Maximum Rocky View County Funding including grant request cannot exceed 50% of total project costs.
Cash Contributions	\$48000	Please note: <b>Cash contributions</b> and <b>donated in kind</b> represent your matching amount which must equal or exceed grant request.
Donated In Kind	\$0	
Other Grant Funding	\$0	Attach a detailed list of other grant funding which has been applied for or approved for this project.
Total Revenue	\$96000	

Total Project Cost and Donated Components Breakdown – If you are applying for funding for more than one project, please provide ALL quotes (3 for each project) in the following table. See Appendix C for an EXAMPLE.

Project Description	Quote Cost (A)	Source of Quote	Quote Attached	Quote used for Total Project Cost Calculation Below	Labour* (B)	Equipment (C)
A. Green Space Development	1.106842.16 (see Note)	Year Round Landsca ping	Х			
	2.85750.00	Earth Design Landscap ing and Maintanc e				
	3.					

Note: We have casino money we have set aside and AGLC application to use for Fieldhouse/park upgrades. We are seeking matching funds for this project. Quote 1 is too high, and items can be removed, quote 2 is missing some key items we would like to see. We have asked 4 other landscaping companies to give us a quote, with no response. Hopefully we will get one before the grant review board meets.

\*Volunteer labour valued at \$12 per hour as per Rocky View County Bylaw C-7551-2016

Total Project Costs= \_\_96000\_\_\_\_\_ (Sum of A + B + C)  $\rightarrow$  This figure must equal 'Total Revenue' above. Please indicate which quote you are using for this calculation.

- Include quotes. If not included, indicate source of estimates
- Include confirmation of all corporate in kind materials and/or services (i.e. letter from donor)
- Cash contribution should be supported by Financial Statements and letters from donors of larger cash amounts
- No retroactive funding is permitted for costs that have already been incurred prior to application submission

Capital Assistance Grant – District Fall 2017



## FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

A. If your organization has a current operating surplus, capital reserve or unrestricted cash assets, explain what you plan to do with these funds if they are not being allocated to this project.

We do not have an operating surplus, capital reserve or unrestricted cash.

B. If you are unsuccessful in getting approved for the total amount of funds requested, how do you plan on completing the project?

If we are unsuccessful in getting approved, we develop the land with the money we currently have, focus on the pathway, and a few garden beds. We will fundraise to add to the area each year

C. Have you, or are you planning on receiving funding for this project from another government program, municipality or another level of government?

Yes XNo 🗆

If yes, please explain.

AGLC-Casino money

## Mandatory Attachments

- □ Minimum of three (3) quotes per project
- □ Audited financial statements
- □ List of organization's Officers and Directors
- PLEASE NOTE: If you have not heard from us within a week of your application submission, please get in direct contact with Sue de Caen at <u>sdecaen@rockyview.ca</u>.

## **Declaration Statement**

We, the two representatives, certify that this application is complete and accurate

6

Page 261 of 410

**AGENDA** 

4				Page 32 of
ch .		Deli	L.	
Declaration Statemen	nt			
We, the two represents	atives, certify that this a	application is comple	te and accurate	and the state of the
Name: Chrissy (	raig Cliery			
Title: Vice Cha	ir o			
Date: Morch I	118			
Name: Care	> Crysta	al Upstone		
Title: Treasure	r			State Barries
Date: March	1/18			
A construction of the				
receive a Council grant. This Information and Protection of Council meeting. Questions and Community Services at	regarding the collection of	f this information can b	e directed to the Manager	Recreation
Obligations Upon Receivin Grant recipients will receive	- Ot Arresement outlini	ing the approved grant	amount, including specif	ic items
approved or denied, and the specific items approved.	project goals and outcom	nes expected. Organiza	auons may only spond gr	
Upon completion of the proje spent and whether or not the application consideration. At examine records to determine	stated objectives were a	s must permit a repres	entative of Rocky View C	ue money was uture grant county to
PL CONTRACTOR	aluation criteria			Contraction of the local distance
Please see page 15 for eva	ack with application form	1		
Please see page 15 for eva Do not send appendices ba				and the second
				the second s
				A STREET
		Capital Assistance	ce Grant – <b>District F</b> a	<b>all 2017</b> 7

### AGENDA e 262 of 410

April 5, 2018

#### Rocky View West Recreation Board



Rocky View County Council

911 - 32<sup>nd</sup> Ave NE

Calgary, AB T2E 6X6

## **2018 Capital Assistance Funding Recommendation**

Dear Sirs:

At our Board meeting on March 28, 2018, the Rocky View West Recreation Board decided to not recommend capital funding in the amount of \$4260 for the request by STAPA (Springbank Trails and Pathways Association).

Sincerely,

Pam Janzen

Chair, RVWRB

AGENDA Page 263 of 410



**Community Recreation Funding** 

# **Capital Assistance Grant**

Please type or print clearly. Applicants must be a district organization serving County residents. All information provided is public.

## **Organization Information**

Organization's Name: Springbank Trails and Pathways Association (STAPA)				
Incorporation Act Registered Under (If Applicable): Alberta				
Incorporation Number:5020261391				
Mailing Address: c/o 24271 Westbluff Drive Calgary, AB				
Postal Code: <u>T3Z 3N9</u> (All correspondence and cheques will be mailed to this address)				
Primary Contact:				
Name: Ronda Rankin, President				
Telephone: (W) (H) (C)				
Email:				
Alternate Contact:				
Name: Shelly Jacober, Treasurer				
Telephone: (W) (H) (C)				
Email:				
Amount Requested:\$4,260				

Page 264 of 410

#### Attachment 'E'

## Facility

Name of Facility:

Legal Description / Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Registered Holder of Land Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Please give us a brief description of your organization

STAPA is a volunteer advocacy group committed to establishing a safe and accessible, regionally, integrated trail and pathway system, connecting generations of residents, while preserving the diverse natural heritage of the Springbank community.

Please describe in detail the work to be carried out and the need for this project (*Please attach a separate piece of paper if you need additional space*)

This request for 2018 Capital Grant funds is to conduct a feasibility assessment for a proposed regional trail along Range Road 33 (RR33), extending from Township Rd 250 in the north to Township Road 244 in the South.

Describe how the project will benefit your community and the County

Long identified as a gap in the heart of our community, the proposed pathway along RR33 will provide safe access for active transportation by enhancing connectivity between amenities within this Springbank corridor, including between the existing schools (Springbank elementary, Middle, and SCHS High schools and Edge) as well as the Lions soccer fields, Springbank Park for all Seasons, the Springbank Heritage Club and seniors' community, as well as providing access to commercial and residential nodes (both existing, approved and those currently under consideration), along the RR 33 corridor. By providing safe access, our community amenities will be more accessible to all residents and will promote their use as well as active modes of transportation within our community. This project is perfectly aligned with the Active Transportation Study currently being developed by Rocky View County. We believe it is prudent to conduct this feasibility study now, given the active planning currently underway for Bingham Crossing and Pradera Springs, and to be ready to move forward once the Rocky View County's Active Transportation Plan is released.

The feasibility assessment will conduct a high level review to assess the feasibility of building a pathway in this location, and will identify the preferred location, including potential options within the right of way and/or private property, the identification of pedestrian crossings to address safety concerns, and consideration of preferred connections to major nodes along the corridor.



Please indicate the <u>number of people</u> who access your facility, amenity or program for which funding is being sought who reside in:

- Within Rocky View County: 40,000 (2011 RVC website)
- Outside Rocky View County boundaries: <u>Accessible to the public</u>

Is this project located in a neighbouring municipality?

] Yes

IXNo

If yes, how will access to County residents be assured? Is there an existing joint use agreement in place?

What are the annual operating expenses for this facility?N/A					
How many months of the year does this facility operate? Accessible year round					
Estimated project start date:July 2018					
Estimated completion date:September 2018					

# Project Budget

#### Revenue

Requested Grant Amount	\$ 4,260	Maximum Rocky View County Funding including grant request cannot exceed 50% of total project costs.
Cash Contributions	\$ 4,160	Please note: <b>Cash contributions</b> and <b>donated in kind</b> represent your matching amount which must equal or exceed grant request.
Donated In Kind	\$ 100	Site visits by three (3) STAPA Board members
Other Grant Funding		Attach a detailed list of other grant funding which has been applied for or approved for this project.
Total Revenue	\$ 8,520	

Total Project Cost and Donated Components Breakdown – If you are applying for funding for more than one project, please provide ALL quotes (3 for each project) in the following table. See Appendix C for an EXAMPLE.

Project Description	Quote Cost (A)	Source of Quote	Quote Attached	Quote used for Total Project Cost Calculation Below	Labour* (B)	Equipment (C)
A. Range Road 33 Regional	1. \$8,520	MacElha nney	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
Pathway Feasibility Study	2. \$9,450	02				
	3.					
В.	1.					
	2.					
	3.					
C.	1.					
	2.					
	3.					

\*Volunteer labour valued at \$12 per hour as per Rocky View County Bylaw C-7551-2016

**Total Project Costs= \$8,520** (Sum of A + B + C)  $\rightarrow$  This figure must equal 'Total Revenue' above. Please indicate which quote you are using for this calculation.

- Include quotes. If not included, indicate source of estimates
- **Include confirmation** of all corporate in kind materials and/or services (i.e. letter from donor)
- Cash contribution should be supported by Financial Statements and letters from donors of larger cash amounts
- No retroactive funding is permitted for costs that have already been incurred prior to application submission

Capital Assistance Grant – District



## FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

A. If your organization has a current operating surplus, capital reserve or unrestricted cash assets, explain what you plan to do with these funds if they are not being allocated to this project.

STAPA does not have a surplus. We have operating funds received from RVC in 2017 which have been designated for operating expenditures within the RVC funding period ending June 30, 2018. This is our initial application for capital funds.

B. If you are unsuccessful in getting approved for the total amount of funds requested, how do you plan on completing the project?

Investigate potential additional funding and grant opportunities and assess potential private contributions.

C. Have you, or are you planning on receiving funding for this project from another government program, municipality or another level of government?

Yes 🗆 No X

If yes, please explain.

#### Mandatory Attachments

- $\square$   $\sqrt{Minimum of three (3) quotes per project}$
- $\square$   $\sqrt{Audited financial statements}$
- □ √List of organization's Officers and Directors
- PLEASE NOTE: If you have not heard from us within a week of your application submission, please get in direct contact with Sue de Caen at <u>sdecaen@rockyview.ca</u>.

#### **Declaration Statement**

We, the two representatives, certify that this application is complete and accurate

Name:	Ronda Rankin
Title:	President
Date:	March 1,2018
Name:	Ander Stelly Jacober
Title:	Treasurer
Date:	March 1, 2018

The personal information on this form is being collected for the purpose of determining eligibility of an applicant to receive a Council grant. This information is collected under the authority of Section 33 (c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and may become public information once it is submitted to Council during a Council meeting. Questions regarding the collection of this information can be directed to the Manager, Recreation and Community Services at 403.520.6307

#### **Obligations Upon Receiving Grant**

Grant recipients will receive a Grant Agreement outlining the approved grant amount, including specific items approved or denied, and the project goals and outcomes expected. Organizations may only spend grant funds on the specific items approved.

Upon completion of the project, recipients must submit a **Project Completion report** detailing how the money was spent and whether or not the stated objectives were achieved. Failure to submit a report may affect future grant application consideration. At any time, grant recipients must permit a representative of Rocky View County to examine records to determine whether the grant funding has been used as intended and approved.

Please see page 15 for evaluation criteria Do not send appendices back with application form

Capital Assistance Grant – District





April 5, 2018

Rocky View West Recreation Board



Rocky View County Council

911 – 32<sup>nd</sup> Ave NE

Calgary, AB T2E 6X6

## 2018 Capital Assistance Funding Recommendation

Dear Sirs:

At our Board meeting on March 28, 2018, the Rocky View West Recreation Board passed a motion to recommend to Council 2018 Capital Assistance Funding to the Greater Bragg Creek Trails Association as follows:

The RVWRB conditionally recommends a capital assistance grant of \$100,000 of the \$331,000 request by GBCTA. This grant is conditional upon RVC Council funding the remaining amount of \$231,000 from a source other than the RVWRB.

The grant will be used to complete the outstanding portion of the Trans Canada Trail, connecting the hamlet of Bragg Creek to K country at the West Bragg Creek trailhead. RVC has supported the development of this trail in past years and the RVWRB feels strongly that the trail must be completed.

Sincerely Pam Jabze

Chair, RVWRB

AGENDA Page 270 of 410



Community Recreation Funding

# **Capital Assistance Grant**

Please type or print clearly. Applicants must be a district organization serving County residents. All information provided is public.

## **Organization Information**

Organization's Name: The Greater Bragg Creek Trails Association (GBCTA)

Incorporation Act Registered Under (If Applicable): Societies Act

Incorporation Number: 5011429288

Mailing Address: Box 1379 Bragg Creek, AB

Postal Code: <u>T0L0K0</u> All correspondence and cheques will be mailed to this address)

#### **Primary Contact:**

Name: Eric Lloyd Telephone: (W) <u>NA</u> (H) 4	(C) NA
Email:	
Alternate Contact:	
Name: Conrad Schiebel	
Telephone: (W) <u>NA</u> (H)	(C)
Email:	

Amount Requested: \$331,000



Facility

Name of Facility: West Bragg Creek Trail (TransCanada Trail)

Legal Description / Address: As per Maintenance Agreement with\_Rocky View County

Registered Holder of Land Title: Rocky View County

Please give us a brief description of your organization

The GBCTA was incorporated as an Alberta not for profit Society in 2004 and as a federally registered charity in 2007. The mission of the GBCTA is "to develop and maintain trails in the Bragg Creek Area for public recreation." Over the past 10 years, the GBCTA has invested over \$ 2 million in Bragg Creek trails in Rocky View County (RVC). The GBCTA has constructed over 10 km of new non motorized trails in RVC in the Bragg Creek area. We have created a world class trail system with these trails combined with the 152 km trail system we have constructed or upgraded in Kananaskis Country.

Please describe in detail the work to be carried out and the need for this project (Please attach a separate piece of paper if you need additional space)

This portion of a \$ 2.2 million project (\$1.7 million spent to date) to construct the West Bragg Creek Trail (TransCanada Trail) includes:

- 1) 472 meters of strong post guardrail and
- 2) Pedestrian bridge over Bragg Creek.

The guardrail will act as a physical barrier between the recently constructed West Bragg Creek Trail Phase 2, which is immediately adjacent to the West Bragg Creek road, to protect trail users.

The pedestrian bridge will enable trail users to remain on the trail rather than exiting the trail to walk on the road bridge, which has no sidewalk or physical safety barrier (the road bridge spans Bragg Creek).

These two pieces of infrastructure are important for public safety and are required to meet the RVC approved trail design, which meets Alberta Transportation requirements.

Describe how the project will benefit your community and the County

This trail, bridge and guardrail provide many benefits including:

- 1. Improving public safety by reducing the number of pedestrians using the road shoulder and providing a guardrail barrier between road traffic and trail users,
- 2. Allowing children to safely bike to Banded Peak School,
- 3. Connecting the community and residents,
- 4. Providing fitness and recreation opportunities,
- 5. Enabling nature and wildlife appreciation and
- 6. Attracting visitors to RVC to boost the local economy.



Please indicate the **<u>number of people</u>** who access your facility, amenity or program for which funding is being sought who reside in:

- Within Rocky View County: 10,000 user visits per year for all GBCTA trails in RVC
- Outside Rocky View County boundaries: 1,000 user visits per year for all GBCTA trails in RVC

Is this project located in a neighbouring municipality?

Yes

X No

If yes, how will access to County residents be assured? Is there an existing joint use agreement in place?

NA

What are the annual operating expenses for this facility? \$20,000 for all GBCTA trails in RVC

How many months of the year does this facility operate? 12 months

Estimated project start date: May 2018

Estimated completion date: October 2018

4

AGENDA

Page 273 of 410

# **Project Budget**

#### Revenue

Requested Grant Amount	\$ 331,000	Maximum Rocky View County Funding including grant request cannot exceed 50% of total project costs.
Cash Contributions	*See below	Please note: Cash contributions and donated in kind represent your matching amount which must equal or exceed grant request.
Donated In Kind	\$	
Other Grant Funding (TCT)	\$ 169,000	Attach a detailed list of other grant funding which has been applied for or approved for this project.
Total Revenue	\$ 500,000	

\*The GBCTA total cash contributions for this entire project exceed the total of this grant request and previous RVC grants for this project.

Total Project Cost and Donated Components Breakdown – If you are applying for funding for more than one project, please provide ALL quotes (3 for each project) in the following table. See Appendix C for an EXAMPLE.

Project Description	Quote Cost (A)	Source of Quote	Quot e Attac hed	Quote used for Total Project Cost Calculation Below	Labour* (B)	Equipment (C)
A. Bridge	1. \$300,000	Mcelhanney	XD			
	2.					
	3.					
B. Guardrail	1. \$ 200,000	Bragg Creek Excavating/ Volker Stevin				
	2.					
	3.					
С.	1.					
	2.					
	3.					

\*Volunteer labour valued at \$12 per hour as per Rocky View County Bylaw C-7551-2016

Please note a contingency factor was added to cost quotes from 2017 for inflation.

Total Project Costs = 500,000 (Sum of A + B + C)  $\rightarrow$  This figure must equal 'Total Revenue' above. Please indicate which quote you are using for this calculation.

Include quotes. If not included, indicate source of estimates

Capital Assistance Grant - District Fall 2017



- Include confirmation of all corporate in kind materials and/or services (i.e. letter from donor)
- Cash contribution should be supported by Financial Statements and letters from donors of larger cash amounts
- No retroactive funding is permitted for costs that have already been incurred prior to application submission

#### FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

A. If your organization has a current operating surplus, capital reserve or unrestricted cash assets, explain what you plan to do with these funds if they are not being allocated to this project.

NA

B. If you are unsuccessful in getting approved for the total amount of funds requested, how do you plan on completing the project?

We will be unable to complete the project as per the RVC approved design.

C. Have you, or are you planning on receiving funding for this project from another government program, municipality or another level of government?

Yes 🗌 No X 🗌

If yes, please explain.

The timing of a CFEP funding approval would be too late if we were successful with a CFEP application.

#### Mandatory Attachments

Minimum of three (3) quotes per project Audited financial statements List of organization's Officers and Directors

PLEASE NOTE: If you have not heard from us within a week of your application submission, please get in direct contact with Sue de Caen at <u>sdecaen@rockyview.ca</u>.



#### **Declaration Statement**

We, the two representatives, certify that this application is complete and accurate

Name: Eric Lloyd

En loya

Title: Special Projects Coordination

Date: February 22, 2018

Name: Conrad Schiebel

Connerd Scheepel

Title: Vice President

Date: February 22, 2018

The personal information on this form is being collected for the purpose of determining eligibility of an applicant to receive a Council grant. This information is collected under the authority of Section 33 (c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and may become public information once it is submitted to Council during a Council meeting. Questions regarding the collection of this information can be directed to the Manager, Recreation and Community Services at 403.520.6307

#### **Obligations Upon Receiving Grant**

Grant recipients will receive a Grant Agreement outlining the approved grant amount, including specific items approved or denied, and the project goals and outcomes expected. Organizations may only spend grant funds on the specific items approved.

Upon completion of the project, recipients must submit a **Project Completion report** detailing how the money was spent and whether or not the stated objectives were achieved. Failure to submit a report may affect future grant application consideration. At any time, grant recipients must permit a representative of Rocky View County to examine records to determine whether the grant funding has been used as intended and approved.

Please see page 15 for evaluation criteria

Do not send appendices back with application form

Capital Assistance Grant - District Fall 2017

AGENDA

Page 276 of 410

# PLANNING SERVICES

TO: Council

**DATE:** April 24, 2018

**FILE:** 4010-100

DIVISION: ALL

APPLICATION: N/A

**SUBJECT:** Aggregate Resource Plan

### <sup>1</sup>ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Council directs Administration to proceed under the Aggregate Resource Plan Terms of Reference adopted on June 13, 2017, with presentation of the final draft Plan to Council no later than October 2018.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to seek direction from Council on the continuation of the Aggregate Resource Plan (ARP) project.

The original Terms of Reference for the ARP project were adopted by the previous Council on April 28, 2015, and were subsequently revised by that Council on June 13, 2017. Administration has been working to develop the ARP document for some time and has held three rounds of engagement since 2016 to obtain feedback from residents, industry, and other stakeholders.

A revised draft of the ARP was released on February 23, 2018, and the draft has again seen significant resident opposition. Taking into account this opposition and the election of a new Council in October 2017, Administration is seeking confirmation from Council on whether the adopted Terms of Reference for the ARP project, as attached in Appendix A, are still appropriate.

In the absence of any alternative direction, Administration recommends **Option #1**, that Council directs Administration to proceed under the Aggregate Resource Plan Terms of Reference adopted on June 13, 2017, with presentation of the final draft Plan to Council no later than October 2018.

## BACKGROUND:

In 2013, the County Plan was adopted. The County Plan addresses the development of natural resources, and identifies specific goals and policies around the extraction of gravel.

Two actions are identified in the Plan:

- 1. Prepare an aggregate extraction policy that addresses site design, location criteria, visual impact, mitigation of extraction impacts, and appropriate setbacks between extraction activities and other land uses (policies 15.1 to 15.6).
- 2. Develop an aggregate management plan to identify resource areas and address land use management issues, and prepare the plan in consultation with residents, industry, and stakeholder groups (policies 15.1 to 15.6).

<sup>1</sup> Administration Resources Dominic Kazmierczak, Planning Services Sherry Baers, Planning Services



Following the direction of the County Plan, the previous Council then approved the Terms of Reference for the development of an aggregate plan, which provided the timelines and objectives for the project (see Appendix A).

The first draft of the ARP was released on December 14, 2016, and over 1,850 separate comments were received within approximately 250 feedback letters. Administration worked to thoroughly assess and respond to all comments received on the draft Plan and, where appropriate, changes were made to incorporate the feedback received into the ARP. Having completed amendments to the initial draft document, a revised draft of the ARP was released on February 23, 2018. Three information sessions were held around the County to present the key revisions to the Plan, and to take questions and comments from those attending.

Administration continues to receive strong opposition to the draft ARP from residents both at the information sessions and through written submissions. The predominant concern of residents is regarding the 500 metre setback proposed within the draft ARP, but a number of other concerns have also been raised.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

Section 15.0 of the County Plan sets goals and policies in relation to natural resources. The goals of this section state that the County will:

- Support the extraction of natural resources in a manner that balances the needs of residents, industry, and society.
- Support the environmentally responsible management and extraction of natural resources.

With respect to the first goal, it is apparent from the noted opposition that many residents do not consider that the appropriate balance has been achieved by Administration, and that the current ARP draft does not protect their health, safety, or amenity.

Administration considers that the current draft ARP accords with the goals and actions of Section 15 of the County Plan, and that it meets the Terms of Reference adopted by the previous Council on June 13, 2017. Administration sought technical and legal advice throughout the project to ensure that the policies, standards and requirements set out within the draft Plan are practical and achievable.

If Council decides to proceed under the adopted Terms of Reference, Administration recommends that the final draft Plan be presented to Council at a public hearing held no later than October 2018. This would provide Administration with sufficient time to collate and review the recent feedback received and undertake final amendments to the draft Plan.

However, if Council should consider that the current draft Plan does not achieve balance in accordance with the County Plan goals, and/or that the adopted Terms of Reference are no longer appropriate, there are several alternative strategies that Council may adopt. These include:

- 1. Cease the development of any aggregate plan and continue to assess aggregate development on a case-by-case basis against the policies and goals of the County Plan.
- 2. Direct a re-write of the plan guided by a steering committee consisting of residents, and representatives from the industry and other stakeholder groups.
- 3. Direct Administration to develop a Plan that only covers application submission requirements and performance standards to improve how applications are assessed. This would leave consideration of site location to Council's discretion on a case-by-case basis.
- 4. Continue the ARP project under modified terms based on the direction of Council.

It is noted that a significant amount of residents' concerns with the draft ARP are based on the setbacks proposed and the policies that seek to manage the location of new aggregate development.



These concerns may be addressed through the third strategy, which directs Administration to develop an Aggregate Resource Plan that only covers application submission requirements and performance standards. This would set a consistent benchmark for both existing and future aggregate development without providing criteria to guide Council on where aggregate development should be located.

The location of future aggregate developments could then be assessed by Council on a case-by-case basis, or Council could provide direction through policy on how it wishes to direct aggregate development to appropriate locations within the County.

In considering any revisions to the adopted ARP Terms of Reference, Council should be cognizant of the direction of the County Plan and whether the goals and policies set out within Section 15.0 of the County Plan are still appropriate.

### **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:**

It should be noted that the alternative strategies identified in this report will have varying budgetary implications for the County. The budgetary implications associated with the selected strategy would be assessed, and additional information would be provided through the response to Council's selected strategy.

#### **OPTIONS:**

- Option #1: THAT Council directs Administration to proceed under the Aggregate Resource Plan Terms of Reference adopted on June 13, 2017, with presentation of the final draft Plan to Council no later than October 2018.
- Option #2: THAT Council provide alternative direction.

Respectfully submitted,

Concurrence,

"Chris O'Hara"

"Kent Robinson"

**General Manager** 

Interim County Manager

DK/rp

**APPENDICES:** APPENDIX 'A' – Revised Terms of Reference

# REVISED TERMS OF REFERENCE AGGREGATE RESOURCE PLAN

#### 1. Introduction

This document sets out the background, goals, objectives and timing for the development of an Aggregate Resource Plan (ARP) for Rocky View County.

#### 2. Background

In 2013, Council approved the County Plan. The County Plan addresses the development of natural resources and identifies specific goals, policies (15.1 to 15.6), and actions around the extraction of gravel.

Two actions are identified in the Plan:

- 1. Prepare an aggregate extraction policy that addresses site design, location criteria, visual impact, mitigation of extraction impacts, and appropriate setbacks between extraction activities and other land uses.
- 2. Develop an aggregate management plan to identify resource areas and address land use management issues, and prepare the plan in consultation with residents, industry, and stakeholder groups

Accordingly, Administration commenced work on this project in May 2015.

The intent of the project is to prepare an ARP, and to provide comprehensive and detailed recommendations for the preparation of amendments to the County Plan, Land Use Bylaw and any other relevant documents for Council's consideration. The following sections detail the objectives, goals, and project timing, which will guide the development process.

#### 3. Project Scope

The County will prepare an ARP, as per the goals and the objectives of Sections 5 and 6, in a form suitable for submission to Council. The ARP will be presented to Council at a public hearing to be scheduled on the basis of Council's direction.

#### 4. Plan Area

The recommendations of the ARP are intended to be County-wide. However, it may result in the identification of specific areas where the aggregate resource should be managed by policies guiding the suitable location of aggregate development.

#### 5. Aggregate Resource Plan Goals

Based on the County Plan goals for natural resource extraction, the ARP should:

- 1. Support the extraction of natural resources in a manner that balances the needs of residents, industry, and society.
- 2. Support the environmentally responsible management and extraction of natural resources.
- 3. Prepare an aggregate resource management plan to identify resource areas and address land use management issues; and that addresses site design, location criteria, visual impact, mitigation of extraction impacts, and appropriate setbacks between extraction activities and other land uses.

## 6. Aggregate Resource Plan Objectives

The ARP has the following objectives:

- 1. Map aggregate deposits throughout the County;
- 2. Identify industry Best Management Practices;
- 3. Identify provincial performance standards;
- 4. Identify and review other municipalities' policies, requirements, and /or land use bylaw provisions;
- 5. Identify and review reclamation options and procedures;
- 6. Use any other supporting materials that may inform a thorough assessment;
- 7. Prepare an ARP that will provide detailed and comprehensive recommendations on amendments to the County Plan and Land Use Bylaw;

The ARP may include:

- i. High-level mapping of potential aggregate resource areas;
- ii. Policy on how to assess the compatibility of an aggregate application with the surrounding area;
- iii. Policy to manage non-aggregate development in identified aggregate resource areas;
- iv. Policy and standards on site design, location criteria, visual impact, mitigation of off-site impacts, and appropriate setbacks between extraction activities and other land uses;
- v. Performance standards;
- vi. Performance based penalties and rewards;
- vii. Policy on aggregate site monitoring and reclamation; and
- viii. Recommendations on use of the CAP levy;
- 8. Develop Public/Council confidence that the proposed polices, performance standards, monitoring, compliance and reclamation are achievable and effective;
- 9. Draft amendments to the County Plan and Land Use Bylaw that implement the recommendations of the ARP;
- 10. Provide the framework for the future implementation of an aggregate site monitoring bylaw to ensure that controls imposed upon existing and proposed aggregate development are properly enforced;
- 11. Develop other guidance documents and materials as required; and
- 12. Any other matters deemed necessary to develop a well-designed ARP.

# 7. Timing and Deliverables

The goals and objectives of the ARP will be achieved across two phases. Phase One was completed in December 2015 and involved the preparation of background and supporting materials to inform the ARP preparation. The current Phase Two includes the implementation of the public engagement strategy and the ARP preparation.

Phase Two commenced in early 2016, and the final draft Aggregate Resource Plan will be presented to Council for consideration at a public hearing when Phase 2 is completed.

#### Phase One Deliverables

Phase One deliverables included the preparation of objective items #1 through #6, which comprise supporting materials for the preparation of the ARP. Phase One also included the development of a Work Plan and a public and stakeholder engagement strategy.

#### Phase Two Deliverables

Phase Two deliverables include the launch of the Work Plan prepared in Phase One, the public and stakeholder engagement strategy, the ARP as per objective #7 as well as objective items #8 through #12, which include drafting amendments to both the County Plan and Land Use Bylaw to implement the policies, requirements, and standards of the ARP.

#### 8. Project Work Plan

a. Work Plan

A Work Plan will be developed that identifies and implements key process requirements, timelines, and deliverables that results in the timely creation of an ARP.

b. Public and Stakeholder Engagement

To implement an effective and meaningful engagement process with the general public and identified stakeholder groups that:

- i. Raises the awareness of the planning process and encourages participation;
- ii. Identifies the full set of issues and opportunities the new ARP should address, and
- iii. Responds constructively to the interests of various audiences.

A detailed communications and engagement strategy will identify all relevant interest groups within the County and any external stakeholders affected by the planning process outcomes. The engagement strategy will spell out how the process will proceed through both phases, and how various tools/techniques will be used to meaningfully engage a range of participants.

The engagement strategy will result in a participatory process that is educational, inclusive, transparent, responsive, and timely, and one that builds community and stakeholder trust.

#### 9. Financing

Completion of the ARP project, and presentation of the final draft ARP to Council, will have no impact on the current budget, and no budget adjustments will be required.

#### **10. Definitions**

The relevant County Land Use Bylaw definitions are set out below:

Aggregate means of a rock, consisting of a mixture of minerals such as sand and gravel.

*Natural Resource Extraction/Processing* means development for the removal, extraction and primary processing of raw materials. Typical resources and raw materials would include oil and gas, peat, sand, silt and gravel, shale, clay, marl, limestone, gypsum other minerals precious or semi-precious, timber and coal. Typical facilities or uses would include gravel pits (and associated crushing operations), asphaltic processing, sand pits, clay or marl pits, peat extraction, stripping of topsoil, timber removal, sawmills and related timber/wood processing and oil and gas processing plants.



# PLANNING SERVICES

TO:	Council	
DATE:	April 24, 2018	DIVISION: 9
TIME:	Afternoon Appointment	
FILE:	06731002	APPLICATION: PL20170184
SUBJECT:	Master Site Development Plan – Summit Aggregates Note: This application should be considered in conjun Redesignation Application from Ranch and Farm Dist District.	ction with PL20170145, Land Use

#### <sup>1</sup>ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the amendments to the Summit Aggregates Master Site Development Plan be approved in accordance with Appendix B.

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The purpose of this application is to amend the Summit Master Site Development Plan to support the development of a gravel pit on the subject lands. The amendments would accommodate the corresponding redesignation application (PL20170145) and simplify the future phases of development on the site.

This report focuses primarily on the technical aspects of the proposal, including all development related considerations, while the report to consider the associated land use application (PL20170145) contains the relevant policy analysis.

The adopted MSDP provides for a phased approach to development; each of the four phases requires a redesignation and a public hearing prior to commencement. This varies from most gravel operations in which land use is granted for the entire development area, and the MSDP guides the Development Permits for each phase; the Applicant would then apply for Development Permits as they move through each phase of development. The proposed amendments to the Summit MSDP (Appendix 'B') would retain the phased approach, but would eliminate the need for a redesignation at each new phase. A Development Permit, however, would still be required in accordance with the MSDP requirements. The amendments also include the removal of the "undisturbed natural area" within the southern portion of the lands, and an increase to the maximum number of acres permitted to be open at any one time from 25 acres to 40 acres or greater.

Administration reviewed the application and determined that:

- The proposed amendments do not propose any significant changes to the development or operating standards, but rather allow the operator to develop and operate in a manner consistent with the other operations in the area and across the County;
- The policies outlined in the MSDP and subsequent Development Permits would maintain the operating standards as set by Council in the adopted MSDP;
- The MSDP would continue to demonstrate that impacts associated with the proposed aggregate development could be reduced to an acceptable level in accordance with existing operating standards established by the County and provincial government;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Administrative Resources

Jessica Anderson, Planning Services Gurbir Nijjar, Engineering Services



- All technical concerns, including consideration of the cumulative effects of several aggregate sites operating in proximity to one another, were addressed; and
- The MSDP amendments meets the requirements of the County Plan.

Consequently, Administration recommends approval in accordance with Option #1.

#### DATE APPLICATION DEEMED COMPLETE: November 23, 2017

PROPOSAL:	To amend the Summit Master Site Development Plan in support of a land use redesignation proposing Natural Resource Industrial District, and to continue to provide a policy framework to guide and evaluate the development of aggregate extraction on the site.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	NW-31-26-03-W05M
GENERAL LOCATION:	Located at the southeast junction of Hwy 567 and Rge Rd 40, approximately 3.0 miles northeast of Cochrane
APPLICANT:	B & A Planning Group – Jonathan Schmidt
OWNERS:	1410266 Alberta Ltd.
EXISTING LAND USE DESIGNATION:	Natural Resource Industrial District and Ranch and Farm District
PROPOSED LAND USE DESIGNATION:	Natural Resource Industrial District
GROSS AREA:	± 66.27 hectares (± 163.76 acres)
SOILS (C.L.I. from A.R.C.):	<b>4H, F, P</b> - Severe limitations due to temperature limiting factors, excessive wetness/poor drainage, low natural fertility and excessive surface stoniness.

#### **PUBLIC & AGENCY SUBMISSIONS:**

The application was circulated to 16 adjacent landowners. Twenty-four (24) letters in objection and six (6) letters in support of the application were received. These letters are attached to the corresponding redesignation application (PL20170145), and are indicated within the map set to this report (Appendix 'D'). The application was also circulated to a number of internal and external agencies. Those responses are available in Appendix 'A'.

#### **HISTORY:**

September 26, 2017 A Master Site Development Plan (PL20150100) was approved, providing a policy framework for future redesignation and development on the subject lands.

July 11, 2017An application (PL20150101) was approved to redesignate 25.00 acres of the<br/>subject quarter to Natural Resource Industrial District (NRI).

#### BACKGROUND:

The purpose of this application is to amend the previously adopted Summit Master Site Development Plan to support the development of a gravel pit on the subject lands. Amendments include: removing the requirement to redesignate with each development permit application; removing the "undisturbed natural area" within the southern portion of the lands; and increasing the maximum number of acres permitted to be open at any one time from 25 acres to 40 acres or greater.

Applications to redesignate 25.00 acres of the subject quarter and to adopt the Summit Master Site Development Plan were approved in July 2017. The intent of the associated land use application (PL20170145) is to redesignate the remainder of the lands to Natural Resource Industrial District so that the gravel operations may commence through the quarter section as outlined in the MSDP.



The lands currently contain a dwelling that is serviced by a well and private sewage treatment system. Access is provided from an existing approach off Highway 567 and Range Road 40. The lands are located in an area of the County that is primarily agricultural in nature; however, there is an existing gravel operation less than ½ mile to the west and two new gravel operations proposed to the west and north.

## MASTER SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN OVERVIEW:

As directed by the County Plan, the MSDP provides a comprehensive overview of the proposed development, addressing matters such as noise, air quality, stormwater, groundwater, visual and landscape impacts, reclamation, and traffic impacts. In addition, at Council's direction, the MSDP includes a set of policies to address cumulative effects and joint operating standards for each of the aggregate operations in the Big Hills Springs area.

The proposed amendments are detailed in Appendix B and are summarized below.

### Revised Phasing Plan

The adopted MSDP provides for a phased approach to development. Each of the four phases would require a redesignation and a public hearing prior to commencement. The intent of this approach was to allow for public consultation at each phase through a public hearing and a Council decision. Currently, the MSDP affects the entire quarter, but only about 25 acres of the quarter section are designated NRI. Typically, land use is granted for the whole development area and an MSDP is approved to guide future Development Permits; the Applicant would then apply for Development Permits as they move through each phase of development. The proposed amendments retain the phased approach, but eliminate the need for a redesignation at each new phase. A Development Permit, however, would still be required, for each phase.

This approach is consistent with the other aggregate operations in the County. It allows the operator to proceed with the various improvements required (such as intersection upgrades and paving of Range Road 40) with the assurance that a Development Permit may be granted for future phases if all County and Provincial requirements are met, including the Joint Operating Standards as approved by Council within the MSDP.

#### Development within the Undisturbed Natural Area

The adopted MSDP identifies an existing undisturbed natural area within the southern portion of the subject lands, which was proposed to be retained or undisturbed throughout operations. The Applicant proposes amendments to the MSDP to allow extraction to occur within this natural area, contingent upon appropriate approvals from Alberta Environment and Parks. The Applicant submitted a Biophysical Impact Assessment (BIA), prepared by Ghostpine Environmental Services, which did not identify any significant features in this area. The assessment took into consideration the environmental significance and historical resource values for the subject lands. As a condition of the future Development Permit, the Applicant would be required to obtain clearance under the Historical Resources Act, and any required approvals from Alberta Environment and Parks, prior to commencing with mining activities within the undisturbed natural area. Administration has no concerns with this amendment.

#### Maximum Number of Acres Open

The adopted MSDP provides for a maximum of 25 to 33 acres to be open at any one time during operations. The Applicant proposes amendments to the MSDP to allow up to 40 acres to be open at any one time. This amendment is consistent with the revised phasing plan, which would include the previously undevelopable natural areas to the south. At the Development Permit stage, a limited number of acres would be permitted to be open at any one time with requirements for reclamation to occur behind operations as they progress. This amendment is also consistent with other operations in the County, which are permitted to have 25 to 40 acres open at any one time, based on relevant MSDP provisions.



#### Update to Setbacks

The Applicant proposes amendments to the setbacks outlined in the adopted MSDP. Currently, the setbacks are beyond what is required by the Land Use Bylaw for the NRI District. The proposed amendments would bring the setbacks in-line with the Land Use Bylaw requirements and other aggregate sites operating in the County, and would be further implemented through Development Permits. Administration has no concerns with this amendment.

#### CONCLUSION:

The proposed amendments to the Summit MSDP do not significantly change the development or operating standards, but rather allow the operator to develop and operate in a manner consistent with the other operations in the area and across the County. The policies outlined in the MSDP and subsequent Development Permits would maintain the operating standards as set by Council in the adopted MSDP. The Applicant would continue to demonstrate that impacts associated with the proposed aggregate development could be controlled to an acceptable level in accordance with existing operating standards established by the County and Provincial government. All technical concerns, including consideration of the cumulative effects of several aggregate sites operating in proximity to one another, were addressed, and the MSDP meets the requirements of the County Plan. Consequently, Administration recommends approval in accordance with **Option #1**.

#### **OPTIONS:**

- Option # 1: THAT the amendments to the Summit Aggregates Master Site Development Plan be approved in accordance with Appendix B.
- Option # 2: THAT application PL20170184 be refused.

Respectfully submitted,

Concurrence,

"Chris O'Hara"

"Kent Robinson"

General Manager

Interim County Manager

JA/rp

#### **APPENDICES:**

APPENDIX 'A': Application Referrals APPENDIX 'B': Proposed Amendments to the Summit Pit Master Site Development Plan APPENDIX 'C': Redline Version - Summit Pit MSDP APPENDIX 'D': Map Set



# APPENDIX A: APPLICATION REFERRALS

AGENCY	COMMENTS
School Authority	
Rocky View Schools	No comments provided.
Calgary Catholic School District	Calgary Catholic School District (CCSD) has no objection to the above-noted circulation (PL2017-0145) located northeast of Cochrane.
Public Francophone Education	No comments provided.
Catholic Francophone Education	No comments provided.
Province of Alberta	
Alberta Environment	No comments provided.
Alberta Transportation	This will acknowledge receipt of the above referenced proposal to accommodate an aggregate extraction operation at the above noted location. Due to the required access to and proximity of Highway 567, Alberta
	Transportation has the following comments and observations:
	<ol> <li>Alberta Transportation understands that the intersection of Highway 567 and Range Road 40 is to be upgraded as a condition of development permit approvals as contemplated within the Master Site Development Plan.</li> <li>The department further acknowledges that the development proposed will occur as generally contemplated within the Master Site Development Plan, and should be advised in writing should there be changes to this Plan.</li> <li>Design and construction of highway improvements to support the proposed development is to be completed at no cost to Alberta Transportation to the satisfaction of Alberta Transportation and Rocky View County.</li> <li>The existing highway access must be removed and reclaimed as part of the intersection improvement noted above.</li> <li>A Roadside Development Permit will be required from Alberta Transportation for the proposed development, as well as the upgrade to the intersection of Highway 567 and Range Road 40.</li> <li>Alberta Transportation has reviewed the proposed amendment to the MSDP and has no concerns or requirements.</li> </ol>
Alberta Sustainable Development (Public Lands)	No comments provided.



AGENCY	COMMENTS		
Alberta Culture and Community Spirit (Historical Resources)	No comments provided.		
Energy Resources Conservation Board	No comments provided.		
Alberta Health Services	<ol> <li>It is our understanding that this is an amendment for the Summit Pit Master Site Development Plan (MSDP) to update the phasing plan, environmental area policies and mapping. AHS has had opportunities to review the original MSDP and relevant applications, including PL20150100-MSDP (dated September 25 2015), PL20150101-Redesignation (dated January 2016) and PL 20170145 – Redesignation (dated September 2017). Based on the new information provided in the referenced application, AHS has no additional comment to those listed in our previous letters.</li> </ol>		
Public Utility			
ATCO Gas	ATCO Gas has no objection to the proposed.		
ATCO Pipelines	ATCO PIPELINES has no objection.		
AltaLink Management	No comments provided.		
FortisAlberta	FortisAlberta has a power line within the area to be re- designated, going to the residence. The developer can contact 310-WIRE(9473) to make arrangements to have the power line relocated or safety orientation.		
Telus Communications	No comments provided.		
TransAlta Utilities Ltd.	No comments provided.		
Rockyview Gas Co-op Ltd.	No comments provided.		
Other External Agencies	No comments provided.		
EnCana Corporation			
City of Calgary	If this application were to be approved, the application of the Agricultural Boundary Design Guidelines would be beneficial in buffering the Natural Resource Industrial District land use from the agricultural land uses surrounding the parcel. The guidelines would help mitigate areas of concern including: trespass, litter, pets, noise and concern over fertilizers, & dust.		


AGENCY	COMMENTS
Rocky View County Boards and Committees	As Municipal Reserves are not required pursuant to Section 663 of the MGA, the Ranch Lands Recreation District Board has no comments about this circulation.
ASB Farm Members and Agricultural Fieldmen	
Rocky View Central Recreation Board	The Municipal Lands Office has no concerns with this application.
Internal Departments	No comment.
Municipal Lands	No comment.
Development Authority	No comment.
GeoGraphics	Having reviewed the circulation, the Fire Service has no comments at this time.
	<ul> <li>Due to the presence of wetland areas on the parcel, recommend Alberta Environment input be sought;</li> <li>Recommend that no extraction activities be permitted to commence until such time as all necessary County and other Government approvals are in place;</li> <li>Recommend that Alberta Environment be consulted due to the presence of multiple wetland areas on the subject lands;</li> <li>Recommend that no work be started until valid Development Permits are in place.</li> </ul>
	Recommend that the "Joint Commitments" identified in Section 24.0 be made conditions, as written, for any Development Permits granted for natural resource extraction work on subject lands.
Building Services	General
	<ul> <li>The review of this file is based upon the application submitted. These conditions/recommendations may be subject to change to ensure best practices and procedures;</li> <li>It is to be noted that there are two (2) other Council adopted Master Site Development Plans (MSDPs) and one (1) active Development Permit (DP) application for gravel pits in near vicinity of the subject lands. The applicant, together with the other gravel operators in the area, are referred to as the Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group (BHSAPG) for which all operators share a joint set of operating standards which have been identified in their respective MSDPs. The requirements from the council approved MSDP for this application</li> </ul>

# AGENDA Page 289 of 410



AGENCY	COMMENTS
	<ul> <li>including the joint operating standards have been reflected in the comments below;</li> <li>At time of extraction activities within the Phase IV area (southwest corner of the subject lands), the applicant will be required to apply to close and consolidate the undeveloped road allowance prior to proceeding with any extraction activities;</li> <li>The current version of the MSDP for the Mountain Ash Gravel Pit (formerly known as Summit Gravel) had indicated that each phase of the gravel pit was to be redesignated individually. The current application is to redesignate the remainder of the quarter section to the NRI district and to allow a maximum of 40 acres of open pit area at any given time (previously 25 – 33 acres);</li> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant, in conjunction with the other members of the BHSAPG, will be required to provide a detailed Joint Operations Plan which provides an implementation and operations plan for the the Joint Commitments stated in the MSDPs. This plan shall include:</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Joint noise, emissions, dust and air quality monitoring plans providing the location of any offsite monitoring stations, monitoring intervals, mitigation practices and procedures to be followed by the pit operators if prescribed limits have been exceeded;</li> <li>Methods of communication of joint coordination of pit activities for any loud work;</li> <li>Joint dust control plan showing the location of any offsite air quality measurement stations including procedures to be followed if air quality limit exceedances have occurred;</li> <li>Emissions Mitigation Plan addressing air quality and dust mitigation practices, monitoring intervals and locations; and</li> <li>Creation of BHSAPG website which is to provide updated monitoring information on noise, dust, air quality and groundwater measurements including all reported exceedances. The site is also include up-to-date pit information and all other pertinent resources for the public.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>As a permanent condition of the future DP, the applicant will be required to provide the County with the EPEA registration for the proposed pit;</li> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant is required to provide a Construction Management for the construction o the Type IVa intersectional improvement and paving of Range Road 40 which shall address noise mitigation measures, traffic accommodation, sedimentation and dust control, management of stormwater during construction,</li> </ul>



AGENCY	COMMENTS
	<ul> <li>erosion and weed control, construction practices, waste management, firefighting procedures, evacuation plan, hazardous material containment and all other relevant construction management details;</li> <li>As a condition of future DP, the applicant will be required to provide a detailed Weed Control Plan which meets the requirements of the Weed Control Act and the County's Land Use Bylaw. The recommendations of the plan are to be implemented during extraction activities;</li> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant will be required to provide a detailed reclamation plan for the Phase I area in accordance with the MSDP and the requirements under the Code of Practice for Gravel Pits published by AEP. The plan shall address:</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>the progressive reclamation of the pit in terms of operating and un-reclaimed areas compared to reclaimed areas to ensure a maximum open pit area of 25 acres at any given time;</li> <li>the reclamation monitoring and maintenance plan to ensure the success of the reclamation activities; and</li> <li>implementation of the recommendations of the slope stability assessment prepared in support of reclamation activities</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant is required to provide a comprehensive landscaping plan, prepared by a qualified Landscape Architect, for the Phase I area showing the landscaping elements that are to be incorporated into the berm, setback and entrance areas;</li> <li>The applicant previously provided a Biophysical Impact Assessment (BIA) prepared by Ghostpine Environmental Services dated November 2014. The assessment took into consideration the environmental significance and historical resource values for the subject lands. As a condition of future DP, the applicant will be required to obtain clearance under the Historical Resources Act prior to commencing with mining activities;</li> <li>The applicant previously submitted a Noise Impact Assessment, prepared by SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd. dated January 27, 2016. The assessment concludes that the predicted cumulative sound level from normal operation of the proposed facility, provided that appropriate noise mitigation measures are implemented, is expected to meet AER Directive 038 at the nearby residences of concern. As a condition of the future DP, the applicant is required to provide a revised Noise Impact Assessment, prepared by a qualified professional, demonstrating compliance with the Alberta Energy Regulator's 'Directive 038'. The plan shall also provide details of the integration strategy into the joint monitoring</li> </ul>

# AGENDA Page 291 of 410



AGENCY	COMMENTS	
AGENCY	<ul> <li>COMMENTS</li> <li>requirements as outlined in the Joint Operations Plan for the BHSAPG;</li> <li>The applicant previously provided a Dust Control Plan prepared by Ghostpine Environment Services Ltd which provides various dust mitigation measures such as berming, landscaping, watering, seeding and limiting crushing activities to the approved operating locations and times. The MSDP for the proposed gravel pit also contain numerous commitments in regards to dust mitigation and control to be implemented by the members of the BHSAPG including the applicant. As a condition of the future DP, the applicant will be required to provide the County with details of the dust suppression measures to be implemented as part Phase I of the pit all in accordanc with the MSDP and the County Servicing Standards. The plan shall also provide details of the integration strategy into the joint monitoring requirements as outlined in the Joint Operations Plan for the BHSAPG;</li> <li>The applicant previously provided an Air Quality Assessment prepared by Millennium EMS Solutions Ltd. dated March 2015. The assessment concluded that the proposed mining operation is not expected to exceed air quality objectives beyond the subject lands and have minimal impact to nearby residences however, the study did not take into consideration the gravel pits in the area or the BHSAPG. As a condition of future DP, the applicant will be required to provide an updated Air Quality Assessment, prepared by a qualified professional, for Phase I of the proposed pit taking into consideration the other pits in the area and provide a strategy that will allow the pit to remain in compliance with the Canadian Ambient Air Quality Objectives (AAAQO). The plan shall also provide</li> </ul>	
	requirements as outlined in the Joint Operations Plan for the BHSAPG.	
	Geotechnical	
	<ul> <li>The applicant previously provided a Hydrogeological Assessment Report prepared by SLR Consulting (Canada Ltd. dated February 2015. The report concludes that the mining of the aggregate resources will be extracted to a maximum of 1.0m above the maximum level of the groundwater table. As a condition of future DP, the applicant will be required to implement a groundwater measurement program and provide the County with new groundwater readings at the boundaries of the Phase I area to record all fluctuations in groundwater levels to ensure gravel extraction activities remain a minimum of 1.0m above the highest recorded groundwater reading at</li> </ul>	

all times;



AGENCY	COMMENTS
	<ul> <li>As a permanent condition of the DP, the applicant is required to implement a groundwater measurement program for which the applicant is to install piezometers within the open pit area to take regular readings of the groundwater levels to ensure mining activities remain a minimum of 1.0m above the recorded groundwater levels at all times. The applicant will be required to keep a log to record the readings and be able to provide the County with the log upon request and include the log in the Annual Operations Report;</li> <li>As a condition of future DP, the applicant will be required to provide a Geotechnical Assessment which provides slope stability recommendations for Phase I of the gravel pit. The assessment is to provide recommendations for slope design and setbacks in active pit areas as well as for final reclaimed conditions;</li> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant is required to provide a geotechnical report, prepared by a qualified geotechnical professional, providing a pavement at Range Road 40 and Highway 567 and for the paving of Range Road 40 to the satisfaction of AT and the County.</li> </ul>
	Transportation
	<ul> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant will be required to enter into a Development Agreement with the County for:</li> <li>The upgrade of Range Road 40 to a regional transitional paved standard (400.10) at a minimum from Highway 567 to the site;</li> <li>Upgrade of the intersection of Range Road 40 and Highway 567 to a Type IVa standard including all signage and any other roadside indicators to the satisfaction of AT;</li> <li>Implementation of the recommendations of the geotechnical report and pavement structure design;</li> <li>Implementation of the recommendations of the</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Construction Management Plan; and</li> <li>Implementation of the recommendations of the illumination and climbing lane warrants</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant is required to provide an intersection illumination warrant analysis, prepared by a qualified professional, to determine if any illumination is warranted at the Type IVa intersection of Range Road 40 and Highway 567;</li> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant is require to provide a climbing lane warrant, prepared by a qualified professional, to determine if there is a need for a climbing lane to allow for the safe entrance of truck traffic onto the</li> </ul>



AGENCY	COMMENTS
	<ul> <li>highway from the intersection of Range Road 40 and Highway 567;</li> <li>As a condition of future DP, the applicant is required to obtain a Roadside DP from AT and implement the intersectional improvement at Range Road 40 and Highway 567 to the satisfaction of AT;</li> <li>As a condition of future DP, the existing access from Highway 567 is required to be removed and reclaimed to the satisfaction of AT;</li> <li>As a condition of future DP, the applicant will be required to provide a Traffic Management Plan which shall address:</li> <li>measures to control driving behavior of aggregate haulers;</li> <li>use and monitoring of in-vehicle monitoring systems;</li> <li>turning movements onto the Highway to provide recommendations to optimize safety of Highway users; and</li> <li>measures to be implemented to prevent the transfer of aggregate and other detritus materials onto the</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>As a condition of the future DP, the applicant will be required to provide a transportation network assessment, prepared by a qualified professional, of the haul routes to the proposed aggregate markets taking into consideration the truck traffic from proposed pit and the BHSAPG. The assessment shall take into consideration the existing constraints of the haul routes and provide recommendations to improve road safety to the satisfaction of the County and AT. The applicant may be required to implement the necessary highway safety improvements along its identified haul routes as identified by the County and AT prior to issuance of the future development permit;</li> <li>As a condition of future DP, the applicant will be required to provide payment of the Transportation Offsite Levy, in accordance with the current levy at time of DP, for the total gross acreage of the gravel pit and areas associated with gravel extraction activities.</li> </ul>
	Sanitary/Waste Water
	<ul> <li>ES has no concerns at this time. As per policy 449, the county recommends the use of sewage holding tanks and a trucked service for all industrial, commercial and institutional lands.</li> </ul>
	Water Supply And Waterworks
	<ul> <li>ES has no concerns at this time however recommends the use of cisterns and a trucked service for all industrial, commercial and institutional applications.</li> </ul>



#### COMMENTS

#### Storm Water Management

The applicant previously provided a Conceptual Stormwater Management Report prepared by SLR Global Environmental Solutions dated May 2015 which provided the overall stormwater management concept for the gravel pit. As a condition of future DP, the applicant will be required to provide a detailed stormwater management plan for the Phase I pit area which follows the stormwater management concepts outlined in the SLR Global Environmental Solutions dated May 2015 and meets the requirements of the County Servicing Standards. As the concept relies on the discharge of stormwater via groundwater discharge sumps, the applicant will be required to provide confirmation of AEP approval for the implementation of the discharge sumps or for any release to the environment

- As a condition of the future DP, the applicant will be required to provide an Erosion & Sedimentation Control Plan (ESC) prepared by a qualified professional, providing the ESC measures to be implemented onsite during the operation of the pit in accordance with the MSDP and the requirements of the County Servicing Standards;
- As a condition of the future DP, the applicant will be required to provide an Erosion & Sedimentation Control (ESC) Plan prepared by a qualified professional, providing the ESC measures to be implemented for the construction of the Type IVa intersectional improvement and paving of Range Road 40

### **Environmental**

The applicant previously provided a Biophysical Impact Assessment (BIA) prepared by Ghostpine Environment Services Ltd. dated November 2014. The report indicates that there are existing Wetlands identified within the overall proposed mining area. As a condition of the future DP, the applicant will be required to provide a wetland impact assessment, prepared by a qualified professional, identifying the classification and all other relevant characteristics of the impacted wetlands within the Phase I area. The applicant will be required to obtain all permits and approvals from AEP under the Water Act for the loss of the wetlands due to the gravel extraction activities.

• As per road operations comments.

No concerns.

Infrastructure and Operations -Engineering Services

**Emergency Services** 

Infrastructure and Operations - Maintenance

Applicant to confirm how they intend to access the proposed gravel pit. If using Rge. Rd. 40, recommend applicant prepare a Traffic Impact Assessment to determine if any road upgrade work is required to be completed by the Applicant along Rge. Rd. 40 and what if any intersection treatment requirements at Hwy



### AGENCY

## COMMENTS

567.

Infrastructure and Operations - Capital Delivery

Infrastructure and Operations - Operations

No comments provided.

Circulation Period: December 4, 2017 to December 29, 2017



# AMENDMENTS TO SUMMIT MASTER SIDE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FORMING PART OF COUNCIL'S RESOLUTION

### Amendment #1

Amend text in Section 1.0 Introduction, which reads:

"...maximum of 25-33 acres open at any one time."

To read:

"...maximum of 40 acres open at any one time."

#### Amendment #2

Delete text in Section 1.0 Introduction, which reads:

This extraction period will be undertaken in smaller phases to provide the community opportunity to formally comment on operations through additional land use redesignations that occur approximately every 5 to 7 years depending on market conditions. This MDSP contemplates re-zoning in small phases of about 20 to 33 acres to ensure Council and the local community are given opportunity for input throughout the life of the operations. The phased land use approach is discussed in detail in Section 10 of this MSDP.

#### Amendment #3

Delete text in Section 4.0 Public Benefit, which reads:

"...land use redesignation will be required with every development phase,"

#### Amendment #4

Add text to Section 5.2, which reads:

A land use redesignation for the remainder of the site to Natural Resource Industrial District (NRI) will be required until the land is returned to agricultural land use through reclamation.



Delete Figure 3: Local Land Uses, which shows:



And replace with:







## And replace with:



Delete Figure 6: Surface Flows and Wetlands, which shows:



Delete text in Section 7.50 Biophysical Overview, which reads:

There is a undisturbed naturalized area on the site that has not been cultivated. This area is highlighted in Figure 6.

### Amendment #8

Delete Map: Mountain Ash – Our Commitments, which shows:



And replace with:



Paved Access Road

AGENDA Page 300 of 410



Delete Figure 7: Site Plan, which shows:



And replace with:



Paved Access Road

AGENDA Page 301 of 410



ROCKY VIEW COUNTY Cultivating Communities

## Amendment #10

Amend text in Section 9.0 Site Plan, which reads:

- 60.0 m from the north property line adjacent to Secondary Highway 567;
- 30.0 m from Range Road 40;
- 30.0 m from the east property line (NE 31- 26-3-5); and
- 30m and 60.0 m from the southern property boundary (SW 31- 26-3-5) to provide a visual and physical separation from the closest dwellings to the south.

To read:

- 60.0 m from the north property line adjacent to Secondary Highway 567;
- 30.0 m from the west property line adjacent to Range Road 40;
- 15 m from the east property line (NE 31- 26-3-5); and
- 15.0 m from the southern property boundary (SW 31- 26-3-5) to provide a visual and physical separation from the closest dwellings to the south.

### Amendment #11

Delete Figure 8: Phasing Plan, which shows:





And replace with:



#### Amendment #12

Delete text in Section 10.0 Phasing, which reads:

Summit Pit contemplates rezoning the project in phases that are approximately 5 to 7 years in length. To this end, the development will be broken down into four (4) phases with each phase being approximately 12 ha to 13.35 ha (25-33 acres). A land use redesignation application and a development permit will be required prior to the commencement of each subsequent phase.

### Amendment #13

Delete policy 10.2, which reads:

10.2 A land use redesignation application and approval will be required prior to the commencement of each subsequent phase of development.

### Amendment #14

Amend text in Section 17.0 Environmental Areas, which reads:

Mountain Ash undertook a Biophysical Impact Assessment (Ghostpine 2014) that identified a number of Class III wetlands in the northwest and an undisturbed natural area as shown in Figure 6. Summit Pit will employ strategies to avoid several Class III wetlands as identified in the Biophysical Impact Assessment. and the undisrupted natural area. As noted in the Biophysical Impact Assessment, the operations plan will disturb 0.361 ha of wetland area of out of the total 2.317 ha of wetlands located in NW 31-26-3 W5M. Activities that may affect wetlands are subject to the Alberta Environment and Parks Water Act and Alberta Wetland Policy. Mountain Ash will avoid the site's largest wetlands and not develop the undisturbed natural area. An updated Biophysical Impact Assessment Permit stage.

AGENDA Page 303 of 410



## To read:

Mountain Ash undertook a Biophysical Impact Assessment (Ghostpine 2014) that identified a number of Class III wetlands in the northwest as shown in Figure 6. Summit Pit will employ strategies to avoid several Class III wetlands as identified in the Biophysical Impact Assessment. As noted in the Biophysical Impact Assessment, the operations plan will disturb 0.361 ha of wetland area of out of the total 2.317 ha of wetlands located in NW 31-26-3 W5M. Activities that may affect wetlands are subject to the Alberta Environment and Parks Water Act and Alberta Wetland Policy. Mountain Ash will avoid the site's largest wetlands. An updated Biophysical Impact Assessment will be provided at the Development Permit stage.

### Amendment #15

Amend text in policy 17.1, which reads:

17.1 Mountain Ash avoid the site's largest wetlands and not develop the undisturbed natural area.

To read:

17.1 Mountain Ash shall avoid the site's largest wetlands.

#### Amendment #16

Amend text in policy 18.3, which reads:

18.3 Monitoring wells shall be checked quarterly throughout the life of the project and a monitoring report shall be made available upon request or prior to future land use redesignation applications to address community concerns.

To read:

18.3 Monitoring wells shall be checked quarterly throughout the life of the project and a monitoring report shall be made available upon request.

#### Amendment #17

Amend text in policy 19.3, which reads:

19.3 The size of the operating and unreclaimed areas shall be limited to a maximum size as determined in a development approval in order to reduce the potential for generation of suspended sediment in stormwater.

To read:

19.3 The size of the operating areas shall be limited to a maximum size as determined in a development approval in order to reduce the potential for generation of suspended sediment in stormwater.

#### Amendment #18

Amend text in Section 20.0 Reclamation, which reads:

Reclamation will be ongoing and continuous throughout the life of the project to maximize the amount of land under agricultural production during pit operations. The size of open areas being used for operations or unreclaimed will be limited to 40 25-33 acres at any one time.



#### To read:

Reclamation will be ongoing and continuous throughout the life of the project to maximize the amount of land under agricultural production during pit operations. The size of open areas being used for operations will be limited to 40 acres at any one time.

### Amendment #19

Amend text in policy 20.2, which reads:

20.2 The size of the operating and unreclaimed areas shall be limited to a maximum of 25 acres or greater, but will be determined through applicable County approvals and AEP approvals pursuant to the Code of Practice for Pits in Alberta, as part of a progressive reclamation plan and methodology.

To read:

20.2 The size of the operating area shall be limited to a maximum of 40 acres or greater, but will be determined through applicable County approvals and AEP approvals pursuant to the Code of Practice for Pits in Alberta, as part of a progressive reclamation plan and methodology.

#### Amendment #20

Delete text in Section 28.0 Rocky View County Land Use Redesignation Approval, which reads:

A land use redesignation shall be sought prior to the commencement of each phase of development. Each land use application and subsequent development permit will be updated with the latest monitoring and site information to enable a thorough assessment of operations. A road closure application will also be required prior to development.

#### Amendment #21

Minor amendments throughout to correct grammar, dates and numbering.

# Summit Pit

# Master Site Development Plan

*Submitted to:* Rocky View County September 2017 November 2017

Submitted by:







# Summit Pit

# Master Site Development Plan

Submitted to: Rocky View County September 2017

November 2017

Submitted by:

Prepared by:



b&a B&A Planning Group

Supporting Consultants:



AGENDA Page 308 of 410

# **Table of Contents**

#### Section A | OVERVIEW

1.0	Introduction	01
2.0	Land Ownership	01
3.0	Purpose of the Application	02
4.0	Public Benefit	02
5.0	Municipal Framework	03
	5.1 Rocky View County Plan, Municipal Development Plan (2013)	03
	5.2 Rocky View County Land Use Bylaw No. C-4841-97 (2013-2014)	03

Section B   EXISTING CONDITIONS		
6.0 Area and Site Context	07	
7.0 Existing Site Conditions & Policy Framework	09	
7.1 Legal Description & Aerial Photo	09	
7.2 Topography	11	
7.3 Gravel Deposit (Geotechnical Evaluation)	11	
7.4 Surface Hydrology and Wetlands	13	
7.5 Biophysical Overview	13	

#### Section C | DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT 8.0 Community Input 16 9.0 Site Plan 21 10.0 Phasing 23 11.0 Stripping, Grading & Construction Activities 24 12.0 Operations 25 13.0 Dust Control Plan 26 14.0 Noise Mitigation 28 15.0 Haul Routes 29 16.0 Site Access & Trucking 30 17.0 Environmental Areas 33 18.0 Groundwater Management 36 19.0 Stormwater Management 38 20.0 Reclamation 39 21.0 Sediment and Erosion Control 41 22.0 Weed Management Control 41

Section D   Jointly Managing Offsite Impacts (Cumulative Effects)			
23.0	Council Motion on Joint Standards	44	
24.0	Joint Commitments	45	
25.0	Joint Communications Plan	47	
26.0	Joint Operating Standards Policies	49	
27.0	Joint Transportation Strategy	54	

Section E   Implementation		
28.0 Rocky View (	County Land Use Redesignation Approval	60
29.0 Rocky View (	County Development Permit Approval	61
30.0 Provincial Ap	provals	62

Section F   Appendices	
31.0 Appendices (under separate cover)	66

List of Figures		
1	Regional Context	i
2	Local Context	06
3	Local Land Uses	07
4	Site Context   Aerial Photo	08
5	Cross Sections of Existing Conditions	10
6	Surface Flows & Wetlands	12
7	Site Plan	20
8	Phasing Plan	22
9	Access	32
10	Proposed Joint Highway 567 Access Strategy	34
11	Cross Section of Reclaimed Conditions	40

AGENDA Page 311 of 410

# **SECTION A**



AGENDA Page 312 of 410





AGENDA Page 313 of 410



# 1.0 Introduction

The proposed Summit Pit is located along Highway 567 northeast of the Town of Cochrane at NW 31-26-3 W5M and is approximately 163 acres in total size. Mountain Ash Limited Partnership (hereby 'Mountain Ash') is a locally owned company which intends to develop an aggregate extraction operation.

The subject site is located in an area with a mix of land uses including farming, farmsteads and a mix of non-residential land uses such as other aggregate pits, oil and gas wells, and commercial development.

On-site operations will include the stripping of topsoil and overburden materials and the mining of the underlying sand and gravel. The sand and gravel will be crushed and screened on-site and shipped to markets around Balzac, Calgary International Airport and north Calgary growth areas. Washing is not planned for the site. Reclamation of the pit will be phased and will follow closely behind mining operations, with a maximum of 25-33 40 acres open at any one time. The site will be returned to agricultural uses upon completion. Mountain Ash anticipates a 20 to 28 year operating period with Development permits to be submitted throughout the life of the project. This extraction period will be undertaken in smaller phases to provide the community opportunity to formally comment on operations through additional land use redesignations that occur approximately every 5 to 7 years depending on market conditions. This MDSP contemplates re-zoning in small phases of about 20 to 33 acres to ensure Council and the local community are given opportunity for input throughout the life of the operations. The phased land use approach is discussed in detail in Section 10 of this MSDP.

Technical supporting documents provided under separate cover include: Transportation Impact Assessment, Conceptual Stormwater Management Report, Hydrogeological Assessment, Biophysical Impact Assessment, Noise Impact Assessment, and Air Quality Assessment.

In addition to these supporting technical documents, Mountain Ash has undertaken an extensive public engagement effort to help address general concerns while providing awareness regarding general operations and future plans for this property.

# 2.0 Land Ownership

The subject site consists of 163.76 acres (66.26 hectares) excluding road right of ways within NW Section 31, Township 26, Range 3, West of the 5th Meridian. These lands are owned by **1410266 Alberta Ltd.** (as a general partner of Mountain Ash Limited Partnership) as indicated on the current certificate of title.

# 3.0 **Purpose of the Application**

This Master Site Development Plan (MSDP) complies with the relevant policies of the County Plan (Bylaw C-7280-2013) and provides guidance for the land use redesignation and development permit process. This MSDP establishes specific expectations about how the project will be implemented including phasing, proposed operations, reclamation, transportation, and community considerations. It includes a policy framework that describes how the aggregate operation will be implemented in accordance with various principles of the County Plan which "supports the extraction of natural resources in a manner that balances the needs of residents, industry, and society" (Section 15.0, page 67).

# 4.0 Public Benefit

Aggregates are non-renewable resources found only in locations where natural processes have placed them. They are essential in the development of roads, buildings, and municipal infrastructure. The Calgary region has traditionally enjoyed large aggregate reserves; however, reserves are depleting due to high growth in the region and the sterilization of gravel deposits by urban development. There are few other permitted long-term sources of aggregate available north of Calgary.

Adding additional supply in the north Calgary region would increase competition in the local aggregate industry and help to secure a competitive market. This lowers construction and infrastructure costs and supports area growth.

Larger aggregate pits such as the Summit Pit play an important role in ensuring a steady, cost effective supply of aggregate products for infrastructure projects throughout RVC and the surrounding area. Summit Pit's location is close to areas with high aggregate demand including Airdrie, north Calgary and the Highway 2 corridor. The site has direct access to Provincial Highway 567/Big Hill Springs Road for aggregate hauling that minimizes truck traffic on local, County maintained roads.

Mountain Ash has undertaken extensive public engagement to ensure its operating plans reflect community concerns to the greatest extent possible. Mountain Ash is sensitive to neighbour concerns about noise, dust, traffic, groundwater, and visual impacts related to aggregate operations. As discussed throughout this MSDP, land use redesignation will be required with every development phase, Mountain Ash will work collectively with neighbouring pit operators and County administration to manage and mitigate cumulative effects.



Mountain Ash and the Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group will work with stakeholders to mitigate their concerns before, during, and after operations have ceased. Mountain Ash has incorporated numerous operating protocols to ensure they are the best neighbour possible. In addition, Mountain Ash was careful to choose a location in an area with minimal country residential development on the provincial highway system to ensure the best possible project outcome.

# 5.0 Municipal Framework

# 5.1 Rocky View County Plan, Municipal Development Plan (2013)

Section 15 "Natural Resources" of the County Plan contains supportive policies related to aggregate resource extraction when offsite impacts related to operations can be mitigated.

Section 15.6 of the County Plan notes that "until such a time as a County aggregate extraction policy is prepared, applications for aggregate extraction shall prepare a master site development plan that address the development review criteria identified in section 29." Further guidance on the preparation of an aggregate master site development plan can be found in Appendix C, Section 4 of the County Plan. This Master Site Development Plan (MSDP) has been prepared in accordance with the County Plan's direction for aggregate master site development plans. The requirements for an MSDP for aggregate operations are extensive and provide Rocky View Council, Administration, and local residents a good basis on which to evaluate proposed aggregate projects.

# 5.2 Rocky View County Land Use Bylaw No. C-4841-97 (2013-2014)

The subject lands are currently designated Ranch and Farm District (RF) and Natural Resource Industrial District (NRI) under the Rocky View Land Use Bylaw C-4841-97 (see Figure 3 - Local Land Uses). The current NRI designation covers an approximately 25 acre portion of the site intended for Phase 1 of the development. A land use redesignation for the remainder of the site to Natural Resource Industrial District (NRI) will be required until the land is returned to agricultural land use through reclamation.

AGENDA Page 317 of 410

# SECTION B

# Existing Conditions

AGENDA Page 318 of 410

# Figure 2: Local Context





# AGENDA Page 319 of 410



# 6.0 Area and Site Context

The Summit Pit is in an area with a range of land uses including farming and farmsteads and a mix of non-residential land uses such as other aggregate pits, oil and gas wells, and commercial development. Summit Pit is located within the vicinity of one existing and two future aggregate operations as shown on Figure 3. Hillstone Aggregates is in operation and McNair Sand & Gravel and Lafarge recently received land use redesignation approval. The project location on a provincial highway in an area with little country residential subdivision is a good example of the benefits of a well located aggregate operation.

Figure 3 illustrates the various approved land uses in the surrounding area which include the following zonings: Ranch and Farm District, business districts, oil and gas wells and aggregate operations.

There is an existing registered road plan that will be closed as part of this development. Roadway 552 BM is located in the southwest corner of NW 31- 26- 3-W5M, as shown in Figure 4.



# Figure 3: Local Land Uses

Mountain Ash Limited Partnership | September 2017 AGENDA Page 320 of 410

# Figure 4: Site Context | Aerial Photo







# 7.0 Existing Site Conditions & Policy Framework

A summary of the existing site conditions is provided below. The summary is based on field observations and the findings of the technical studies that have been prepared in support of this MSDP.

# 7.1 Legal Description and Aerial Photo

The subject site is located at NW 31-26-3 W5M and consists of an unsubdivided quarter section with an existing road allowance in the southwest corner of the site. The lands are bound by Provincial Highway 567 to the north, Hill Stone Aggregates Gravel Pit and farmland to the west, a large coulée and farmstead to the south, and another farmstead and equestrian business location to the east. A full quarter section of land (160 acres) directly to the west (LaFarge Hughes Pit) was redesignated from Ranch and Farm (RF) District to Natural Resource Industrial (NRI) District in July 2017.



Subject Site Looking East



# Figure 5: Cross Sections of Existing Conditions









# 7.2 Topography

The topography in the project area is undulating, with elevations ranging from 1288.0 m to 1295.0 m. The high point is located in the upper north and east portions of the subject lands. The subject lands slope towards the south and east. The majority of the northern portion of the site is relatively flat with a slight southwest facing aspect.

# 7.3 Gravel Deposit (Geotechnical Evaluation)

Almor Testing prepared a Gravel Investigation report (July 2014) which identified that the subject lands contain glacial till consisting of cobbles, sand, gravel, silt and traces of clay. The structure of the soils and gravels is as follows:

- average topsoil depths range from 0.4 m to 0.8 m
- the topsoil overlies an overburden material ranging in depths from 4.0 m to 7.0 m
- sand and gravel layer ranges from 15.0 m to 22.0 m in depth
#### Figure 6: Surface Flows and Wetlands



#### Legend



Class I Wetland Class III Wetland



### 7.4 Surface Hydrology and Wetlands

There are no rivers, creeks, or streams on the subject lands. The Biophysical Overview prepared for the subject lands has identified the presence of 17 wetlands. There are 14 Class III wetlands, one (1) Class II wetland and two (2) Class I wetlands. All of the wetlands identified were Class III or lower. The total area of wetlands on the site with NW 31-26-3 W5M is 2.317 ha. Drainage from the subject lands flows generally from the northwest to the southeast.

### 7.5 Biophysical Overview

Ghostpine Environmental Services was retained by Mountain Ash to prepare a Biophysical Overview for the Summit Pit development (November 2014). The Biophysical Overview is a review of the existing biophysical conditions of the site based on available desktop information and a reconnaissance level field survey which was conducted in July 2014.

The Summit Pit site is presently being used for agricultural activities. The subject site contains limited biodiversity of wildlife and vegetation. There is a undisturbed naturalized area on the site that has not been cultivated. This area is highlighted in Figure 6.

This overview does not identify any rare plants or species of conservation concern within the project site. The overview identifies that the site consists mainly of pasture-land with semi-natural/ altered and cultivated vegetation communities. There are a number of wetlands within the project development area that will require provincial applications to allow for their disturbance or removal. Wetlands on the subject site are shown in Figure 6.

AGENDA Page 327 of 410

### SECTION C

# Development Concept

AGENDA Page 328 of 410

# 8.0 Community Input

The purpose of Mountain Ash's community engagement and mitigation strategy was to develop an operating plan that addresses local community concerns through valuable community input to the greatest extent possible.

Prior to developing a phasing and operations plan, Mountain Ash contacted local neighbours and businesses to inform them of Mountain Ash's intent to permit an aggregate operation at NW 31-26-3 W5M. A subsequent public engagement plan was undertaken to gather meaningful input that would help Mountain Ash address and respond to community concerns through the site plan design and proposed operating procedures.

The intent of these operating plans and policies is to provide local residents and businesses with:

- Continued opportunity for input into the project, and
- Assurance that local residents will be able to affect changes in the operations even after the land use redesignation application has been approved.

Representatives of Mountain Ash are seeking to make its operations the best possible neighbour. Every effort has been made to earn the trust of the community through commitments to strict operating procedures and open dialogue.



Mountain Ash undertook the following public engagement activities in order to develop the operating and phasing plan:

- During the summer of 2014, a newsletter was sent with a project summary and direct contact information to all landowners on title within a 1.6 km (1 mile) radius prior to undertaking extensive project planning.
- Following the newsletter, a representative went door-to-door to meet with adjacent landowners to answer questions and understand concerns.
- Direct contact information for the project representative was made available to community members, administration, and Council at every opportunity, prior to application submission.
- A project website was created and updated.
- Many face-to-face meetings were held with neighbours or stakeholders.
- An open house was held on November 5th and 6th, 2014. An invitation to the open house was mailed to all landowners within the 1.6km (1 mile) radius and an advertisement was placed in the Rocky View Weekly in excess of two weeks.
- The project design was updated in response to feedback and a second newsletter was mailed to stakeholders in December 2014.
- A second open house was held on April 22, 2015 that provided further updated maps and policies based on feedback from early consultation activities.
- The proposed MSDP was taken to affected stakeholders in July and August 2015 for their review of the document and its commitments.
- The draft and proposed MSDP was posted to the website.
- March 3, 2015 Presentation to Rocky View County Planning & Priorities Committee (PPC)
- June 2016 Initial open house in and later returned in June 2017 with another open house
- July 2017 received land use redesignation approval for 25 acres Phase 1
- July 2017 Council directs aggregate producers in Big Hill Springs area to collaborate on joint operating standards, communications plan & transportation strategy.
- August 2017 Mountain Ash meets with Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group to establish joint operating standards, joint communications plan and joint transportation strategy.
- August 2017 nearest neighbours are circulated draft joint operating standards, joint communications plan and joint transportation strategy.
- September 2017 updated MSDP submitted

### What We Heard Through Public Consultation









**Development Concept** 

# **Mountain Ash - Our Commitments**



### Legend

Subject Lands
 Screening & Sound Berm
 Paved Access Road
 Setback

#### Figure 7: Site Plan





Subject Lands

- Screening & Sound Berm
  - Paved Access Road
- ---- Setback



#### AGENDA Page 333 of 410



9.0 Site Plan

All mining activities will be undertaken in accordance with the Natural Resource Industrial District (NRI) within the Rocky View County Land use Bylaw. Development of the site will be subject to the following setbacks as required in Section 58.4 of the NRI District, subject to potential future revision in accordance with discussions with neighbours, including letters of support and any variances approved by the development authority at the development permit stage:

- 60.0 m from the north property line adjacent to Secondary Highway 567;
- 30.0 m from the west property line adjacent to Range Road 40;
- 15m <del>30.0 m</del> from the east property line (NE 31- 26-3-5); and
- 15.0m 30m and 60.0 m from the southern property boundary (SW 31- 26-3-5) to provide a visual and physical separation from the closest dwellings to the south.

The proposed development concept for the Summit Pit is shown in Figure 7: Site Plan.

A portable scale will be installed at the entrance to the site along Range Road 40 South approximately 400m south of the Highway 567. All sand and gravel will be excavated by a front-end loader and fed into a portable crushing and screening spread that will operate onsite as demand for gravel occurs. Truck haul will occur from completed aggregate product stockpiles to the scale house for weighing prior to hauling.

#### POLICIES:

- 9.1 All mining operations shall be conducted in accordance with the Natural Resource Industrial District within with Rocky View County Land Use Bylaw
- 9.2 Setbacks along the south property line shall be 15.0m and 60.0m to provide a visual and physical separation from dwellings to the south.
- 9.3 Mining operations shall generally follow the mine phasing plan as shown in Figure 8.
- 9.4 The subject lands shall be fenced prior to the commencement of operations to secure the property.

#### Figure 8: Phasing Plan





Use overburden from Phase 4 to reclaim Phase 3 area and berm in Phase 4

Commence gravel operations in the Phase 3 area Place soil and seed Phase 3 for return to agricultural use



- Construct Phase 2 berm with reclamation material
- Commence gravel operations in the Phase 2 area Place soil and seed Phase 1 for return to agricultural land use :





Remove berms and place as reclamation backfill in Phase 4 area or in •

- :
- Remove scalehouse and reclaim gate area and return to agricultural land use

#### Legend







PHASE 3







**Development Concept** 

## 10.0 Phasing

Aggregate mining operations will occur over a 20 to 28 year time frame depending on market conditions.

Summit Pit contemplates rezoning the project in phases that are approximately 5 to 7 years in length. To this end, the development will be broken down into four (4) phases with each phase being approximately 12 ha to 13.35 ha (25-33 acres). A land use redesignation application and a development permit will be required prior to the commencement of each subsequent phase.

Mining operations will commence in Phase 1 along the west property line of the subject lands. In Phase 1, extraction will progress in easterly direction into Phase 2. Phase 2, extraction efforts will then progress southward into Phase 3. Phase 3 will move westward into Phase 4. As part of Phase 4, Roadway 552 BM will be closed on the subject site.

This phasing plan is illustrated in Figure 8.

#### **POLICIES:**

10.1 Phasing of the aggregate operations shall generally follow the mine plan as shown in Figure 8.

10.2 A land use redesignation application and approval will be required prior to the commencement of each subsequent phase of development.

# 11.0 Stripping, Grading & Construction Activities

Mountain Ash will require on-site activities to prepare the resource for production. These are considered construction activities. Stripping and grading of the topsoil and overburden and construction of berms and other features of the operations will be the first stage of mining activities.

The stripped topsoil and overburden materials will be removed and stockpiled separately for sight and sound berm construction. These stockpile berms will also be used for future reclamation processes once extraction activities have been completed. Stockpiled topsoil and overburden will be placed in the depleted areas in the same order they were removed as per regulations found within the Code of Practice for Pits in Alberta. The topsoil layer will be seeded for pasture or annual crops after final reclamation.

In Phase 1, sight and sound berms will be constructed along Highway 567 to ensure operations are not visible from the Highway. Dust control, sediment/erosion control, and weed management control practices will be implemented during stripping and stockpiling.

#### **POLICIES:**

- 11.1 All topsoil shall be salvaged such that there is no contamination with other materials.
- 11.2 All of the topsoil and overburden from the site shall be used to reclaim operation and mining areas.
- 11.3 Stockpiled topsoil and overburden will be placed in the depleted areas in the same order they were removed in accordance with the Code of Practice for Pits in Alberta.
- 11.4 A sight and sound berm shall be constructed along Highway 567 as part of the initial stripping and grading for Phase 1.
- 11.5 Sight and sound berms shall be constructed as a first priority for each phase prior to commencement of other activities.



12.0 **Operations** 

To address community concerns about the quality of life on surrounding residential parcels, Mountain Ash has committed to reducing its hours of operation to create better compatibility between industrial and residential land uses. Hours of operation will be aligned with the joint commitments of the Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group (BHSAPG) as outlined in Section D of this MSDP. However, in addition to the joint commitments, Mountain Ash will also commit to no crushing on Saturdays, Sundays and statutory holidays.

Typical extraction and aggregate production operations at full pit development would include the operation of one portable crusher, one loader, one bulldozer, and three scrapers during stripping and reclamation/grading phases of development.

Water and sanitary servicing will be supplied by portable water and sanitary facilities. Garbage facilities will be provided onsite and removed on a weekly basis.

A scale house and office will be constructed on site in a suitable location to ensure safe effective on-site logistics related to the export of aggregates from this location.

#### **POLICIES:**

- 12.1 As part of the BHSAPG, Mountain Ash jointly commits that no crushing shall occur on the site on Sundays.
- 12.2 Mountain Ash commits that no crushing shall occur on the site on Saturdays, Sundays or statutory holidays.
- 12.3 No activities of any kind shall occur on the site on Sundays or statutory holidays.
- 12.4 Self-contained sanitary facilities will be provided onsite and well maintained.
- 12.5 A secure container will be provided onsite for all garbage and disposed of at an appropriate waste disposal facility on a weekly basis.

Also see Joint Commitments and Joint Standards in Section D of this MSDP

### 13.0 Dust Control Plan

Mountain Ash understands that effective dust control is extremely important for surrounding land uses. Mountain Ash has made commitments to air quality, including dust, in collaboration with the Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group outlined in Section D of this MSDP. The preferred method of dust control for this site is the application of calcium chloride to gravel roads due to its ease of application, low cost, and dust reduction effectiveness.



As part of the Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group also outlined in Part D of this MSDP, Mountain Ash commits to the following pertaining to dust control:

- 13.1 Dust control techniques shall be employed in general accordance with the Ghostpine Dust Control Plan prepared at the Development Permit stage.
- 13.2 Mountain Ash shall undertake the following measures to control dust caused by mining and hauling:
  - Paving the entrance road to the pit;
  - Regular watering of gravel roads;
  - Lowering speed limits to 30 km/hr on internal site roads;
  - Surface roughening/win rows of open areas on site;
  - Increasing vegetation beside roads; and
  - Ensuring all topsoil berms/stockpiles are vegetated with an AESRD approved grass seed mixture.
- 13.3 Mountain Ash shall provide a 24-hour number for neighbours within the immediate vicinity to report issues with dust;
- 13.4 Mountain Ash shall promptly investigate any community concerns it receives about dust from its operations if operations are found to be producing excessive fugitive dust, immediate responsive action shall be undertaken.



**Development Concept** 

- 13.5 Stripping, grading and crushing operations will be suspended when excessive wind conditions are experienced, in accordance with Good Neighbour Agreements with adjacent landowners to address their concerns related to excessive fugitive dust emissions being generated on a real time basis.
- 13.6 Mountain Ash shall work collaboratively in partnership with the Big Hills Springs Aggregate Producers Group to monitor and mitigate any cumulative effects that may arise during operations.

### 14.0 Noise Mitigation

SLR Consulting was retained by Mountain Ash to conduct a Noise Impact Assessment at the proposed location (January 2016). SLR examined the noise impacts of proposed operations on the closest six (6) dwellings to the subject site.

Currently there are no standardized methods for conducting aggregate operation noise measurements in Rocky View County. The County regulates noise through the Noise Control Bylaw No. C-5772-2003. The Bylaw states that no person shall "make, continue, cause, or allow to be made or continued any excessive, unnecessary, or unusual noise of any type" and that noise must be "minimized as much as practicable." This Bylaw does not prescribe quantitative limits for noise emissions. Computer noise modeling was used to predict the gravel pit sound level at the nearest dwellings.

A key feature of Summit Pit's noise reduction strategy is construction of a berm around the gravel pit as shown in Figure 8 Phasing and Berming Plan. Mountain Ash will also implement the noise control measures as per the Joint Commitments and Standards in Section D of this MSDP.

#### NOISE POLICIES:

As part of the Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group also outlined in Part D of this MSDP, Mountain Ash commits to the following:

- 14.1 Noise levels generated by the operation will be maintained at or below 65 decibels at the property line. This standard, recommended for Rocky View County by the Alberta Sand and Gravel Association (ASGA), reflects the City of Calgary's daytime noise limit for residential areas.
- 14.2 Joint sound (and dust) monitoring stations will be installed to ensure the determined noise standard is being maintained, as discussed in the statement on cumulative impact mitigation
- 14.3 At development permit stage, a revised Noise Impact Assessment will be submitted demonstrating compliance with the Alberta Energy Regulator's "Directive 038".



15.0 Haul Routes

Summit Pit's location will work to reduce the overall transportation impact of its operations. Direct access onto Highway 567, which is a provincial high load corridor, will eliminate aggregate hauling from Summit Pit's operations on local County roads in order to get to major highways. Truck traffic from the Summit Pit will go from Highway 567 to key markets east of the site, such as Balzac, the Calgary Airport and the north Calgary growth areas. [paragraph moved from former Section 23]

Aggregate produced and transported to market from the Summit Pit will generally service markets east of the proposed aggregate development. Mountain Ash anticipates only 10% of all truck trips west into the Cochrane market due to the existing available supply of aggregates to that market. Mountain Ash proposes the two main transportation routes/networks:

- Route #1 West on Highway 567 will be about 10% of truck trips.
- Route #2 East on Highway 567 will be 90% of truck trips.
  - Route #2A East on Highway 567 into Airdrie which will be about 30% of the Route #2 (East Route) truck trips to and from Summit Pit operations.
  - Route #2B East on Highway 567, south on Highway 766, then East on Highway 1A into Calgary will be about 70% of the Route #2 (East Route) truck trips.

Although there is only one (1) existing aggregate operation along Highway 567 in the Big Hill Springs area, four (4) aggregate operations have approved land use and will be operating in close proximity to each other. As per Section D - Joint Commitments and Standards outlined in this MSDP, Mountain Ash will work with the Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group on issues related to haul routes and transportation.

#### **POLICIES:**

As part of the Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group also outlined in Part D of this MSDP, Mountain Ash commits to the following:

- 15.1 Mountain Ash shall support Alberta Transportation, Rocky View County, and other aggregate producers to appropriately mitigate cumulative impacts related to trucking.
- 15.2 Mountain Ash shall support the implementation of any necessary highway safety improvements along its identified haul routes as may be identified by the County and Alberta Transportation in any future development permit applications.

### 16.0 Site Access & Trucking

Access to the site will be from Provincial Highway 567 at the intersection of Range Road 40 South. Using Range Road 40 South and Highway 567 as a dedicated intersection will facilitate the effective and safe movement of aggregates to the market. Access into the operations from Range Road 40 South would be constructed about 400m south of Highway 567. This access would be paved to reduce dust as well as dirt leaving the site.

A traffic impact assessment (TIA) was commissioned to study the effects of the Summit Pit development on local traffic. A copy of the assessment is provided under separate cover. As identified in the report, both the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic conditions were assessed at existing levels, Opening Day, and the 10-year and 20-year horizons. Data received from the Big Hill Springs Producers Group was used and it was determined that a Type III intersection upgrade was required; however to further mitigate cumulative impacts in the area, Mountain Ash will construct a Type IVa intersection for opening day.

Alberta Transportation has agreed to allow this location to be used for aggregate hauling, provided the intersection is upgraded to a Type IVa and the existing access removed (letter dated June 22, 2015 - see Appendix 8). Alberta transportation re-confirmed its support for the proposed intersection upgrades in a letter dated July 21, 2017. See Section D of this MSDP for joint transportation commitments from the BHAPG.



#### **POLICIES:**

- 16.1 All hauling trucks used as part of Summit Pit operations shall follow appropriate transportation protocols.
- 16.2 All trucks shall follow all posted speed limits and act in a courteous manner particularly when accessing Highway 567 from the site.
- 16.3 All trucks shall be cleaned of loose gravel and be appropriately tarped prior to leaving the site.

As part of the Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group also outlined in Part D of this MSDP, Mountain Ash commits to the following:

- 16.4 All access to the Summit Pit shall be via the intersection of Highway 567 and Range Road 40 South.
- 16.5 All trucks shall arrive during the permitted hours of operations and shall not be allowed to queue at the site entrance.
- 16.6 Mountain Ash shall upgrade the intersection of Highway 567 and Range Road 40 to be a Type IVa intersection prior to opening day.
- 16.7 All trucks hauling for Mountain Ash from Summit Pit shall be appropriately maintained with adequate mufflers.
- 16.8 Where commercially feasible all trucks hauling for Mountain Ash from Summit Pit shall be registered with the Alberta Sand and Gravel Association Truck Registry.
- 16.9 Mountain Ash will participate with other aggregate producers in the vicinity in a joint approach to access to Highway 567.
- 16.10 Mountain Ash supports an auxiliary lane on Highway 567 that connects aggregate operators.

#### Figure 9: Access









**Development Concept** 

## 17.0 Environmental Areas

Mountain Ash undertook a Biophysical Impact Assessment (Ghostpine 2014) that identified a number of Class III wetlands in the northwest and an undisturbed natural area as shown in Figure 6. Summit Pit will employ strategies to avoid several Class III wetlands as identified in the Biophysical Impact Assessment. and the undisrupted natural area. As noted in the Biophysical Impact Assessment, the operations plan will disturb 0.361 ha of wetland area of out of the total 2.317 ha of wetlands located in NW 31-26-3 W5M. Activities that may affect wetlands are subject to the Alberta Environment and Parks Water Act and Alberta Wetland Policy. Mountain Ash will avoid the site's largest wetlands and not develop the undisturbed natural area. An updated Biophysical Impact Assessment will be provided at the Development Permit stage.

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES:

- Shall 17.1 Mountain Ash avoid the site's largest wetlands <del>and not develop the</del> <del>undisturbed natural area</del>.
- 17.2 An updated Biophysical Impact Assessment will be provided at the Development Permit stage.

#### Figure 10: Proposed Joint Highway 567 Access Strategy







#### AGENDA Page 347 of 410









### 18.0 Groundwater Management

SLR Engineering Consultants completed a Hydrogeological Impact Assessment (provided under separate cover) of proposed operations. The study was undertaken to address concerns about the effect of an aggregate operation on local groundwater resources. The purpose of the Assessment was to determine if the project would affect:

- the confined/unconfined aquifers at or near the proposed Summit Pit development,
- neighbours within a 500 m radius of the proposed site, and/or
- Big Hill Springs.

SLR's groundwater assessment concluded the proposed aggregate extraction will not pose any significant or adverse impacts to the existing confined, unconfined groundwater aquifers, or the Big Hills Springs as it pertains to water volume or water quality because aggregate resource will not be mined into the water table. The report therefore anticipated no changes to the groundwater flow system.

To ensure there are no negative effects on the groundwater, Mountain Ash is proposing to excavate to a depth 1.0 m above the groundwater depth. The site will be developed as a dry pit. Mountain Ash will not be mining within the water table, therefore, no Water Act application is required.

In order to monitor the existing groundwater flow system, to give early warning of any unanticipated changes, and to address community concerns related to groundwater, an initial 2 year groundwater monitoring program is being undertaken to determine pre-development and early development groundwater levels. Mountain Ash has installed three perimeter monitoring wells with piezometers at property boundaries. To monitor fluctuations in groundwater levels over time and measure the quantity and quality of groundwater. The monitoring program also includes monitoring four (4) adjacent neighbouring wells that are located within the 800m of the subject site. In addition to the initial groundwater monitoring program, there will be an ongoing groundwater monitoring program with monthly well monitoring.

During the operational phase, a potential source of water pollution would be from man made sources such as fuels, solvents and natural sources such as suspended solids from reworking of the material on site. These potential effects will be mitigated by best handling practices under the Code of Practice for Pits (Alberta, 2004), relevant Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act rules, and other codes of best practice.



#### **POLICIES:**

18.1 Groundwater management techniques shall be employed in general accordance with the SLR Hydrogeological Assessment (2015) which has been provided as part of this MSDP.

As part of the Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group also outlined in Part D of this MSDP, Mountain Ash commits to the following:

- 18.2 As per the Code of Practice for Pits in Alberta all mining operations will be a minimum of 1.0 m above the groundwater table to address community concerns.
- 18.3 Monitoring wells shall be checked quarterly throughout the life of the project and a monitoring report shall be made available upon request or prior to future land use redesignation applications to address community concerns.
- 18.4 Mountain Ash shall provide a 24-hour number for neighbours within the immediate vicinity to report issues with groundwater wells.
- 18.5 Immediate adjacent landowners with concerns regarding groundwater will enter into a Good Neighbour Agreement ensuring protection of water sources.
- 18.5 Mountain Ash shall promptly investigate any community concerns it receives about groundwater wells in the vicinity of its operations.
- 18.6 All potential sources of groundwater contamination from man made sources such as oil and diesel shall be mitigated using best handling practices under the Code of Practice for Pits, Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act rules, and other codes of best practice.
- 18.7 All onsite fuel storage will be contained in PTMAA registered double wall fuel tanks (ULC approved fuel tanks) with 100% secondary containment and emergency vents.

### 19.0 Stormwater Management

SLR Consulting has prepared a conceptual stormwater management report (May 2015). The SWM Report is required to demonstrate how rainfall runoff from the proposed aggregate operation would be managed throughout the course of development. The intent of the assessment is to ensure stormwater is managed onsite to prevent flooding downstream, to prevent pollution of the underlying aquifer or surface water bodies, to provide a gravity system that does not require active pumping, to separately manage runoff from undisturbed areas (clean runoff) whenever possible, and to ensure operations are not affected by stormwater runoff.

Mountain Ash provided SLR with a complete development plan that divided the operations into four phases. SLR determined the infiltration capacity of the in-site sand and gravel layer to determine the size of the area required to ensure enough storage was available under certain rainfall/runoff conditions.

The strategy proposed for each stage are generally similar and include:

- Install perimeter grassed/vegetated ditches at the outer foot of screening berms as initial treatment with appropriately sized settlement ponds as secondary treatment.
- Excavate a sump into underlying sand and gravels to form an area for groundwater recharge (tertiary treatment)
- Provide interception ditches to route clean runoff away from extraction areas and allow for overland dispersal.

POLICIES:		
19.1	Surface water management techniques shall be employed in general accordance with the SLR Hydrogeological Assessment (2015) which forms Appendix 6 of this MSDP.	
19.2	All stormwater runoff shall be handled within settlement lagoons, surface infiltration features, catchment basins, and sumps to manage surface runoff and moisture accumulation within the working area or excavation.	
19.3	The size of the operating and unreclaimed areas shall be limited to a maximum size as determined in a development approval in order to reduce the potential for generation of suspended sediment in stormwater.	
19.4	Several surface water collection features shall be constructed early in the project to ensure the proper staged release of surface runoff is addressed.	
19.5	At the development permit stage Mountain Ash will provide a Stormwater Management Plan.	





Development Concept

# 20.0 Reclamation

Reclamation will be ongoing and continuous throughout the life of the project to maximize the amount of land under agricultural production during pit operations. The size of open areas being used for operations or unreclaimed will be limited to 40 25-33 acres at any one time.

The objective of the final reclamation plan is to return the land to an equivalent agricultural land capability after mining operations are complete. Interim and post reclamation land uses will be agricultural based in keeping with the current use of the site for grazing (pasture land). No ponding or standing water will be left on the landscape as part of the operations (see Figure 11).

During reclamation activities, topsoil and overburden materials will be removed from stockpiles and placed over the reclamation zone. The overburden materials will be placed first with topsoil being spread on top to form the surface layer. To optimize efficiencies, efforts will be made to directly apply the overburden and topsoil materials from expansion areas to reclamation zones as opposed to stockpiling the materials in a storage area.

Replaced topsoil will be seeded with a vegetation seed mixture as soon as practical to help control erosion and weed growth. Determination of seed mixtures will be based on proper land management practices, such as planned crop rotations and/or grazing schedules. Following seeding, the operator will conduct annual inspections to measure the success of the re-vegetation process.

A monitoring and maintenance plan will be developed and implemented to assess the success of reclamation. This would include field identification and documentation as well as the preparation of a report.

#### POLICIES:

- 20.1 Reclamation shall return the land to agricultural production equivalent to the current land capacity.
- 20.2 The size of the operating and unreclaimed areas shall be limited to a maximum of -25-40 acres or greater, but will be determined through applicable County approvals and AEP approvals pursuant to the Code of Practice for Pits in Alberta, as part of a progressive reclamation plan and methodology.
- 20.3 Reclamation of mined areas shall consist of the replacement of salvaged overburden and topsoil with 3:1 side slopes around the mined areas.
- 20.4 Seeding of disturbed areas shall be done with an appropriate seed mix.
- 20.5 A reclamation monitoring and maintenance plan shall be developed to ensure the success of the reclamation.

#### Figure 11: Cross Section of Reclaimed Conditions









Mountain ASH Master Site Development Plan

#### AGENDA Page 353 of 410



**Development Concept** 

# **21.0 Sediment and Erosion Control**

Mountain Ash will undertake appropriate erosion and sediment control during operation and reclamation. Detailed erosion and sediment control plans will be prepared for each Development Permit.

#### **POLICIES:**

- 21.1 Where stormwater flows within the site, silt fencing, erosion control matting, hydroseeding and any other appropriate measures to minimize erosion and siltation shall be undertaken.
- 21.2 Erosion control measures shall be checked on a regular basis and repairs made as required.
- 21.3 Any ditches and culverts shall be checked to ensure stormwater flows are maintained.
- 21.4 Summit Pit shall provide a detailed erosion and sediment control plan at the Development Permit stage.

### 22.0 Weed Management Control

The project area will be monitored for noxious and restricted weeds as defined by the Weed Control Act and regulations and applicable Rocky View County Land Use Bylaw regulations. Herbicide may be applied to weeds as controlled under the Provincial Code of Practice for Pesticides and the Environmental Code of Practice for Pesticides. Summit Pit will engage RVC field men on soil handling and weed control management techniques employed during operations.

#### **POLICIES:**

- 22.1 Mountain Ash shall undertake weed control during operation and reclamation as directed by the Weed Control Act and the Rocky View County Land Use Bylaw.
- *22.2 Mountain Ash shall provide a detailed weed control plan at the Development Permit stage.*

AGENDA Page 355 of 410

### SECTION D

Jointly Managing Offsite Impacts (Cumulative Effects)

> AGENDA Page 356 of 410

### **23.0 Council Motion on Joint Standards**

The motion arising from the July 11, 2017 Rocky View County Council meeting, directed Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group to work collaboratively on a joint Master Site Development Plan in order to:

- i. Identify consistent minimum standards that all operations will adhere to;
- ii. Establish joint measures to minimize and monitor cumulative impacts on the local area, including identifying acceptable mitigation strategies for affected properties within a mile and a half from the property lines of the gravel pits; and
- iii. Review and adapt transportation access and egress to HWY 567 that would maximize safety and result in a design that would allow loaded gravel trucks to maximize their speed to safely merge into highway 567's lanes as determined by RVC engineering and Alberta Transportation.

The Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group has met together multiple times and worked collaboratively to address the above motion from Rocky View County Council. The result is a series of commitments on engagement, communication and joint standards that is presented in this chapter of the MSDP.



**Jointly Managing Offsite Impacts** 

## 24.0 Joint Commitments

Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group (BHSAPG) is committed to continue to work with our local stakeholders. Based on previous engagement the group has identified joint measures to minimize and monitor cumulative impacts for the local area.

- The group commits to keeping noise from the on-site operation to less than 65 decibels at the project property line. Notwithstanding the above, occasional exceedances of the 65 decibels may occur. Notifications will be given to neighbours prior to loud work, or when operators expect noise volumes to exceed 65 decibels.
- The group will work to coordinate any loud decibel work, such as stripping and reclamation.
- Operators will work to reduce noises produced at site when possible while still ensuring the best occupational, health and safety practices.
- Start and stop times will be strictly adhered to:
  - o Monday to Friday: 7am to 7pm
  - o Saturday: 7am to 5pm
  - o No activity on Sundays or statutory holidays
- Dust control measures will be used and will be based on industry best practices. The operators
  will participate in joint dust mitigation efforts. This may include, but is not limited to, water
  spraying on crushers, landscaping barriers, calcium chloride, watering of gravel roads, lowering
  speed limits within project boundaries, and other appropriate methods.
- Queuing on a highway is a traffic safety violation. Each operator will work to educate truckers so there is an understanding that queuing will not be tolerated on the highway. Operators, where possible, will work with enforcement authorities to ensure queuing is not tolerated.

### 24.0 Joint Commitments cont.

- Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group will work with Alberta Transportation at the design phase to discuss relevant local impacts and safety measures for joint intersection and traffic design on Highway 567. Mitigation strategies may include:
  - o Area lighting
  - o Signage and other roadside indicators
  - o Appropriate speed limits
  - o Improving sight lines
  - o Climbing lane warrants
- Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group believes that constructing an auxiliary lane on Highway 567 connecting both intersections is desirable and would support Alberta Transportation's review and approval. This is an effort to mitigate the cumulative effects of traffic from the aggregate producers in the area and a commitment to ensure the safety of vehicles traveling on Highway 567.
- Each operator will install suitable berms and buffers surrounding the sites to minimize visual, dust and noise nuisances to adjacent landowners.
- Noise and air quality monitoring details will be shared publicly through the Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group joint website.
- Operators will work with adjacent neighbours to share information from the ongoing groundwater monitoring process.
- Big Hills Springs Aggregate Producers Group will adhere to a shared communication plan. The communications plan will support engagement with neighbouring resident and businesses.

#### JOINT COMMITMENTS POLICIES:

24.1 Mountain Ash will adhere to the above joint commitments of the BHSAPG.



**Jointly Managing Offsite Impacts** 

# **25.0 Joint Communication Plan**

Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group (BHSAPG) will achieve active communication with surrounding residents and businesses, supporting open and ongoing dialogue with all producers and our neighbours.

### LEVEL OF ENGAGEMENT

<b>General Public</b> Goal: To provide balanced and objective information to a broad audience.	Residents & Businesses within 1.5 mile radius Goal: To gather input on the project, to establish ongoing	Adjacent Neighbours Goal: To work directly with neighbours to ensure that concerns are understood and
Engagement Tactics	communications Engagement Tactics	addressed Engagement Tactics
Engagement Contact	Engagement Contact	Engagement Contact
Project Website	Project Website	Project Website
Yearly Public Event	Yearly Public Event	Yearly Public Event
	Stakeholder Committee	Stakeholder Committee
		Individual Meetings
		Special Mitigation Arrangements

- I. BHSAPG will provide an engagement contact number. Residents will be able to report concerns or questions and expect a quick response from an operator on behalf of the Producers Group.
- II. A project website will be maintained by BHSAPG to provide information to the community, including details on cumulative effects management and monitoring such as noise and dust. The website will also provide residents a feedback mechanism, where they can ask questions and leave feedback for BHSAPG.
- III. A yearly public event will be hosted on project sites so the community is able to see the operations firsthand, meet their local business representatives and receive updates on the projects.
# 25.0 Joint Communication Plan cont.

- IV. A volunteer Stakeholder Committee will be formed, inviting residents within a 1.5 mile radius of the project sites to participate. The Stakeholder Committee will establish:
  - a. How Committee members wish to be engaged and through what media (in person meetings, newsletters, email, etc);
  - b. How often the Committee wishes to meet or to be engaged;
  - c. What information the Committee wishes to discuss;
  - d. A means to resolve future complaints for residents in the 1.5 mile radius; and
  - e. Any other matter as determined by the Committee.
- V. Regular individual meetings with adjacent neighbours and those most directly impacted by the operations will be held at Weedon Hall with representatives from each aggregate producer. These will be held as required either by the projects or the local residents. BHSAPG is committed to providing relevant project information at the meetings and responding to neighbour questions with appropriate subject matter experts and topics such as development permitting, Alberta Transportation, or groundwater monitoring information.
- VI. Special mitigation arrangements for adjacent neighbours may be required from time to time over the life of the projects. As part of being a responsible neighbour, members of the BHSAPG are committed to responding to adjacent neighbour concerns quickly and appropriately.

### JOINT COMMITMENTS POLICIES:

25.1 Mountain Ash will adhere to the above joint communication plan of the BHSAPG.





AGENDA Page 361 of 410



**Jointly Managing Offsite Impacts** 

# **26.0 Joint Operating Standards Policies**

The Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group (Lafarge, McNair Sand & Gravel, Mountain Ash Limited Partnership) have determined a set of operating standards as a measure to ensure consistency among operators and minimize impacts beyond the extraction sites. The establishment of consistent standards not only upholds best practices for aggregate extraction, but also helps to reduce cumulative impacts and ensures that the quality of life of adjacent neighbours is maintained.

#### JOINT NOISE POLICIES:

- 26.1 Noise levels generated by the operation will be maintained at or below Permissible Sound Levels calculated in accordance with the methodologies and guidelines of the Alberta Energy Regulator's (AER) 'Directive 038: Noise Control'. At development permit stage, a revised Noise Impact Assessment will be submitted to Rocky View County, demonstrating compliance with the Directive.
- 26.2 Joint sound (and dust) monitoring stations will be installed to ensure the determined noise standard is being maintained. A Noise Mitigation Plan and Monitoring Program will be submitted at development permit stage outlining, at a minimum, noise mitigation practices and monitoring levels and locations.

#### JOINT AIR QUALITY POLICIES:

- 26.3 PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> levels will be monitored to ensure compliance with Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and Alberta Ambient Air Quality Objectives (AAAQO), respectively. In order to meet or exceed these standards, PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels will remain at or below a 24-hour average of 28 μg m<sup>-3</sup> (CAAQS), while PM<sub>10</sub> levels will remain at or below a 24-hour average of 100 μg m<sup>-3</sup> (AAAQO).
- 26.4 The Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group supports the involvement of the Alberta Sand and Gravel Association (ASGA) in any provincial policy forums on silica.
- 26.5 As detailed in the Joint Community Commitments, the operators will participate in joint dust mitigation efforts. In addition, joint dust (and sound) monitoring stations tracking wind patterns and rainfall will be operated to ensure the air quality standards are met. An Emissions Mitigation Plan and Monitoring Program will be submitted at development permit stage outlining, at a minimum, dust mitigation practices and monitoring intervals and locations.

# 26.0 Joint Operating Standards cont.

### JOINT TRAFFIC POLICIES:

re op	rticipation in the ASGA Truck Registry program (or equivalent) will be quired for all commercially licensed trucks directly controlled by the perator. A Traffic Management Plan will be submitted at development prmit stage. At a minimum, the Plan will include:
1.	Measures to control the driving behaviour of aggregate haulers accessing the site and providing discipline procedures for non- compliance:
	• The use of In-Vehicle Monitoring Systems shall be investigated and implemented, unless it can be demonstrated that the use of IVMS would not have positive impacts on operations and traffic safety.
2.	Proposals to reduce safety conflicts between site traffic and other road users; and
3.	Measures to ensure that all vehicles leave the site in a state that will prevent aggregate materials and other detritus from being deposited on the road/highway network.
	• Measures shall include the paving of the internal driveway a minimum length of 100 metres from the highway right of way, with construction to appropriate road standards.
joi wl ali 56 th int an	a discussed in the Joint Community Commitments (Appendix B), a int intersection will be created for the sites to improve traffic safety here feasible. Additionally, the intersection upgrades completed for three gravel pits will allow the gravel truck traffic to merge onto Hwy 77 safely. The Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group believes at constructing an auxiliary lane on Highway 567 connecting both tersections is as an additional safety enhancement, subject to review and approval by which would support Alberta Transportation's review and approval.
be	so subject to Alberta Transportation approval, the auxiliary lane will constructed to a length which allows loaded gravel trucks to reach % of the posted highway speed before the lane ends.

50



**Jointly Managing Offsite Impacts** 

# 26.0 Joint Operating Standards cont.

#### JOINT VISUAL & LANDSCAPE POLICIES:

- 26.8 Common berms will be constructed along Highway 567, both to provide a visual barrier and as a mitigation strategy for dust and noise. Appropriate setbacks from the highway will be determined based on the Alberta Transportation Roadside Development Permit process and Rocky View County standards. Berms will also be constructed as deemed appropriate to reduce visual impact and meet dust and noise commitments. Berms will be seeded to grass, following industry best practice.
- 26.9 Attractive site entrances and signage will also be provided to enhance the visual quality of the landscape.

#### JOINT GROUNDWATER POLICIES:

26.10 As a measure to ensure protection of the groundwater, only dry extraction will be permitted and a minimum buffer of 1 m above the water table will be maintained. Groundwater levels will be monitored using piezometers to ensure compliance with the Water Act. Individual operators will work with adjacent neighbours to address any concerns that may arise, while the Stakeholder Committee will provide a venue to discuss ongoing groundwater monitoring.

> A Groundwater Monitoring Plan will be submitted at Development Permit stage, which measures the impact of the development on groundwater quality and quantity. The submitted Groundwater Monitoring Plan will provide for remedial actions in the event that identified trigger levels are breached.

# 26.0 Joint Operating Standards cont.

#### JOINT HOURS OF OPERATION POLICIES:

26.11 Activities will be restricted to the following hours of operation:

Monday to Friday: 7am to 7pm Saturday: 7am to 5pm No activity on Sundays or statutory holidays

#### JOINT RECLAMATION POLICIES:

- 26.12 Reclamation will be completed in accordance with Part 5 of the Code of Practice for Pits, which sets requirements regarding the conservation of soil and subsoil and the characteristics of reclamation.
- 26.13 Progressive reclamation is strongly encouraged to ensure that the area of disturbance is minimized at any given time and postextraction lands are returned to their former agricultural state.

### JOINT MONITORING POLICIES:

26.14 As discussed in the Joint Community Commitments, Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group will collectively monitor noise, dust and groundwater levels, with monitoring data published on a joint website. Investigation procedures will be determined for non-compliance and complaints, and a lead from the Group will be nominated to manage complaints on behalf of the sites. Regular liaison meetings will be held with appointed residents once a website has been established as a forum to provide operational updates and provide up-to-date information to residents.

MOUNTAIN ASH Master Site Development Plan



**Jointly Managing Offsite Impacts** 

# 26.0 Joint Operating Standards cont.

### JOINT ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES:

26.15 The requirements of relevant provincial legislation (Code of Practice for Pits, Water Act) and the requirements of the County Servicing Standards will be met to ensure that environmental impacts are minimized.

### JOINT EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL & STORMWATER POLICIES:

26.16 Erosion and sediment control and stormwater management will be addressed onsite by the individual operators to meet the requirements of the County Servicing Standards.

# **27.0 Joint Transportation Strategy**

The MSDPs for McNair, Lafarge and Mountain Ash gravel pit applications went before Council on July 11, 2017. Additional details were requested through a Motion Arising. Regarding Transportation, Administration was to work collaboratively with the MSDP Applicants noted above to:

Review and adapt transportation access and egress to HWY 567 that would maximize safety and result in a design that would allow loaded gravel trucks to maximize their speed to safely merge into highway 567's lanes as determined by RVC engineering and Alberta Transportation.

The three Applicants, collectively known as the Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group (the Aggregate Group), commissioned WATT Consulting Group (WATT) to review the adequacy of the Type IV intersection layout to service the gravel pit operations. This review included traffic from the existing gravel pit and the Aggregate Group's proposed gravel pits.

The WATT letter states:

From the traffic perspective, Type IV [intersections] provides for safe traffic operation since it ensures that the turns at the intersection are executed without or with minimal impact on the traffic along Highway 567. It will provide more than adequate capacity to accommodate expected turning movements.

And further, the WATT letter concludes:

Type IV intersections will adequately support gravel extraction areas.

Alberta Transportation has also provided a letter to Administration regarding the sufficiency of the proposed Type IV intersections for the proposed gravel pit operations. The Alberta Transportation letter states:

The location of the access to Highway 567 ... [from the proposed Mountain Ash gravel pit] ... is approved and is to be constructed to a "Type IVa" intersection treatment...

The location of the new access to Highway 567 [for the proposed combined gravel operations intersection] that is 800 metres west of the ... [proposed Mountain Ash gravel pit access] ... is approved and is to be constructed to a "Type IVc" intersection treatment...

These intersection treatments are considered suitable to provide access and egress from Highway 567 to the gravel operations, with minimal disruption to highway traffic.

The WATT letter and the Alberta Transportation letter are provided in Appendix B, Traffic Assessment.



# **Jointly Managing Offsite Impacts**

It is further noted that at a meeting between Administration, Alberta Transportation and the MSDP Applicants held on July 20, 2017, Administration confirmed that they have accepted the proposed intersection locations and Type in theory. Detailed design of the proposed intersection will be confirmed at the development permit stage. They mentioned that this was implicit in their recommendation for approval of the proposed Land Use and the related MSDPs.

The original MSDP submission to the County reflected traffic associated with the McNair BRADI Pit only. The following discussion includes traffic associated with the three proposed gravel pits and the existing gravel pit.

#### Summary of existing traffic and proposed gravel pit traffic:

#### Highway 567

- o 2 lane paved highway under Alberta Transportation jurisdiction
- o 4,670 vehicles per day (Average Annual Daily Traffic)
- o 8,500 vehicles per day (volume where highway is a candidate for twinning)

#### **Gravel Operations**

#### McNair BRADI Pit

• 43 loaded trucks - expected average loaded trucks per day leaving pit

#### Combined Pit Access (McNair BRADI, Lafarge, Existing pit)

- 153 loaded trucks expected average loaded trucks per day leaving pits
- This includes 60 existing loaded trucks per day from existing pit

#### Mountain Ash Pit Access

50 loaded trucks - expected average loaded trucks per day leaving pit

#### Totals from the Aggregate Group's proposed gravel pits

- 143 additional loaded trucks added to Highway 567
- 286 vehicles per day the above number (146) expressed as average annual daily traffic which includes loaded trucks leaving and unloaded trucks entering the gravel pits.
- 6.1% traffic volume increase on Highway 567 due to the Aggregate Group's expected gravel truck traffic.

It is noted that loaded gravel trucks accelerate at a slower rate than passenger vehicles which can impact merging with highway traffic. While Type IV intersections have been deemed appropriate by Rocky View County Administration, Alberta Transportation and the Aggregate Group's Engineers, it is understood that the ultimate length of the acceleration lanes is determined through detailed design.

# 27.0 Joint Transportation Strategy cont.

As noted in the WATT letter:

It should also be noted that an idea to construct an auxiliary lane on the south side of Highway 567 connecting both intersections has been discussed as an additional option to provide acceleration distance for loaded trucks on the predominant movement.

The Big Hill Springs Aggregate Producers Group (BHSAPG) believes that constructing an auxiliary lane on Highway 567 connecting both intersections is an additional safety enhancement and would support Alberta Transportation's review and approval. This is an effort to mitigate the cumulative effects of traffic from the aggregate producers in the area and a commitment to ensure the safety of vehicles traveling on Highway 567.

In summary, Rocky View County Administration and Alberta Transportation support the intersection Types and locations in theory. Detailed design of the proposed intersection will be confirmed at the development permit stage. Alberta Transportation has no issues with the additional traffic on Highway 567. The proposed gravel pit operations traffic can be accommodated through Type IV intersections and the detailed design through the Development Permit process will ensure the intersections are built with appropriate acceleration lanes.

JOINT TRANSPORTATION POLICIES:

27.1 Mountain Ash will adhere to the above joint transportation strategy of the BHSAPG.



**Jointly Managing Offsite Impacts** 

AGENDA Page 371 of 410

# SECTION E

# Implementation

AGENDA Page 372 of 410

# 28.0 Rocky View County Land Use Redesignation Approval

A land use redesignation is required to change the existing Ranch and Farm District (RF) to Natural Resource and Industrial (NRI) District. A land use redesignation from Ranch and Farm (RF) to NRI was approved by Council on July, 2017 for Phase 1 of the development. All development regulations and development setbacks contained in the Natural Resource Industrial District and applicable sections of the Land Use Bylaw shall apply to this site. The land use redesignation shall be approved by Rocky View Council after a Public Hearing. Following the removal of aggregate materials, the subject lands will be returned to agricultural land use.

A land use redesignation shall be sought prior to the commencement of each phase of development. Each land use application and subsequent development permit will be updated with the latest monitoring and site information to enable a thorough assessment of operations. A road closure application will also be required prior to development.





# 29.0 Rocky View County Development Permit Approval

Mountain Ash shall obtain development permits at each phase of mining to ensure Mountain Ash is operating within the purview of this MSDP and the Natural Resource and Industrial (NRI) District. Development Permits shall be renewed with each phase of development.

Development Permit applications shall:

- Set maximum areas for active mining operations,
- Set weed management techniques (i.e., provide updated weed management plan),
- Set dust control measures,
- Set erosion and sediment control,
- Set expectations for noise and dust limits, monitoring, and reporting,
- Require updated/site-specific stormwater management planning,
- Monitory cumulative efforts by providing updates on:
  - extraction activities;
  - reclamation activities,
  - noise monitoring activities (operating and ambient noise), and
  - dust monitoring activities.

# 30.0 Provincial Approvals

# **Code of Practice for Pits**

Mountain Ash has completed a Code of Practice application to be submitted to Alberta Environment and Parks in support of the Summit Pit project upon approval of Mountain Ash's MSDP and land use redesignation application. The Code of Practice is a document that requires a gravel pit registration holder to perform certain duties during the life of the pit. Examples of information required which is to accompany a Code of Practice for Pits in Alberta is illustrated in Table 2.

# Table 2: Code of Practice Reporting Requirements (Alberta Environment & Parks)

- Pit Water Monitoring
- Contravention Reports
- Five Year Reports
- Final Reclamation Reports
- Operating Records
- Reclamation Certification
- Activities Plan

- Full Cost Security
- Extraction Setbacks
- Depth of Excavation
- Wildlife Considerations
- Noise
  - End land uses
  - Sequence of Operations

- Soil Conservation
- Drainage
- Soil Replacement
- Re-vegetation
- Weed Control



# Water Act Approval

Alberta Environment & Parks (AEP) is also responsible for provincial approvals under the Water Act. Under the Water Act, a Wetland Impact Assessment (WIA) is required in areas where wetlands may be impacted by development. These studies will be prepared and submitted to Alberta Environment and Parks at the future Development Permit stages.

# Historic Resource Act Approval

Historic Resource Act Clearance from Alberta Culture is required prior to development on the site. This approval was granted on September 16, 2014 for the entire quarter section.

# **Roadside Development Permit**

Mountain Ash will require a Roadside Development Permit to be approved by Alberta Transportation prior to operations because the proposed development is within 800m of Provincial Highway 567. Mountain Ash will prepare and submit this application subsequent to the approval of the MSDP and prior to any operations occurring on the site.

AGENDA Page 377 of 410

# SECTION F

# Appendices

AGENDA Page 378 of 410

# 31.0 Appendices

# The following appendices are provided under separate cover

- 1. Certificate of Title
- 2. Historic Resources Act Approval Alberta Culture
- Biophysical Impact AssessmentGhostpine Environmental Services (November 2014)
- 4. Hydrogeological Assessment SLR Global Environmental Solutions (February 2015)
- Noise Impact Assessment
  SLR Global Environmental Solutions (January 2016)
- 6. Conceptual Stormwater Management Report SLR Global Environmental Solutions (May 2015)
- 7. Transportation Impact Assessment Watt Consulting Group (August 2014)
- 8. Air Quality Assessment in support of the Summit Aggregates Pit Application Millennium CMS Solutions Ltd (March 2015)
- 9. Letters from Alberta Transportation Alberta Transportation (July 2017)
- 10. Transportation Memo Watt Consulting Group (2017)

MOUNTAIN ASH Master Site Development Plan





APPENDIX 'D': Map Set Master Site Development Plan Proposal: To amend the Summit Pit Master 100 of 106 Development Plan to update the phasing plan, environmental area policies and mapping.

Figure 7: Site Plan







Contours are generated using 10m grid points, and depict general topographic features of the area. Detail accuracy at a local scale cannot be guaranteed. They are included for reference use only.

# TOPOGRAPHY Contour Interval 2 M

# NW-31-26-03-W05M

Date: Nov 23, 2017

Division #9

File: \_06731002

AGENDA Page 384 of 410



Page 385 of 410







**DIVISION:** All

# LEGISLATIVE AND LEGAL SERVICES

TO: Council

**DATE:** April 24, 2018

FILE: N/A

**SUBJECT:** Appointment of Councillor to the Springbank Airport Community Noise Consultative Committee

### <sup>1</sup>ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Councillor McKylor be appointed as the Rocky View County representative on the Springbank Airport Community Noise Consultative Committee until the 2021 Rocky View County Organizational Meeting.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

Prior to 2015, the area Councillor was appointed as Rocky View County's representative on the Springbank Airport Community Noise Consultative Committee (SACNCC). However, on September 29, 2015, Council rescinded that appointment because the SACNCC Terms of Reference (TOR) stated that the committee member should be a staff member of Planning Services.

In 2017, the SACNCC updated their TOR. The SACNCC TOR no longer requires Rocky View County's representative to be a staff member of Planning Services. Given that the objective of the committee is to facilitate dialogue and information exchange, Council may wish to revisit the decision to rescind the appointment of the area Councillor.

To that end, Administration has prepared a motion for Council's consideration that would put the Councillor for the Springbank area back on the SACNCC for the duration of this Council's term of office.

Administration recommends Option #1.

### BACKGROUND:

The SACNCC was established by the Calgary Airport Authority with the following objective: "to provide a forum that enables dialogue and information exchanges between airport operators, community representatives, and airport users." The committee includes members from flight training schools, the Calgary Airport Authority, NavCanada, Transport Canada's Aerodrome Safety Branch, and six community members who live in the area. Meetings are not open to the public.

The SACNCC TOR states that the purpose of the Committee is to:

- Provide an interface between the Airport Authority and its stakeholders;
- Serve as a forum for the exchange of relevant information amongst all stakeholders;
- Enhance awareness and understanding of the airport operations;
- Examine noise management issues; and
- Allow the discussion of potential operational options.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Administrative Resources

Angie Keibel, Manager – Legislative and Legal Services



The TOR goes on to state that "SACCC meetings are about bringing in knowledge, data from studies, looking at options when possible and keeping the community informed of any industry changes from a technical perspective."

## **BUDGET IMPLICATION(S):**

N/A

# **OPTIONS:**

- Option #1: THAT Councillor McKylor be appointed as the Rocky View County representative on the Springbank Airport Community Noise Consultative Committee until the 2021 Rocky View County Organizational Meeting.
- Option #2: THAT Council provide alternate direction.

Respectfully submitted,

"Kent Robinson"

Interim County Manager

ADK

# ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 'A' - SACNCC Terms of Reference

# SPRINGBANK AIRPORT COMMUNITY NOISE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

D-6 Page 3 of 4

Terms of Reference May, 2017

The Calgary Airport Authority (the Authority) established the Springbank Airport Community Noise Consultative Committee (SACNCC) with the objective being to provide a forum that enables dialogue and information exchanges between airport operators, community representatives, and airport users.

### 1. Purpose

The purpose of the Committee is to:

- Provide an interface between the Airport Authority and its stakeholders.
- Serve as a forum for the exchange of relevant information amongst all stakeholders.
- Enhance awareness and understanding of the airport operations.
- Examine noise management issues.
- Allow the discussion of potential operational options.

The SACCC meetings are about bringing in knowledge, data from studies, looking at options when possible and keeping the community informed of any industry changes from a technical perspective.

### 2. Membership

Members of the committee will comprise representatives from the following:

- Airport major tenants (e.g. flight training schools, fixed-base operators, etc.).
- Calgary Airport Authority.
- Community members.
- NavCanada.
- Rocky View County.
- Springbank Airport Business and Pilots Association.
- Transport Canada's Aerodrome Safety Branch.

Community membership will be open to five (5) representatives with residence near the Springbank Airport and one (1) representative from the Harmony community nominated by the Harmony Homeowners' Association.

Openings for the community membership will be advertised in local newspapers. Community members must express their interest to join the committee in writing to the Authority. The Authority will review the expressions of interest and appoint the representatives for a two (2) year period. The membership of the Committee will be reviewed and reconfirmed by the Authority bi-annually.





## 3. Meetings

Meetings will be held biannually. At the final meeting each year, the committee will approve the schedule for the following year.

Meetings will be held at the Calgary Flying Club boardroom and chaired by the Springbank Airport General Manager.

Meetings may include matters related but not limited to the following:

- Technical aspects of operations at YBW.
- Noise management.
- Plans for airport growth.
- Potential changes to airspace.
- Community Outreach opportunities.

Invitation to propose agenda items will be sent two weeks before the scheduled meeting, and final meeting agenda will be circulated electronically to committee members seven days before the meeting.

Meetings are not open to the public.

Springbank Airport is one of Canada's busiest airport in terms of aircraft movement. Operating 24 hours a day, we are a busy and growing airport that is the primary general aviation reliever airport for Calgary International Airport. The operations and development of Springbank Airport are directed to supporting light aircraft activity including flight training, recreational flying, corporate and air charter activity and compatible aircraft maintenance, manufacturing and support operations.

The Calgary Airport Authority Springbank Airport springbankairport@yyc.com





# ENGINEERING SERVICES

TO: Council

**DATE:** April 24, 2018

DIVISION: All

FILE: 1015-750 / 1025-225

**SUBJECT:** Budget Adjustment to Receive ACRP Grant Funds

# <sup>1</sup>ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Cooperative Stormwater Management Initiative budget adjustment in the amount of \$7,600,000 be approved as in Attachment 'A'.

# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The Cooperative Stormwater Management Initiative (CSMI) has secured \$7.6 million in funding from the Province of Alberta to begin Phase I engineering and construction activities in 2018.

The 2018 Base Budget was completed prior to the completion of the funding agreement between the County and the Province, and as such, the funds are not considered with the Base Budget. Administration requires an approved budget adjustment to formally receive and allocate the funds.

# **BACKGROUND:**

CSMI is a collaborative partnership between the City of Chestermere, the City of Calgary, Rocky View County, the Town of Strathmore, Wheatland County and the Western Irrigation District, with Alberta Environment and Parks participating as an observer.

The focus of CSMI is the development of long-term sustainable stormwater management system that, together with existing WID infrastructure, is resilient in wet years and has capacity to meet irrigation needs in dry years.

Further, the development of common shared infrastructure helps member communities overcome the limited number natural drainage courses that can effectively transfer stormwater within the CSMI region, while also adopting a collaborative approach to the management and funding of the system.

The Province of Alberta, through the Alberta Community Resilience Program (ACRP) provides funding for projects which enhance or enable the protection of infrastructure, and/or mitigate public safety hazards.

In the fall of 2017, Rocky View County applied for \$7.6 million in funding, on behalf of CSMI, to fund engineering, regulatory, and construction activities. The application was subsequently approved by the Province, with funds being made available in March 2018, and a budget adjustment is required in order for the County to formally receive these funds.

### **OPTIONS:**

Option #1 THAT the Cooperative Stormwater Management Initiative budget adjustment in the amount of \$7,600,000 be approved as in Attachment 'A'.

Option #2 THAT alternative direction be provided.

<sup>1</sup>Administration Resources

Doug Hafichuk, Engineering Services



Respectfully submitted,

Concurrence,

"Byron Riemann"

General Manager

"Kent Robinson"

Interim County Manager

DH

ATTACHMENTS:

ATTACHMENT 'A' – ACRP Grant Funds Budget Adjustment

### Attachment 'A'

# ROCKY VIEW COUNTY BUDGET ADJUSTMENT REQUEST FORM BUDGET YEAR: <u>2018</u>

Description			Budget	
Description EXPENDITURES:	ACRP Funding for CSN	VII	Adjustment	
Furtherance of CSMI en Includes activities	ngineering/construction activ including but not limited to e or the buildout of the require	engineering, regulatory approvals,	(7,600,000)	
TOTAL EXPENSE:			(7,600,000)	
REVENUES:			(1)000,000,	
Alberta Provincial Gran (ACRP Funds for CSN (Agreement 18GRAC	ИI)		7,600,000	
TOTAL REVENUE:			7,600,000	
NET BUDGET REVISIO	N:		0	
REASON FOR BUDGET REVISION: Provincial grant was approved outside of the County's annual budget cycle Grant agreement effective 24-January-2018 / Amendment effective 21-March-2018				
AUTHORIZATION:				
Acting County Mana	ager: Kent Robinson	Council Meeting Date:		
General Man	ager Byron Riemann	Council Motion Reference:		
Mana				
		Budget AJE No:		
		Posting Date:		

**DIVISION:** All



# FINANCIAL SERVICES

TO: Council

**DATE:** April 24, 2018

**FILE:** 2025-350

SUBJECT: 2018 Tax Rate Bylaw C-7764-2018

# <sup>1</sup>ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:

- Motion 1: THAT Bylaw C-7764-2018 be given first reading.
- Motion 2: THAT Bylaw C-7764-2018 be given second reading.
- Motion 3: THAT Bylaw C-7764-2018 be considered for third reading.
- Motion 4: THAT Bylaw C-7764-2018 be given third and final reading.

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Under the *Municipal Government Act* Section 353 (1), "Each council must pass a property tax bylaw annually". The property tax bylaw authorizes Council to impose a tax in respect of property in the County to raise revenue to be used toward the payment and delivery of County services. The 2018 tax rate bylaw includes a 1.7% Municipal tax increase as well as increased tax revenue related to new assessment growth that has taken place within Rocky View County. Bylaw C-7764-2018 also includes a 6.0% tax increase related to education amounts, a 6.3% tax increase related to the Rocky View Foundation and a new requisition from the Province of Alberta for the administration of Designated Industrial Properties.

Administration recommends **Option #1.** 

# BACKGROUND:

Property taxes are the difference between the County's total expenditures and revenues relating to user fees and government transfers. Under the *Municipal Government Act* Section 353 (1), "Each Council must pass a property tax bylaw annually". The property tax bylaw authorizes Council to impose a tax in respect of property in the County to raise revenue to be used toward the payment and delivery of County services. Funds raised from taxes support the General Municipal services and Emergency services delivered by Rocky View County to its residents.

The final assessment roll is used to set the County's tax rates and an update is included with this report as Attachment 'B'. The 2018 tax rate bylaw includes a 1.7% or \$1,116,100 Municipal tax increase as well as increased tax revenue 3.1% or \$2,576,600 related to new assessment growth. Bylaw C-7764-2018 also includes a 6.0% or \$2,677,900 tax increase related to education, a 6.3% or \$39,100 tax increase related to the Rocky View Foundation and a new requisition from the Province of Alberta for the administration of Designated Industrial Properties in the amount of \$62,800. These amounts are external requisitions and Rocky View County collects these funds through the property tax system and forwards these amounts to the requisitioning bodies. Random property samples have been included to demonstrate total tax impacts as represented in Attachment "C".

# **BUDGET IMPLICATION(S):**

\$ 117,520,900 – Total external requisitions and Municipal taxes


#### **OPTIONS:**

Option #1:	Motion 1:	THAT Bylaw C-7764-2018 be given first reading.
	Motion 2:	THAT Bylaw C-7764-2018 be given second reading.
	Motion 3:	THAT Bylaw C-7764-2018 be considered for third reading.
	Motion 4:	THAT Bylaw C-7764-2018 be given third and final reading.
Option #2:	THAT Counci	I provides alternative direction.

Respectfully submitted,

"Kent Robinson"

Acting County Manager

BW/ls

### ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 'A' – Bylaw C-7764-2018

Attachment 'B' - Final Assessment Roll

Attachment 'C' – Property Samples – Tax Impacts



# **BYLAW C-7764-2018**

# A Bylaw of Rocky View County to authorize the rates of taxation to be levied against assessable property for the 2018 taxation year.

The Council of Rocky View County enacts as follows:

#### **PURPOSE & TITLE**

- 1 The purpose of this bylaw is to authorize the rates of taxation to be levied against assessable property for the 2018 taxation year.
- 2 This bylaw shall be known as the "2018 Tax Rate Bylaw".

#### DEFINITIONS

- 3 In this bylaw:
  - (a) **"Designated Industrial Property"** has the same meaning as in Section 284(1)((f.01)
  - (b) **"Farm Land"** has the same meaning as Section 297(4)(a) of the *Municipal Government Act* and Section 2(f) of Matters Relating to Assessment and Taxation Regulation;
  - (c) **"Machinery and Equipment"** has the same meaning as in Section 284(1)(I) and 297(4)(a.1) of the *Municipal Government Act;*
  - (d) "*Municipal Government Act*" means the *Municipal Government Act,* RSA 2000, c M-26, as amended from time to time;
  - (e) **"Non-Residential Property"** has the same meaning as in Section 297(4)(b) of the *Municipal Government Act*;
  - (f) **"Parcel of Land"** has the same meaning as in Section 1(1)(v) of the *Municipal Government Act;*
  - (g) **"Property"** has the same meaning as in Section 284(1)(r) of the *Municipal Government Act*, and
  - (h) **"Residential Property"** has the same meaning as in Section 297(4)(c) of the *Municipal Government Act.*

## TAX RATES

- 4 Rocky View County (hereinafter referred to as the "County") has prepared and adopted detailed estimates of the municipal revenues and expenditures as required.
- 5 The estimated municipal expenditures and transfers set out in the budget for the County for 2018 total \$267,150,700.
- 6 The estimated municipal revenues and transfers from all sources other than taxation is estimated at \$149,629,800 and the balance of \$117,520,900 is to be raised by general municipal taxation.
- 7 The requisitions are:

Alberta School Found	lation	Fund		
(ASFF) Residential Non-Residential			\$ 29,798,145 <u>13,931,878</u> <u>\$ 43,730,023</u>	
Opted Out School Boards Residential Non-Residential			\$ 2,903,317 <u>813,842</u> <u>\$ 3,717,159</u>	
Rocky View Seniors Found	dation		\$ 663,342	
Designated Industrial Prop	<u>perty</u>		\$ 62,798	

- 8 The Council of the County is required each year to levy on the assessed value of all property the tax rates sufficient to meet the estimated expenditures and the requisitions.
- 9 The Council is authorized to classify assessed property and to establish different rates of taxation in respect to each class of property, subject to the *Municipal Government Act.*
- 10 Section 297 of the *Municipal Government Act* provides that the assessor must assign one or more of the following classes to the property: residential, non-residential, farm land, and machinery and equipment, and that the assessor may assign one or more sub-classes to a property if a council, by bylaw, divides the residential and non-residential classes into sub-classes.
- 11 The County Manager is hereby authorized to levy the following rates of taxation on the assessed value of all taxable property as shown on the Assessment Roll of the County:

<u>Tax</u>	<u>Tax Levy</u>	<u>Assessment</u>	<u>Rate</u>
General Municipal			
Residential	\$ 25,276,066	12,674,790,050	1.9942
Farmland	683,176	152,256,890	4.4870
Non-Residential	18,279,487	3,055,442,000	5.9826

Machinery and Equipment Linear	3,192,536 <u>7,577,435</u> <u>\$ 55,008,700</u>	533,636,920 <u>1,266,579,000</u> <u>17,682,704,860</u>	5.9826 5.9826
Emergency Services Residential Farmland Non-Residential Machinery and Equipment Linear	\$ 6,588,355 178,079 4,764,656 832,153 <u>1,975,103</u> <u>\$ 14,338,346</u>	$\begin{array}{r} 12,674,790,050\\ 152,256,890\\ 3,055,442,000\\ 533,636,920\\ \underline{1,266,579,000}\\ 17,682,704,860 \end{array}$	0.5198 1.1696 1.5594 1.5594 1.5594
Alberta School Foundation Fund (ASFF) Residential/Farmland Non-Residential	\$ 29,798,145 <u>13,931,878</u> <u>\$ 43,730,023</u>	11,686,005,319 <u>3,926,020,865</u> <u>15,612,026,184</u>	2.5499 3.5486
Opted Out School Boards (Calgary) Residential/Farmland Non-Residential	\$ 2,903,317 <u>813,842</u> <u>\$ 3,717,160</u>	1,138,600,431 <u>229,341,845</u> <u>1,367,942,276</u>	2.5499 3.5486
<b>Rocky View Seniors Foundation</b>	\$ 663,342	17,682,704,860	0.0375
Designated Industrial Property	\$ 62,798	1,855,168,840	0.0341

12 The assessed value of all taxable property in the County as shown on the Assessment Roll is:

Residential	12,674,790,050
Farmland	152,256,890
Non-Residential	3,055,442,000
Machinery and Equipment	533,636,920
Linear	<u>1,266,579,000</u>
	<u>17,682,704,860</u>

13 The minimum Tax Levy for each individual taxable property in the County is \$20.00

#### TRANSITIONAL

14 Bylaw C-7764-2018 is passed when it receives third reading, and is signed by the Reeve/Deputy Reeve and the Municipal Clerk, as per the *Municipal Government Act.* 

Division: All File: 2025-350

READ A FIRST TIME IN COUNCIL this	day of	, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME IN COUNCIL this	day of	, 2018
UNAMIMOUS PERMISSION FOR THIRD READING	day of	, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME IN COUNCIL this	day of	, 2018

Reeve

Municipal Clerk

Date Bylaw Signed

Page 4 AGENDA Page 401 of 410

ATTA	ACHMENT 'B'		
Final Assesssment Roll for 2018 Tax Rates			
Property Class	2018		
	\$	%	
Residential	12,674,790,050	71.6%	
Farmland	152,256,890	0.9%	
Non-Residential	3,055,442,000	17.3%	
Machinery & Equipment	533,636,920	3.0%	
**LINEAR	1,266,579,000	7.2%	
Totals	17,682,704,860	100.00%	

#### Rocky View County 2018 Tax Impacts Property Samples

	2017 Assmt	2017 Mun.Portion	2017 External Reg's	2017 Total Tax	2018 Assmt	2018 Mun.Portion	2018 External Reg's	2018 Total Tax
Example #1: Vacant Farm 159 Acres	\$44,900	\$250.39	\$112.94	\$363.33	\$44,900	\$253.98	\$116.17	\$370.15
Example #2: Gravel Pit with improvements*	\$4,179,060	\$31,073.40	\$7,254.91	\$38,328.31	\$4,167,860	\$31,434.00	\$7,347.75	\$38,781.75
Example #3: Highway Commercial*	\$2,284,300	\$16,984.91	\$8,026.80	\$25,011.71	\$2,192,900	\$16,538.85	\$7,863.96	\$24,402.81
Example #4: Golf Course West of Calgary*	\$6,845,700	\$50,901.20	\$24,055.11	\$74,956.31	\$6,863,800	\$51,766.78	\$24,614.27	\$76,381.05
Example #5: Shopping Centre	\$863,700	\$5,565.77	\$2,862.47	\$8,428.24	\$880,000	\$5,752.03	\$2,980.00	\$8,732.03
Example #6: Wrangler office/shop	\$5,584,400	\$41,522.81	\$19,623.02	\$61,145.83	\$5,736,530	\$43,264.91	\$20,571.77	\$63,836.68
Example #7: Vacant Land - Wrangler Bus Park	\$935,300	\$6,954.42	\$3,286.55	\$10,240.97	\$979,200	\$7,385.13	\$3,511.51	\$10,896.64
Example #8: Industrial Site (Compressor site)*	\$4,568,000	\$33,965.36	\$2,712.47	\$36,677.83	\$4,613,800	\$34,797.28	\$2,897.41	\$37,694.68
Example #9: Bottrel area acreage 19.37 ac.	\$844,700	\$2,093.59	\$2,124.76	\$4,218.35	\$856,100	\$2,152.24	\$2,215.07	\$4,367.31
Example #10: Res.in Conrich area - 2.00 ac.	\$1,251,400	\$3,101.59	\$3,147.78	\$6,249.37	\$1,220,700	\$3,068.84	\$3,158.44	\$6,227.28
Example #11: Res. In Escarpment - 2.00 ac.	\$2,149,700	\$5,173.38	\$5,250.40	\$10,423.78	\$2,048,200	\$5,149.17	\$5,299.51	\$10,448.69
Example #12: Res. in Bearspaw - 2.00 ac.	\$1,016,600	\$2,519.64	\$2,557.15	\$5,076.79	\$1,040,400	\$2,615.57	\$2,691.93	\$5,307.50
Example #13: Res. in Indus area - 3.72 ac.	\$585,000	\$1,449.92	\$1,471.51	\$2,921.43	\$570,000	\$1,432.98	\$1,474.82	\$2,907.80

**DIVISION:** 4



# FINANCIAL SERVICES

TO: Council

**DATE:** April 24, 2018

**FILE:** 2025-350

**SUBJECT:** 2018 Langdon Special Tax Rate Bylaw C-7765-2018

### <sup>1</sup>ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:

- Motion 1: THAT the budget adjustment be approved as per Attachment 'C'.
- Motion 2: THAT Bylaw C-7765-2018 be given first reading.
- Motion 3: THAT Bylaw C-7765-2018 be given second reading.
- Motion 4: THAT Bylaw C-7765-2018 be considered for third reading.
- Motion 5: THAT Bylaw C-7765-2018 be given third and final reading.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Bylaw C-7765-2018 authorizes a special tax for recreation services in the Hamlet of Langdon. This special tax totals \$88,600 and will assist in the quality and delivery of recreation services. Under section 383(1) of the *Municipal Government Act*, "the special tax bylaw authorizes the Council to impose the tax in respect of property in any area of the County that will benefit from the specific service or purpose stated in the bylaw". As the 2018 operating base budget currently has an amount of \$84,600 Administration has attached a budget adjustment for \$4,000 bringing the total budget to \$88,600.

Administration recommends Option #1.

### BACKGROUND:

Recreation services in the hamlet of Langdon, means "the purpose of providing funding for an increased service delivery model for the development of community programs, amenities and events exclusively for community organizations that operate and support projects within the Hamlet of Langdon, as approved by the County". The special tax raised in the hamlet of Langdon will be used to support recreational services and will enhance the quality and delivery of these services. All taxable properties within the Hamlet of Langdon are subject to this special tax, Attachment 'B' – area map.

In 2017 Councilor Ashdown provided a motion amending the 2017 tax rate bylaw from \$88,600 to \$84,600 and amended the tax rate from 0.01047 to 0.1000. This was done to fix the tax rate at 0.1000 and allow increased assessment to increase the amount collected. Administration determined that this methodology does not accomplish its intended goal as it will take more time to raise the actual amount required. This motion was passed by a majority of Council in 2017.

The current bylaw (C-7765-2018) has a tax rate of 0.1029 thus raising an amount of \$88,600 which is the amount requested by Recreation Services for its intended purpose. Currently there is an amount of \$84,600 in the 2018 operating base budget. It is in this regard that Administration is recommending approval to increase the budget from \$84,600 to \$88,600 as per attachment 'C' and to give three readings to Bylaw C-7765-2018.



### **BUDGET IMPLICATION(S):**

\$4,000

#### **OPTIONS:**

Option #1:	Motion 1:	THAT the budget adjustment be approved as per Attachment 'C'.
	Motion 2:	THAT Bylaw C-7765-2018 be given first reading.
	Motion 3:	THAT Bylaw C-7765-2018 be given second reading.
	Motion 4:	THAT Bylaw C-7765-2018 be considered for third reading.
	Motion 5:	THAT Bylaw C-7765-2018 be given third and final reading.
Option #2:		THAT Council provides alternative direction.

Respectfully submitted,

"Kent Robinson"

Acting County Manager

### ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 'A' – Bylaw C-7765-2018 Attachment 'B' – Area Map Attachment 'C' – Budget Adjustment



# **BYLAW C-7765-2018**

# A Bylaw of Rocky View County to authorize a Special Tax for Recreational Services to be levied against assessable property in the Hamlet of Langdon for the 2018 Taxation Year.

The Council of Rocky View County enacts as follows:

#### **PURPOSE & TITLE**

- 1 The purpose of this bylaw is to authorize a Special Tax for Recreation Services to be levied against assessable property in the Hamlet of Langdon for the 2018 taxation year.
- 2 This bylaw shall be known as the "2018 Langdon Special Tax Rate Bylaw".

#### DEFINITIONS

- 3 In this bylaw:
  - (a) **"Farm Land**" means land used for farming operations as defined in the regulations passed under the *Municipal Government Act;*
  - (b) **"Machinery and Equipment**" has the same meaning as in Section 284(1)(I) and 297(4)(a.1) of the *Municipal Government Act*;
  - (c) "*Municipal Government Act*" means the *Municipal Government Act*, RSA 2000, c M-26, as amended from time to time;
  - (d) **"Non-Residential Property"** has the same meaning as in Section 297(4)(b) of the *Municipal Government Act*;
  - (e) **"Parcel of Land**" has the same meaning as in Section 1(1)(v) of the *Municipal Government Act*;
  - (f) **"Property**" has the same meaning as in Section 284(1)(r) of the *Municipal Government Act*,
  - (g) **"Recreation Services**" means providing funding for an increased service delivery model for the development of community programs, amenities, and events exclusively for community organizations that operate and support projects within the Hamlet of Langdon, as approved by the County; and
  - (h) **"Residential Property**" has the same meaning as in Section 297(4)(c) of the *Municipal Government Act.*

Page 1

#### LANGDON SPECIAL TAX RATE

- 4 The estimated municipal expenditures and transfers set out in the budget for Recreational Services in the Hamlet of Langdon for 2018 total \$88,600.
- 5 The Council of Rocky View County is required each year to levy on the assessed value of all property in the Hamlet of Langdon the tax rates sufficient to meet the estimated expenditures for Recreation Services in the Hamlet of Langdon.
- 6 The assessed value of all taxable property in the Hamlet of Langdon as shown on the Assessment Roll is:

<u>Assessments</u>

Residential/Farmland	825,270,860
Non-Residential	<u>35,665,060</u>
	860.935.920

7 The County Manager is hereby authorized to levy the following rates of taxation on the assessed value of all taxable property as shown on the Assessment Roll of the County:

	<u>Tax Levy</u>	<u>Assessment</u>	Tax Rate
<u>Recreational</u> <u>Services</u>	\$ 88,600	860,935,920	0.1029

#### TRANSITIONAL

8 Bylaw C-7765-2018 is passed when it receives third reading, and is signed by the Reeve/Deputy Reeve and the Municipal Clerk, as per the *Municipal Government Act.* 

		<b>Division:</b> 4 <b>File:</b> 2025-350
READ A FIRST TIME IN COUNCIL this	day of	, 2018
READ A SECOND TIME IN COUNCIL this	day of	, 2018
UNAMIMOUS PERMISSION FOR THIRD READING	day of	, 2018
READ A THIRD TIME IN COUNCIL this	day of	, 2018

Reeve

Municipal Clerk

Date Bylaw Signed



Attachment 'C'

E-2 Page 7 of 7

## ROCKY VIEW COUNTY INTERIM BUDGET ADJUSTMENT REQUEST FORM BUDGET YEAR: <u>2018</u>

Description		Budget Adjustment		
EXPENDITURES:		,		
Langdon Recreation		4,000		
		.,		
TOTAL EXPENSE:		4,000		
REVENUES:				
Special Langdon Tax		(4,000)		
TOTAL REVENUE:		(4,000)		
NET BUDGET REVISIO	N:	0		
REASON FOR BUDGET REVISION:				
To increase the Langdon recreation amount to enhance recreation services within the Hamlet.				
AUTHORIZATION:				
County Manager:	Council Meeting Date:			
General Manager :	Council Motion Reference:			
Ocheral Manager .				
Manager:	Date:			
L				
	Budget AJE No:			
	Posting Date:			