

# 2025

## Operating & Capital Budget Requests



ROCKY VIEW COUNTY

### *What is the Operating and Capital Budget Request Book?*

The 2025 Operating and Capital budget request document contains proposed 2025 budget changes to the base budget for Council's consideration.

### *Why is this Important?*

In 2024, the County began its transition from a department-based budgeting process to a service-based budgeting process, aligning the County's yearly budgeting exercise to its recently developed Service Management Framework, which applies a service-based lens on everything the County delivers.

The 2025 County budget document presents the County's proposed budget by service. The proposed budget consists of base budget changes for known and estimated factors by Administration at the time of budget preparation. This report summarizes all proposed base budget changes to increase transparency in the budgeting process.

### *How do I read it?*

The service budgets are organized by our existing County divisions based on the department who leads the service delivery for the County, allowing for linkage between our services and the departments that offer these services.

Only services with a base budget change will have a 2025 Operating and Capital budget request for Council's consideration.

Each service requesting a change to its budget describes its recommended changes via a budget request form containing the following sections:

### **Request Summary**

This section summarizes all resource investment being recommended by:

- **Resource Request:** The specific resource that the service needs to continue to operate at an agreed upon service level.
- **Requesting department:** The County department that is requiring the additional resources for service delivery continuity or enhancement. This could be the service lead department or a service partner department.
- **Subservices:** The County currently offers 53 services that are associated with 164 sub-service, each of which provides the County with a unique service offering. All County's Service and Sub-service descriptions are detailed in the County's 2024 service book. Service descriptions can also be found in the 2025 County budget document.
- **Investment Type:** The County categorizes all proposed investment changes to base budget into four categories, defined below:
  - New Initiative: This can be a proposed new service at the County or proposed changes to an existing service that allows the service to be delivered in a new way. A request in this category is mainly initiated by Council direction and law or regulatory authority. It can also be a CAO sponsored initiative.
  - Growth in service request: This is a proposed investment change due to increase demand in volume or complexity for an existing service.
  - Price Increases: This is a proposed investment change due to year over year price increases, evident by 3-year historic average of the service price or a contract pricing change with a vendor.

- Capital Asset Replacement: This is a proposed investment change due to a Tangible Capital Asset (TCA) reaching its end of useful life or becoming obsolete because of regulatory changes.

### **Budget Request**

The monetary cost of the investment to the County.

### **Recommendation**

This section puts forward a specific recommendation to Council regarding the investment request.

### **Justification**

This section details the why behind the recommended investment request, with a focus on the service current state and its target state.

### **Financial Implication**

This section details the financial impact of the budget request, highlighting the expense type (Operating vs. Capital), funding source (Grant, Reserve, Tax, Debt), highlighting impact to taxation and the duration of the monetary commitment.

### **Strategic Alignment**

This section creates the link between the County's Strategic plan (2023 -2027) and the recommended resource investment. Some recommendations are statutory obligations and may not support any of the key performance indicators contained in the County's strategic plan.

### **Alternative**

This section provides viable alternatives to the recommended investment, if any, that Administration has considered.

### **Risk to Alternative**

This section provides an explanation on why the alternative has not been recommended.

### *What is the purpose of the Operating and Capital Budget Request Report?*

The objective of this report is to provide increased transparency to the budgeting process as Council works through the 2025 budget deliberation.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.....	5
Communications.....	6
Corporate Planning & Monitoring .....	9
Council Representation .....	12
Public Engagement.....	14
 Community Services.....	 16
Development Planning & Approval .....	17
 Corporate Services.....	 19
Election Management.....	21
Human Resource Access .....	23
Intergovernmental Relations .....	25
Recreation, Leisure and Culture Facility Access & Programming .....	28
Special Event Permission .....	33
 Financial Services .....	 35
Financial Management .....	36
Information Technology Management .....	38
Procurement.....	45
Property Tax Assessment & Collection.....	46
 Infrastructure Services.....	 48
Agricultural Programming .....	51
Cemetery Services .....	53
Emergency Management.....	54
Engineering Design and Construction .....	56
Environmental Protection & Awareness.....	58
Facility Access.....	60
Fire Services Planning and Response .....	62
Fleet Provision .....	68
Incident Response.....	71
Land Administration .....	73
Prevention and Compliance .....	74

Roadway Access .....	75
Roadway Special Access .....	81
Stormwater Drainage .....	82
Utility Permission & Locating.....	85
Vegetation and Pest Management.....	87
Waste Collection and Processing .....	89
Wastewater Collection & Treatment.....	93
Water Treatment & Distribution .....	97
 Rocky View County .....	 101

## OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

SUMMARY OF SERVICE REQUEST Office of the Chief Administrative Officer						
Services	Investment Type	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Budget Request
Council Representation & Executive Coordination	Growth in Service Request; Price Increase	Operating	Tax	10,500	28,600	39,100
Communications	New Initiative; Growth in Service Request; Price Increase	Operating	Tax	-	408,300	408,300
Corporate Planning and Monitoring	Growth in Service Request	Operating	Tax	-	302,500	302,500
Public Engagement	New Initiative	Operating	Tax	-	131,900	131,900
<b>Total</b>				<b>10,500</b>	<b>871,300</b>	<b>881,800</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>						<b>881,800</b>

SERVICE REQUEST BY INVESTMENT TYPE Office of the Chief Administrative Officer	
Investment Type	Budget Request
New Initiatives	252,900
Growth in Service Request	569,400
Price Increase	59,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>881,800</b>

# 1. Communications

## Request Summary

The Communications service is requesting an investment of \$408,300 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
1 FTE – Special Event Hosting	Communications & Engagement	Special Event Hosting	New Initiative	121,000
1 FTE – Communication Advisor	Communications & Engagement	External Communications	Growth in Service Request	146,900
1 FTE – Website Coordinator	Communications & Engagement	External Communications	Growth in Service Request	109,500
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Communications & Engagement	All subservices – Communications & Engagement	Price Increase	30,900
<b>Total</b>				<b>408,300</b>

<sup>1</sup>General expenses include travel and subsistence, advertising, publications and subscriptions, services, printing and promotions.

## Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$408,300 for Communications service due to a proposed new initiative for County-wide coordination of special events, growth in service request for existing communications services, and increased prices for general expenses.

## Justification

### Investment: 1 FTE – Special Event Hosting

#### Current State

In 2024 there was a noticeable increase in event hosting requests, both internally for County services and externally for community events. Many of these requests are left unsupported because the service does not have sufficient capacity to meet the growing demand, shifting the burden back onto other County services to facilitate their own events. This results in an inconsistent experience for both residents and staff.

#### Target State

To deliver a consistent experience at all County-supported special events, Communications and Engagement service requires a full-time Events Advisor to plan and execute internal and external events more effectively. The additional FTE will enable this service to handle the growing volume and complexity of event requests, maintaining service levels, and preventing staff burnout. With a dedicated events advisor, the department can shift to a more strategic approach to event management, ensuring that all events align with the County's goals and are executed efficiently.

### Investment: 1 FTE – Communication Advisor

#### Current State

In 2024, there has been a significant increase in service requests by service customers for the following services:

- Operational Requests – Up by 17% from previous year
- Communication Projects – Up by 26% from previous year
- Key Projects – Up by 31% from previous year
- Council-Related Requests – Up by 35% from previous year

Capacity within the Communications service is unable to meet the increased requests with current resources. This results in an inability to support approved strategies, future growth, or other priority deliverables.

#### **Target State**

The increased demand for communication services, coupled with the strategic direction towards proactive communication and enhanced public engagement, necessitates additional resources and capacity.

#### **Investment: 1 FTE – Website Coordinator**

#### **Current State**

To meet increasing demands and maintain service standards, appointing a Website Coordinator to manage routine operational tasks would enable our existing Webmaster and Graphic Designer to focus on advanced projects. This adjustment ensures efficient response times, frequent updates, and the progression of larger strategic initiatives. The lack of capacity is leading to delays and could potentially hinder our ability to fulfill approved strategies and accommodate future growth.

#### **Target State**

Incorporating a full-time Website Coordinator is crucial to manage the growing demand for communication services effectively. This role will support our shift towards proactive communication and enhanced public engagement by ensuring timely updates and allowing existing staff to concentrate on more complex and advanced projects.

#### **Investment: General Expenses**

#### **Current State**

Cost increases are occurring in travel reimbursements due to the increase in price of meals and accommodations. Advertising channel costs, publications, and service costs are also increasing as they are not tied to multi-year contracts that would lock in costs. There has also been an increased cost from suppliers for food and entertainment that is utilized for promotional events such as the County Open House.

#### **Target State**

The general expense investment would align the budget with the actual costs of providing the existing services.



### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
1 FTE – Special Event Hosting	Operating	Tax	-	121,000	121,000
1 FTE – Communication Advisor	Operating	Tax	-	146,900	146,900
1 FTE – Website Coordinator	Operating	Tax	-	109,500	109,500
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	-	30,900	30,900
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>408,300</b>	<b>408,300</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>408,300</b>

### Strategic Alignment

This investment aligns with the County's strategy of Effective Service Delivery:

- **SD2:** *Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.*

### Alternative

#### Investment: 1 FTE – Special Event Hosting

Deferring the investment in an Events Advisor until 2026.

#### Investment: 1 FTE – Communication Advisor

Invest in 1 FTE (Website Coordinator) and defer the investment in a Communications Advisor.

#### Investment: 1 FTE – Website Coordinator

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

#### Investment: General Expenses

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

### Risk to Alternative

#### Investment: 1 FTE – Special Event Hosting

Delaying the investment will leave the department operating at a below average service level, resulting in inconsistent event quality and lapses in public engagement. The underlying issues and risks related to demographic changes, misinformation, and inadequate engagement will persist.

#### Investment: 1 FTE – Communication Advisor

This alternative focuses on enhancing website and design work while acknowledging the limitations in content creation and messaging. This would allow the County to provide a more robust internal service to customers, while accepting limitations to any proactive external messaging to the public.

#### Investment: 1 FTE – Website Coordinator

N/A

#### Investment: General Expenses

N/A

## 2. Corporate Planning & Monitoring

### Request Summary

The Corporate Planning and Monitoring service is requesting an investment of \$302,500 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Service Optimization Support	Strategy & Performance	Service Optimization	Growth in Service Request	40,000
0.5 FTE – Service Optimization	Strategy & Performance	Service Optimization	Growth in Service Request	67,200
1.5 FTE – Service Plan & Monitoring	Strategy & Performance	Program and Service Plan Development and Monitoring	Growth in Service Request	195,300
<b>Total</b>				<b>302,500</b>

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$302,500 for Corporate Planning and Monitoring service due to growth in volume and complexity of requests from service customers.

### Justification

#### Investment: Service Optimization Support

##### Current State

Rocky View County's Strategic Plan prioritizes continuous assessment of services for innovation opportunities and demonstrable efficiency improvements. While the County continues to build internal capability and capacity to do continuous improvement, some assessments require external support or expertise for analysis or implementation.

##### Target State

To support our strategic objectives and meet the expectations of Council and citizens, a well-rounded Service Optimization program would integrate internal resources and external support. This support could take the form of expertise, training, or technology investments.

#### Investment: 2 FTE – Staffing Requirement

##### Current State

##### 0.5 FTE – Service Optimization

There is a heavy dependence on external consultants by Strategy and Performance in continually assessing County services for improvements in cost efficiency, effectiveness, and customer experience. An example of such optimization is the successful implementation of the Planning Department Diagnostic and subsequent Enhancement Strategy. To date in 2024, four services have been identified as critical for review. Strategy and Performance is leading these reviews with some external consultant expertise (\$0-\$40,000 per review).

### 1.5 FTE – Program and Service Plan Development and Monitoring

The introduction of the service management framework saw the identification of 850 service performance metrics that will support Administration's monitoring of service performance and improve accountability and transparency to Council and ratepayers. All 850 metrics require various degrees of data development support, which includes data collection processes and storage, analysis, and reporting capacity and capability.

### Target State

#### 0.5 FTE – Service Optimization

The recommended investment would ensure sustainable internal expertise to offer a County service optimization program. This investment would reduce the need for external consultant support to less than half the cost in some cases, and no cost for reviews that do not require specialized service expertise.

#### 1.5 FTE – Service Plan Development and Monitoring

The recommended investment would support the County in improving accountability and transparency, and would ensure that the target implementation for the Service Management Framework of Q4 2026 includes the development of all relevant service performance metrics.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Service Optimization Support	Operating	Tax	-	40,000	40,000
0.5 FTE - Service Optimization	Operating	Tax	-	67,200	67,200
1.5 FTE - Service Plan and Monitoring	Operating	Tax	-	195,300	195,300
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>302,500</b>	<b>302,500</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>302,500</b>

### Strategic Alignment

This investment aligns with the County's strategy of Effective Service Delivery:

- **SD4:** Services are continually assessed for improvements in cost efficiency, effectiveness, and customer experience.
- **SD4.1:** Services that are assessed annually for innovation opportunities and have demonstrable efficiency improvements

### Alternative

#### Investment: Service Optimization Support

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo, accessing external resources on an ad hoc basis.

#### Investment: 2 FTE – Staffing Requirement

An alternative considered by Administration is for current service levels to be maintained with external consultant support.

Risk to Alternative
<p><b><u>Investment: Service Optimization Support</u></b></p> <p>The absence of Service Optimization supports would reduce the organization’s ability quickly and efficiently access expertise and may delay the efficiency impacts.</p> <p><b><u>Investment: 2 FTE – Staffing Requirement</u></b></p> <p>Due to dependency on external consultants, the County may incur a significantly higher cost to meet ratepayer expectations, and to meet the strategic objective outlined in the County Strategy to ensure that services are continuously assessed for improvements in effectiveness, efficiency, and customer experience.</p>

### 3. Council Representation & Executive Coordination

#### Request Summary

The Council Representation & Executive Coordination service is requesting an investment of \$39,100 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Council Training	CAO Office	Representation of Public Interest	Growth in Service Request	10,500
2025 Elected Official Devices	CAO Office	Representation of Public Interest	Price Increase	21,800
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	CAO Office	<sup>2</sup> Executive Coordination	Price Increase	6,800
<b>Total</b>				<b>39,100</b>

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses include materials, travel and subsistence, publication and subscriptions, memberships, etc.

<sup>2</sup>Executive Coordination as a sub service was excluded from the 2024 service mapping exercise.

#### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$39,100 for Council Representation & Executive Coordination services due to training requirements and increasing prices for general expenses.

#### Justification

##### Investment: Council Training

##### Current State

2025 is an election year. Policy C-195 (*unapproved*) mandates the training of new councilors, and the current base budget does not factor in the expense associated with required training.

##### Target State

To comply with Policy C-195, a budget adjustment of \$10,500 (\$1,500 per Councilor) is required for Council Representation Services. This adjustment will cover the costs of mandatory training and the provision of new devices for elected officials.

##### Investment: 2025 Elected Official Devices

##### Current State

In 2025, there is an upcoming municipal election, and newly elected official will require new devices.

##### Target State

Council Representation services require an adjustment of \$21,800. The \$21,800 increase is due to expenses related to the upcoming election and the provision of devices for the newly elected official.

##### Investment: General Expenses

##### Current State

There is a year-over-year price increase in general expenses for Council Representation services, evident through a review of the actual cost of general expenses over the last 3 years.

### Target State

Council Representation services require an adjustment of \$6,800. The \$6,800 is due to the price increase on general expense of the CAO Office.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Council Training	Operating	Tax	10,500	-	10,500
2025 Elected Official Devices	Operating	Tax	-	21,800	21,800
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	-	6,800	6,800
<b>Total</b>			<b>10,500</b>	<b>28,600</b>	<b>39,100</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>39,100</b>

### Strategic Alignment

An investment in council training is in accordance with Policy C-195. An investment in general expenses for the representation of public interest sub-service is in alignment with the Effective Service Delivery strategy:

- **SD2:** Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.
- **SD2.1:** Citizens satisfied with the range of County services available/delivered.

### Alternative

#### Investment: Council Training

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

#### Investment: 2025 Elected Official Devices

N/A

#### Investment: General Expenses

N/A

### Risk to Alternative

#### Investment: Council Training

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

#### Investment: 2025 Elected Official Devices

N/A

#### Investment: General Expenses

N/A

## 4. Public Engagement

### Request Summary

Public Engagement service is requesting an investment of \$131,900 for the following resource:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
1 FTE – Mandated Consultation/Public Engagement	Communications & Engagement	Mandated Consultation	New Initiative	131,900
<b>Total</b>				<b>131,900</b>

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$131,900 towards an enhanced public engagement strategy for the County.

### Justification

#### Investment: **1 FTE – Mandated Consultation/Public Engagement**

#### Current State

The Public Engagement service currently has 1 FTE responsible for developing County-wide strategies and plans on public engagement. Due to a significantly high volume of County service engagement activities, this resource has been diverted to support actual engagements, leaving many public engagement strategic tasks unaddressed. Currently, several public engagements are managed within each department. A temporary engagement coordinator has been hired (July-Dec 2024) to assist with data analysis and support; however, this demand will remain into 2025.

#### Target State

The recommended investment will enable this service to meet the increasing demands and expectations of the public more effectively. This will include developing a centralized and coordinated approach to engagement, reducing reliance on external consultants, and providing a consistent experience for residents.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
1 FTE – Mandated Consultation/Public Engagement	Operating	Tax	-	131,900	131,900
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>131,900</b>	<b>131,900</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>131,900</b>

Strategic Alignment
<p>This investment aligns with the County's strategy of Effective Service Delivery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>SD3:</b> <i>Citizens are satisfied with Public Engagement opportunities and availability of information.</i></li> </ul>
Alternative
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>1 FTE – Mandated Consultation/Public Engagement</b></p> <p>An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.</p>
Risk to Alternative
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>1 FTE – Mandated Consultation/Public Engagement</b></p> <p>Engagements managed within each department, leading to inefficiencies and a heavy reliance on external consultants, resulting in an inconsistent and uncoordinated experience for residents.</p>



## COMMUNITY SERVICES

SUMMARY OF SERVICE REQUEST Community Services						
Services	Investment Type	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Budget Request
Development Planning and Approval	Growth in Service Request	Operating	Tax	300,000	-	300,000
<b>Total</b>				<b>300,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>300,000</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>						<b>300,000</b>

SERVICE REQUEST BY INVESTMENT TYPE Community Services	
Investment Type	Budget Request
Growth in Service Request	300,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>300,000</b>

## 5. Development Planning & Approval

### Request Summary

The Development Planning and Approval service is requesting an investment of \$300,000 in the following resource:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Joint Planning – Consulting Costs	Intergovernmental & Regional Planning	Long Range Planning	Growth in Service Request	25,000
Land Use Inventory and Fiscal Impact Model	Intergovernmental & Regional Planning	Long Range Planning	Growth in Service Request	275,000
<b>Total</b>				<b>300,000</b>

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$300,000 to enable the completion of required legislation and regional projects of the Calgary Metropolitan Growth Plan, and to create a Land Use Inventory as well as a Growth and Fiscal Impact Model.

### Justification

#### Investment: Consultant Costs – Joint Planning

##### Current State

The Long-Range Planning sub-service has an increased service demand due to the legislated requirements of the Calgary Metropolitan Growth Plan (i.e. JPA Context Studies, MDP updates, etc.), as well as the need for stronger relationship and greater data to address the County's development pressures.

##### Target State

The recommended investment will enable the new Regional Planning team to complete the required legislated and/or mutually beneficial regional projects, as well as foster key regional relationships, and demonstrate leadership within region.

#### Investment: Consultant Costs – Land Use Inventory and Fiscal Impact Model

##### Current State

The County lacks a clear and consistent system and methodology for collecting, analyzing, and presenting growth and development data. A consistent Land Use Inventory, as well as a Growth and Fiscal Impact Model, would provide the County with reliable data for decision making and monitoring.

##### Target State

The recommended investment will enable decision making based on up-to-date, accurate, and repeatable data across the County. This will assist with both local and regional decision-making. This information would be useful for numerous subject areas across the County (e.g. Regional Planning, Economic Development, Planning, Engineering and Capital Projects, Utility Services, etc.).

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Joint Planning Agreement- Growth and Fiscal Impact model – Consulting Costs	Operating	Tax	25,000	-	25,000
Land Use Inventory and Fiscal Impact Model – Consulting Costs	Operating	Tax	275,000	-	275,000
<b>Total</b>			-	-	<b>300,000</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>300,000</b>

### Strategic Alignment

This investment aligns with the County's strategy of Thoughtful Growth:

- **TG3:** *Demonstrating leadership within the CMRB and leveraging the County's strategy for growth within the Regional Growth Plan*
- **TG1:** *Clearly defining land use policies and objectives for the County – including types, growth rates, locations, and servicing strategies*

### Alternative

#### Investment: **Consultant Costs – Joint Planning Areas**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo, which would be a reduction of legislated service requirement.

#### Investment: **Land Use Inventory and Fiscal Impact Model**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to continue to assess growth and development with ad hoc and limited data collection.

### Risk to Alternative

#### Investment: **Consultant Costs – Joint Planning Areas**

This alternative Increases the risk that the County fails to be involved within the region in a manner that secures and promotes the County's interests. The County's capability to be a leader within the region and ability to meet the Strategic Plan's KPIs would be negatively impacted.

#### Investment: **Land Use Inventory and Fiscal Impact Model**

This alternative means the County would lack fulsome data for decision making.

## CORPORATE SERVICES

SUMMARY OF SERVICE REQUEST						
Corporate Services						
Services	Investment Type	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Budget Request
Election Management	New Initiative	Operating	Tax; Reserve	50,000	-	50,000
Human Resource Access	Growth in Service Request; Price Increase	Operating	Tax	-	92,400	92,400
Intergovernmental Relations	Growth in Service Request; Price Increase	Operating	Tax	-	137,700	137,700
Recreation, Leisure, & Culture Facility Access and Programming	New Initiative; Growth in Service	Operating; Capital	Tax; Reserve	12,600,000	200,900	12,800,900
Special Event Permission	New Initiative	Operating	Tax	10,000		10,000
<b>Total</b>				<b>12,660,000</b>	<b>431,000</b>	<b>13,091,000</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>						<b>714,900</b>

SERVICE REQUEST BY INVESTMENT TYPE	
Corporate Services	
Investment Type	Budget Request
New Initiatives	12,885,000
Growth in Service Request	105,300
Price Increase	100,700
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,091,000</b>

SERVICE REQUEST BY INVESTMENT TYPE (Tax Funded)	
Investment Type	Budget Request
New Initiatives	508,900
Growth in Service Request	105,300
Price Increase	100,700
<b>Total</b>	<b>714,900</b>

## 6. Election Management

### Request Summary

The Election Management service is requesting an investment of \$50,000 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Permanent Electors Register Software	Information Technology	Election Facilitation	New Initiative	50,000
<b>Total</b>				<b>50,000</b>

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$50,000 for Election Management service due to a requirement under the *Local Authorities Election Act*.

### Justification

#### Investment: Permanent Electors' Register Software

#### Current State

Municipal elections occur every four years, and the County is responsible for collecting and counting ballots cast by eligible voting residents to determine which candidates are elected to serve as councillors or school trustees. The County allocates a set amount to the reserve each non-election year to offset increased costs in election years. The set amount would have been enough to cover the total cost of elections, but the province is implementing a permanent electors' register for all future elections, which results in a tax impact for 2025.

#### Target State

The County will continue to manage elections every four years as legislated. Future transfers to the reserve will account for the cost of a permanent electors register.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Permanent Electors Register Software	Operating	Tax; Reserve	50,000	-	50,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>50,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>50,000</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>43,900</b>

### Strategic Alignment

This is a legislated requirement under the *Local Authorities Election Act*. Conducting municipal elections is a requirement under the *Local Authorities Election Act*. The new investment in election facilitation would align with the effective service delivery goals of the Strategic Plan. It would also increase the County's election service levels and clearly define and communicate them to residents, as well as ensuring that the County's election service level is adequately resourced and delivered to residents.

Alternative
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>Permanent Electors' Register Software</b></p> <p>Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.</p>
Risk to Alternative
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>Permanent Electors' Register Software</b></p> <p>If the new investment in election facilitate does not occur, the ability of the County to facilitate an election in compliance with the Local Authorities Election Act would be put in jeopardy. This new investment is to implement a new legislative requirement under the Local Authorities Election Act.</p>

## 7. Human Resources Access

### Request Summary

The Human Resources Access service is requesting an investment of \$92,400 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Job Posting	People & Culture	Talent Acquisition and Development	Growth in Service Request	7,500
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	People & Culture	Multiple	Price Increase	84,900
<b>Total</b>				<b>92,400</b>

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses include contracted costs for the working alone program and compensation survey costs for safety footwear and eyewear.

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$92,400 for Human Resource Access services due to growth in the volume of job postings and cost increases for general expenses.

### Justification

#### Investment: Job Postings

##### Current State

There has been an increasing requirement for recruitment job postings (2021: 99; 2022: 99; 2023: 122; 2024 Jan to June: 83). The cost for this service has exceeded its budget for the past 3 years. Administration does not expect recruitment needs to decrease over the next few years.

##### Target State

Human Resource Access services 2025 budget requires a \$7,500 budget adjustment to accommodate the increased demand for job postings.

#### Investment: General Expenses

##### Current State

There is a year-over-year price increase in general expenses for Human Resource Management as the result of increased contract prices and costs for safety equipment.

##### Target State

Human Resource Access service requires a \$84,900 budget adjustment to accommodate the increased contract prices and costs for safety equipment.



Financial Implication					
Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Job Posting	Operating	Tax	-	7,500	7,500
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	-	84,900	84,900
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>92,400</b>	<b>92,400</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>92,400</b>
Strategic Alignment					
<p>This investment aligns with the County's strategy of Effective Service Delivery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>SD2:</b> <i>Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.</i></li> </ul>					
Alternative					
<p><b>Investment: Job Postings</b>  An alternative considered by Administration is to decrease service level by restricting the number of posting sites per position or restricting posting costs per site.</p> <p><b>Investment: General Expenses</b>  Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.</p>					
Risk to Alternative					
<p><b>Investment: Job Postings</b>  May attract fewer candidates or may not reach as many candidates. This may result in a reduction in experienced/qualified candidates/new hires, and departments running short-handed for longer or increased training requirements for new hires.</p> <p><b>Investment: General Expenses</b>  N/A</p>					

## 8. Intergovernmental Relations

### Request Summary

The Intergovernmental Relations service is requesting an investment of \$137,700 in the following:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Consultant Cost – Indigenous Engagement Strategy	Intergovernmental & Regional Planning	Intergovernmental Relations	New Service	25,000
Management of Intermunicipal Relationships Consultant Cost	Intergovernmental & Regional Planning	Intergovernmental Relations	Growth in Service Request	50,500
Regional Growth Management Board Participation	Intergovernmental & Regional Planning	Intergovernmental Relations	Growth in Service Request	47,300
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Intergovernmental & Regional Planning	Management of Intermunicipal Relations	Price Increase	14,900
<b>Total</b>				<b>137,700</b>

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses includes materials, travel and subsistence, publications and subscriptions, memberships etc.

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$137,700 for Intergovernmental & Relations service to support an Indigenous engagement strategy, members of Administration and the County's elected representatives, enable productive participation in the Calgary Metropolitan Region Board (CMRB), and manage intermunicipal relationship (Prairie Economic Gateway Initiative).

### Justification

#### Investment: Consultant Cost - Indigenous Engagement Strategy

#### Current State

The County has two First Nations neighbours with significant boundary areas. Relationships with these neighbours have been sporadic over the years. There are opportunities to realise mutual benefit and solve potential border issues, particularly with the Tsuut'ina Nation, whose lands surround Bragg Creek.

#### Target State

Consultant expertise is required to assist County Administration and Council to build skills and strategies to effectively engage with First Nations. Preparation of thoughtful approaches to engagement will increase the chance of success of productive, respectful relationships. Building effective relationships with neighbours can contribute to achieving fiscal goals and thoughtful growth minimizing risk of disputes and recurring problems. Expertise is required to build internal knowledge and identify best practice.

### Investment: **Consultant Cost – Management of Intermunicipal Relationships**

#### **Current State**

The County is engaged in a joint project with the City of Calgary called the Prairie Economic Gateway Initiative. This project will contribute to the Strategic Plan's goal of attracting non-residential business development through the joint creation of a rail-served business park.

#### **Target State**

Should the Prairie Economic Gateway Initiative be approved, the project will shift to implementation. To maintain this project as well as other service levels, it is recommended that there be budget for consultant support on planning and advocacy, if required. Continued investment in this sub-service will contribute to KPIs identified in the Strategic Plan including regional plan alignment, increased leadership in the regional, and effective issue resolution.

### Investment: **Regional Growth Management Board Participation**

#### **Current State**

The County values the working relationships with neighboring municipalities. There is benefit in working well with neighbors beyond simply fulfilling legislative requirements. Servicing efficiencies, cost savings, and attracting new business opportunities are a few of the benefits that can be realized through effective partnerships.

#### **Target State**

The investment of \$47,300 in Regional Growth Management Board participation will contribute to several KPIs identified in the Strategic Plan, including regional plan alignment, increased leadership in the region, and effective issue resolution.

### Investment: **General Expenses**

#### **Current State**

There is a year-over-year price increase in general expenses for management of Intermunicipal relationships services, evident through a review of the actual cost of general expenses over the last 3 years.

#### **Target State**

Management of intermunicipal relationships services requires an adjustment of \$14,900 to accommodate the increase in prices.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Consultant Cost – Indigenous Engagement Strategy	Operating	Tax	-	25,000	25,000
Management of Intermunicipal Relationships Consultant Cost	Operating	Tax	-	50,500	50,500
Regional Growth Management Board Participation	Operating	Tax	-	47,300	47,300
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	-	14,900	14,900
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>137,700</b>	<b>137,700</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>137,700</b>

### Strategic Alignment

Participation in the CMRB is a mandatory, legislated requirement. Requisitions are enabled by legislation and regulation. To implement the Board's 2025 budget, CMRB will be requisitioning the members.

### Alternative

**Investment: Consultant Cost - Indigenous Engagement Strategy**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

**Investment: Consultant Cost - Management of Intermunicipal Relationships**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

### Risk to Alternative

**Investment: Consultant Cost - Indigenous Engagement Strategy**

Maintaining status quo or reducing services levels may result in errors when engaging with First Nations neighbors or a continued ad-hoc approach to engagement.

**Investment: Consultant Cost - Management of Intermunicipal Relationships**

If no investment is made at this time, Administration may need to request a future budget adjustment, in alignment with Council's direction and goals for the Prairie Economic Gateway Initiative.

## 9. Recreation, Leisure, and Culture Facility Access & Programming

### Request Summary

The Recreation, Leisure and Culture Facility Access and Programming service is requesting an investment of \$12,800,900 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Animated Training Videos for Recreation, Culture and Community Grants	Recreation & Community Support	Cultural Facility Access	New Initiative	40,000
Community Plans	Recreation & Community Support	Recreation, Leisure, and Culture Facility Planning	New Initiative	100,000
Funding Sustainability Analysis	Recreation & Community Support	Recreation, Leisure, and Culture Facility Planning	New Initiative	60,000
Langdon Recreation Grant	Recreation & Community Support		Growth in service	900
Langdon Recreation Centre	Recreation & Community Support		New Initiative	600,000
Indus Recreation Centre Rink Expansion	Recreation & Community Support		New Initiative	12,000,000
<b>Total</b>				<b>12,800,900</b>

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$12,800,900 for Recreation, Leisure, and Culture Facility Access and Programming services to fund the Indus Recreation Centre Rink Expansion, grant training, community plans, sustainability analysis, and recreation center contributions and growth in the Langdon Recreation Grant.

### Justification

**Investment:** **Animated Training Videos for Recreation, Culture, and Community grants**

#### Current State

There is currently a lack of information and awareness of the County's current community, cultural, and recreational funding streams. This results in viable projects going unfunded.

#### Target State

Recreation, Leisure, and Culture Facility Access & Programming service requires a \$40,000 budget adjustment to provide grant training videos that would focus on the County's five community, cultural, and recreational funding streams:

- Large capital funding of +\$1M and requirements for expansion and new infrastructure
- Medium capital funding of +\$500K
- Small capital funding of under \$500K
- Community Enhancement funding
- Operational Funding

The initiative would create a social return on investment as residents and non-profit groups would be able to access the videos online and at their convenience. The initiative would increase our community's knowledge of the grant programs and create a seamless application submission process. The County risk would be reduced with this investment as our community organizations would have more information available at their convenience, reducing the work and coordination required to submit grant applications. Additionally, with the variety of applications received, Recreation and Community Support will be able to maximize current internal resources and maintain the attentiveness required to facilitate the grant program successfully.

#### Investment: **Community Plans**

##### **Current State**

Evolving communities throughout the County are driving the need for area-specific community and recreation plans. The current Recreation and Parks Master Plan highlights direction and guiding philosophy for the County without the analysis of the diverse communities County-wide. The Recreation and Parks Master Plan is approaching its review period, and a change in direction for delivering more fulsome documents has been noted by Council and the associations within the communities.

##### **Target State**

Recreation, Leisure, and Culture Facility Access and Programming service requires a \$100,000 budget adjustment to create community plans that will replace the need for a County-wide Recreation and Parks Master Plan. Benefits to the individual community plans may include:

- A wider community acceptance of County planning initiatives
- Ability for more community-specific initiatives to be considered and explored through plans
- Potential administrative time and cost savings by having the ability to update the smaller community plans in-house
- Flexibility with the plans as ASPs and County Plans are updated
- Streamlined and thoughtful County capital project planning for recreation and community infrastructure

#### Investment: **Funding Sustainability Analysis**

##### **Current State**

With the evolution and complexities of new and existing communities, recreation, and cultural infrastructure, various Community and Recreation initiatives have arisen and consist of multiple different processes. As a result, expectations are increasing from our residents and non-profit groups, and gaps have been identified on how the County may provide financial support.

##### **Target State**

Recreation, Leisure, and Culture Facility Access and Programming service requires a \$60,000 budget adjustment to create a funding sustainability analysis will provide financial recommendations for the following recreational and community items:

- Funding recommendations to sustain the Community, Recreation and Culture Grant Program
- Funding structure for large County projects such as recreation centres, community centres, and other large amenities.
- Funding agreement structures for organizations providing recreation services

The analysis will decrease the risk to this service and provide the County with fulsome information when moving forward with future applications, projects, and agreements. The analysis will inform Administration of best practices when recommending strategic direction of funding sources for the ongoing recreational initiatives and grant programs. With the completion of the analysis, the Administration will be able to maximize internal resources with proactive information.

Investment: **Langdon Recreation Grant**

**Current State**

Driven by the Langdon Special Tax Bylaw, the County provides a grant to the Langdon Recreation Center. This increase is the result of estimated population increase in accordance with the grant policy.

**Target State**

Recreation, Leisure, and Culture Facility Access and Programming service requires a \$900 budget adjustment for the estimated increased population in the grant area.

Investment: **Langdon Recreation Centre**

**Current State**

In 2024, 1.1 million was approved to start the studies for the Langdon Recreation Centre.

**Target State**

Additional studies and preliminary work will be required in 2025. \$600,000 is requested to be carried over to continue the preliminary work for the Langdon Recreation Centre Project. Construction Costs will be presented in the 2026 capital budget discussions. The Langdon Recreation Centre, As per the approved business case, will provide recreational opportunities to the residents of Langdon and surrounding areas.

Investment: **Indus Recreation Centre Rink Expansion**

**Current State**

The Indus recreation center current is oversubscribed with ice time requests from youth and adult sport organizations within the County and outside of the County. To meet the needs of local and non-local sport teams, the development of an additional ice sheet will meet the current needs of the community.

**Target State**

Recreation, Leisure, and Culture Facility Access and Programming service requires a \$12,000,000 budget adjustment for the expansion of Indus Recreation Centre Rink. The arena expansion will provide an additional ice sheet for the residents of Indus and surrounding area. The Indus Recreation Center currently is oversubscribed with ice time requests from youth and adult sport organizations within the County and outside of the County. To meet the needs of local and non-local sport teams and the community, the development of an additional ice sheet is needed. No industry standard is available for this service case. Multiple arenas have two ice sheets for efficiency purposes and to attract tournaments.

## Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Animated Training Videos for Recreation, Culture and Community Grants	Operating	Tax	-	40,000	40,000
Community Plans	Operating	Tax	-	100,000	100,000
Funding Sustainability Analysis	Operating	Tax	-	60,000	60,000
Langdon Recreation Grant	Operating	Tax	-	900	900
<sup>1</sup> Langdon Recreation Centre	Capital	Reserve	600,000	-	600,000
<sup>1</sup> Indus Recreation Centre Rink Expansion	Capital	Tax; Reserve	12,000,000	-	12,000,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>12,600,000</b>	<b>200,900</b>	<b>12,800,900</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>430,900</b>

<sup>1</sup>Both Capital Projects (Langdon Recreation Centre and Indus Recreation Centre Rink Expansion) are expected to have operating costs that arise as the result of the completion of these projects. At this time, we are unable to provide an estimate of the yearly costs, but it is expected that there will be a need for grants to organizations and contracted services for both projects.

## Strategic Alignment

This investment aligns with the County's strategy of Effective Service Delivery:

- **SD2:** *Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes*
- **SD2.1:** *Citizens satisfied with the range of County services available/delivered.*

## Alternative

### Investment: **Animated Training Videos for Recreation, Culture, and Community Grants**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

### Investment: **Community Plans**

An alternative considered by Administration is to complete the scheduled review of the 2021 Recreation and Parks Master Plan instead.

### Investment: **Funding Sustainability Analysis**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

### Investment: **Langdon Recreation Grant**

N/A

### Investment: **Langdon Recreation Centre**

There is a risk of rising costs of construction, and leaving a community without the recreational and community spaces they need.

### Investment: **Indus Recreation Centre Rink Expansion**

An alternative considered by Administration is to consider postponing funding approval until additional funding sources can be secured (Soft Levy collection, community fundraising).



## Risk to Alternative

### Investment: **Animated Training Videos for Rec, Culture and Community grants**

If no investment is made into the information sharing of the grant program, the department will continue to work with the community and applicant to ensure applications are adequate. Decreased capacity of the department may result as requests increase and become more complex.

### Investment: **Community Plans**

The risk of a lowered community acceptance and resident satisfaction may result from this alternative. Additional resources may be required to capture the in-depth analysis of the rural and urban areas. The Recreation and Parks Master Plan would require updates and amendments frequently as the County and communities evolve. These updates would require significant amounts of financial and administrative resources.

### Investment: **Funding Sustainability Analysis**

If no investment is made into a strategic funding analysis that explores sustainability options, facilities may be compromised on the programs and services they can offer. Additionally, the County may be subject to a heightened reputational risk as it continues with these increasing financial commitments with no clear funding strategy.

### Investment: **Langdon Recreation Grant**

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration

### Investment: **Langdon Recreation Centre**

Rising costs of construction and leaving a community without the recreational and community spaces they need.

### Investment: **Indus Recreation Centre Rink Expansion**

Rising costs of construction and leaving a community without the recreational and community spaces they need. Reputational risk is high as partial funding has already been committed.

## 10. Special Event Permission

### Request Summary

The Special Event Permissions service is requesting an investment of \$10,000 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Online Training Video – Special Events	Recreation & Community Support	Special Event Permissions	New Initiative	10,000
<b>Total</b>				<b>10,000</b>

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$10,000 to provide online training videos on the special events application process for service customers.

### Justification

#### Investment: Online Training Video – Special Events

#### Current State

While working with applicants, Administration has observed a disconnect between the applicant and application requirements. As a result, Administration spends a significant amount of time clarifying and requesting additional information from the applicant. For some specific applications, this can increase processing times and extend the queue.

#### Target State

The Special Event training videos will provide a platform for applicants to gather more information that is relevant to their specific event. The initiative would create a social return on investment as applicants would be able to access the videos online and at their convenience. The initiative would increase the applicant's knowledge of the special events process and create a seamless application submission process. As a result, the applicant may submit more fulsome special event applications, and in turn, host safer special events.

If successful, these videos may also reduce the processing time of applications and shorten the application queue. In previous years, Administration has facilitated meetings with applicants to discuss the requirements for special event applications. With the successful video implementation, Administration may be able to reduce approximately 40 hours annually that would have been spent on these clarification meetings and application follow up.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Online Training Video – Special Events	Operating	Tax	10,000	-	10,000
<b>Total</b>			-	-	<b>10,000</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>10,000</b>

Strategic Alignment
<p>This investment aligns with the County's strategy of Effective Service Delivery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>SD2:</b> <i>Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.</i></li> <li>• <b>SD4:</b> <i>Services are continually assessed for improvements in cost efficiency, effectiveness and customer experience.</i></li> </ul>
Alternative
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>Online Training Video – Special Events</b></p> <p>An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.</p>
Risk to Alternative
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>Online Training Video – Special Events</b></p> <p>By maintaining our current state, the capacity, acceptance, and processing timelines are subjected to the service risks. A basic level of capacity may result in longer processing times and the inability to work with every applicant to create strong event applications.</p>

## FINANCIAL SERVICES

SUMMARY OF SERVICE REQUEST Financial Services						
Services	Investment Type	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Budget Request
Financial Management	Growth in Service Request	Operating	Tax	-	145,900	145,900
Information Technology Management	Growth in Service Request; Price Increase; Capital Asset Replacement	Operating	Tax	685,000	640,100	1,325,100
Procurement	Price Increase	Operating	Tax	-	500	500
Property Tax Assessment and Collection	Price Increase; New Initiative	Operating	Tax	-	74,200	74,200
<b>Total</b>				<b>685,000</b>	<b>860,700</b>	<b>1,545,700</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>						<b>1,545,700</b>

SERVICE REQUEST BY INVESTMENT TYPE Financial Services	
Investment Type	Budget Request
New Initiatives	72,200
Growth in Service Request	699,500
Price Increase	89,000
Capital Asset Replacement	685,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,545,700</b>

## 11. Financial Management

### Request Summary

The Financial Management Service is requesting an investment of \$145,900 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
1 FTE – Financial Analyst	Financial Services	Financial Reporting, Compliance, and Controls	Growth in Service Request	138,300
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Financial Services	-	Price Increase	7,600
<b>Total</b>				<b>145,900</b>

<sup>1</sup>General expenses include the costs of travel and subsistence, contract services, and materials.

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$145,900 to fund additional a financial analytical resource due to growing demands on the service and price increases

### Justification

#### Investment: 1 FTE – Financial Analyst

#### Current State

Before 2023, Financial Services met the *Municipal Government Act*-mandated service delivery requirement of providing the province with externally audited financial statement packages annually. In 2023, Council requested increased accountability and transparency through periodic financial reporting analysis throughout the year, which resulted in this service request.

#### Target State

Financial Management service requires a \$138,300 adjustment to hire an additional Financial Analyst. Financial Management service is looking to restructure its approach from being reactive to proactive in supporting internal departments and residents of the County based on Council's increased accountability and transparency request. Changes in management reporting requirements, planning and budgeting processes, year-end financial reporting efficiencies, and the need for a new enterprise resource plan (ERP) system in 2025 require Financial Services to add a Financial Analyst, and to restructure the current workload to allow for increased efficiency and capacity in responding to governance needs and regulatory requirements..

In addition to financial reporting duties (i.e., TCA, Treasury, financial reporting package, etc.) each financial analyst (including this position) will be assigned a division, and this additional position will also act as a finance subject matter expert with special projects, whether within finance or across the organization, and coordinate finance processes that encompasses the entire County (year-end, audit, budget).

### Investment: General Expenses

#### Current State

There is a year-over-year price increase for general services, evident through a review of the actual costs of general expenses over the last 3 years.

#### Target State

Financial Management service requires a \$7,600 adjustment to accommodate rising costs of travel and subsistence, contract services, and materials.

#### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
1 FTE – Financial Analyst	Operating	Tax	-	138,300	138,300
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	-	7,600	7,600
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>145,900</b>	<b>145,900</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>145,900</b>

#### Strategic Alignment

This investment aligns with the County's strategy of Effective Service Delivery:

- **SD2:** Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.
- **SD4:** Services are continually assessed for improvements in cost efficiency, effectiveness and customer experience.

#### Alternative

### Investment: 1 FTE – Financial Analyst

The alternative considered by Administration is to maintain status quo.

### Investment: General Expenses

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

#### Risk to Alternative

### Investment: 1 FTE – Financial Analyst

Risk of missing financial statement reporting delivery timelines, continued high staff turnover due to prolonged periods of heavy workloads, lack of financial analysis support for service leads across the County, and possible cost overruns with system implementations requiring a financial analyst subject matter expert.

### Investment: General Expenses

N/A

## 12. Information Technology Management

### Request Summary

The Information Technology Management service is requesting an investment of \$1,325,100 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Sub-service	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
End-of-life replacement of IT Infrastructure Program	Information Technology	All	Capital Asset Replacement	185,000
ERP Program (Phase I)	Information Technology	-	Capital Asset Replacement	500,000
Cyber Security Expense	Information Technology	Information and Cyber Security	Growth in Service Request	106,000
FOIP Management Costs	Legal Services	FOIP Management	Growth in Service Request	45,000
IT Governance and Strategy Support and Service Costs	Information Technology	IT Governance and Strategy	Growth in Service Request	187,700
MRF Geosystems Corporation Upgrade	Information Technology	Business Solutions Management	Growth in Service Request	71,000
VertiGIS (Global Information System) Upgrade	Information Technology	Geographic Information System (GIS)	Growth in Service Request	20,000
Software service and license expansion	Information Technology	-	Growth in Service Request	131,500
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Information Technology	-	Price Increase	78,900
<b>Total</b>				<b>1,325,100</b>

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses include contractual increases for software programs and increased costs for IT equipment and materials.

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$1,325,100 to fund three proposed IT capital projects, multiple growth in service requests, and price increases on general expenses.

### Justification

#### Investment: End-of-life replacement of IT Infrastructure Program

##### Current State

Replacement of end-of-life IT infrastructure (e.g., network, core servers, audiovisual equipment) to ensure current service levels are maintained. The current state of the County is as expected, as we continually replace hardware at risk of failure.

##### Target State

Information Technology services require a \$185,000 adjustment to ensure the County's IT infrastructure remains at industry standard and the efficiency of work is maintained for County employees.

### Investment: ERP Program (Phase I)

#### **Current State**

The current financial software is coming to an end-of-life. This will mean in the short term that support and maintenance will be more difficult and eventually it is expected that the software will be inoperable.

#### **Target State**

Information Technology services requires a \$500,000 investment to begin the transition to a new Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system. Numerous benefits of an ERP system include streamlining operations, enhancing efficiency, and promoting transparency. An ERP system integrates various functions such as finance and public services into a single platform, reducing redundancy and improving data accuracy. This leads to better decision-making and resource allocation, ultimately saving time and money.

Furthermore, an ERP system enhances accountability by providing real-time access to information and automating compliance with regulations. As municipalities face increasing demands for transparency and efficiency, investing in an ERP system is a strategic move that supports sustainable growth and improved public service delivery. This is a major project that involves a variety of services within the County and will require cooperation and input from the entire organization. The future ERP system will allow continued support and maintenance of financial information and will provide opportunities for efficiency throughout the organization.

### Investment: Cyber Security Expense

#### **Current State**

Information Technology has created incident response plans, but there is still a need to create a formal cybersecurity strategy. Information Technology is currently assessing preparedness to conduct formal penetration tests and/or vulnerability/security assessment. There is a need to implement security policies and standards that complement other initiatives, such as an information management policy.

#### **Target State**

Information Technology services requires a \$106,000 adjustment in security technology to enhance the ability to manage and evaluate risks. IT will explore the benefits of cloud technologies for business applications solutions and additional infrastructure (such as disaster recovery, backup/recovery, and security). IT aims to gather and report on IT security, governance, business satisfaction, and effectiveness to understand where the County stands and how it can improve and create security policies that are reasonable, auditable, enforceable, and measurable.

### Investment: FOIP Management Costs

#### **Current State**

A service investment is required to maintain the current level of service. There are two reasons for this: (1) For consultation on complex files. For efficiency, Information Technology Management services eliminated the peer review process that required each FOIP file to be reviewed by the assigned FOIP Coordinator and a second party (which was completed at one time by a second FOIP Coordinator or through interdepartmental support) and replaced it with a process requiring secondary review only on certain files. A consulting budget is needed for this secondary review.



### **Target State**

Information Technology Management services require a \$45,000 adjustment, requested by the legal department, to ensure the County can meet the demands of FOIP requests. Two new projects occurring in 2024/2025 will require FOIP involvement and/or oversight: the website re-design and a project involving inter-departmental collaboration to create a process or guidelines identifying documents that can be distributed directly to the public by departments (as opposed to going through the FOIP process). These projects will require funding.

### **Investment: IT Governance and Strategy Support and Service Costs**

### **Current State**

The County has established IT strategy, plans, roadmaps, policies, and programs that outline the standards, guidelines, governance, and architecture framework to ensure that IT services align with the County's overall strategic objectives and supports meeting the business needs of each County department. Formal IT steering committees have been established, including project portfolio management and information management, to work on establishing the foundations of application portfolio management practices. The IT steering committees are developing data standards for the information management environment and looking at technical platform governance. Other targets include optimizing the IT Governance structure to produce more value from IT, establish new governance charters and ways of working, delegate and empower decision-making capabilities for agile delivery, and identify opportunities to embed and automate governance.

### **Target State**

Information Technology services requires a \$187,700 adjustment to maintain the service level established. The County has established IT strategy, plans, roadmaps, policies, and programs that outline the standards, guidelines, governance, and architecture framework to ensure that IT services align with the County's overall strategic objectives and supports meeting the business needs of each County department.

### **Investment: MRF Geosystems Corporation Expense**

### **Current State**

Investing in new software for Enforcement Services is crucial to maintaining compliance and enhancing service capabilities. Provincial enforcement regulations necessitate this software to stay compliant.

### **Target State**

This investment allows for new software needed to ensure that the County avoids fines and legal repercussions from non-compliance with provincial regulations.

### **Investment: VertiGIS Expense**

### **Current State**

Currently, ArcGIS is in use but lacks advanced tools for streamlined data integration, analysis, and user-friendly workflows, limiting its full potential for municipal applications.

### Target State

With a \$20,000 investment in VertiGIS, ArcGIS will gain enhanced functionality, offering seamless data integration, intuitive user interfaces, and improved efficiency for staff, ultimately enabling faster, more informed decision-making across departments.

### Investment: Software service and license expansion

### Current State

As the County has grown, the demand for software licenses has increased across many areas of Administration. As we look to increase productivity and efficiency in the County, there is a need for additional staff members to have access to the core software that we use to operate in the County.

### Target State

Information Technology services requires a \$131,500 adjustment to continue to provide highly efficient and effective IT services to a growing workplace.

### Investment: General Expenses

### Current State

There is a year-over-year price increase for general services, evident through a review of the actual costs of general expenses over the last 3 years.

### Target State

Information Technology services require a \$78,900 adjustment to accommodate rising costs of software, equipment, and materials.

## Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
End of life replacement of IT Infrastructure Program	Capital	Tax	185,000	-	185,000
ERP Program (Phase I)	Capital	Tax	500,000	-	500,000
Cyber Security Expense	Operating	Tax	-	106,000	106,000
FOIP Management Costs	Operating	Tax	-	45,000	45,000
IT Governance and Strategy Support and Service Costs	Operating	Tax	-	187,700	187,700
MRF Geosystems Corporation Upgrade	Operating	Tax	-	71,000	71,000
VertiGIS (Global Information System) Upgrade	Operating	Tax	-	20,000	20,000
Software service and license expansion	Operating	Tax	-	131,500	131,500
General Expenses	Operating	Tax		78,900	78,900
<b>Total</b>			<b>685,000</b>	<b>640,100</b>	<b>1,325,100</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>	<b>1,325,100</b>				

The *End of life replacement of IT Infrastructure Program* and *IT Infrastructure for FTEs* capital request are not expected to have future impact on the operating budget as their maintenance cost is already included in the current year's proposed budget.

It is expected that the outcome from the new ERP Program (Phase I) project will have future impact on both the operating and capital budgets.

### Strategic Alignment

This investment aligns with the County's strategy of Effective Service Delivery:

- **SD4:** *Services are continually assessed for improvements in cost efficiency, effectiveness, and customer experience.*
- **SD4.1:** *Services that are assessed annually for innovation opportunities and have demonstrable efficiency improvements.*

### Alternative

#### Investment: **End of life replacement of IT Infrastructure Program**

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

#### Investment: **IT Infrastructure for Budgeted FTEs**

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

#### Investment: **ERP Program (Phase I)**

An alternative considered by Administration is to Continue with current County ERP software.

#### Investment: **Cyber Security Expense**

An alternative considered by Administration is to continue with the current cyber security protocols/ investment.

#### Investment: **FOIP Management Costs**

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

#### Investment: **IT Governance and Strategy Support and Service Costs**

The alternative considered by Administration is to maintain status quo.

#### Investment: **MRF Geosystems Corporation Expense**

The alternative considered by Administration is to maintain current software offering.

#### Investment: **VertiGIS Expense**

The alternative considered by Administration is to maintain current software offering.

#### Investment: **Software service and license expansion**

The alternative considered by Administration is to maintain current levels of software services and licenses.

#### Investment: **General Expenses**

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration

## Risk to Alternative

### Investment: End of life replacement of IT Infrastructure Program

N/A

### Investment: IT Infrastructure for Budgeted FTEs

N/A

### Investment: ERP Program (Phase I)

Inability to patch for security vulnerabilities or perform upgrades.

### Investment: Cyber Security Expense

Underinvestment on cybersecurity creates a major organizational risk. Data breaches become a constant threat, exposing sensitive information and leading to financial losses, regulatory fines, and reputational damage. Even operational disruptions from attacks can cripple an organization. This domino effect can erode resident trust and ultimately hinder growth. The cost of inaction far outweighs the investment in robust and testing of defenses.

### Investment: FOIP Management Costs

N/A

### Investment: IT Governance and Strategy Support and Service Costs

While the current budget allows for a basic framework, it may not be sufficient to proactively adapt to the evolving IT landscape, perform in-depth analysis of IT infrastructure and business needs, or maintain consistent communication and collaboration between IT and County departments.

This would result in:

- Slower Implementation: Prioritization might slow down the implementation of updates to strategies and plans
- Increased Workload: Streamlining may increase the workload on existing staff
- Limited Expertise: Internal training may not fully address complex IT governance challenges

### Investment: MRF Geosystems Corporation Expense

This approach carries significant risks. For Enforcement Services, it would lead to non-compliance with provincial regulations, potentially resulting in fines and legal repercussions for the municipality.

### Investment: VertiGIS Expense

Outdated GIS software may limit service capabilities, hindering departmental efficiency and potentially impacting service delivery to the community.

### Investment: Software service and license expansion

With the expansion of the County, Administration has a need for additional licenses to ensure employees are able to access the software required to complete their job. Without this expansion it would result in inefficiencies and bottlenecks as employees are unable to access the tools needed to complete their jobs.

### Investment: General Expenses

N/A

## 13. Procurement

Request Summary

Procurement services are requesting an investment of \$500 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Financial Services	-	Price Increase	500
Total				500

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses includes materials.

Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$500 for general price increases for providing Procurement services.

Justification

Investment: General Expenses

Current State

There is a year-over-year price increase in general expenses for Procurement services as the result of a review of the actual cost of general expenses over the last 3 years.

Target State

Procurement services requires a \$500 budget adjustment to accommodate the rising costs of materials.

Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	-	500	500
Total			-	500	500
2025 Tax Impact					500

Strategic Alignment

This investment aligns with the County’s strategy of Effective Service Delivery:

- SD2:** Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.
- SD2.1:** Citizens satisfied with the range of County services available/delivered.

Alternative

Investment: General Expenses

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council’s consideration.

Risk to Alternative

Investment: General Expenses

N/A

## 14. Property Tax Assessment & Collection

### Request Summary

The Property Tax Assessment and Collection service is requesting an investment of \$74,200 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
1 FTE - Cashier	Financial Services	Taxation	New Initiative	72,200
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Financial Services	Taxation	Price Increase	2,000
<b>Total</b>				<b>74,200</b>

<sup>1</sup>General expenses include an increase for tax notices mailing cost, staff training, and travel and subsistence.

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$74,200 for a new County-wide cashiering sub-service and price increases.

### Justification

#### Investment: 1 FTE – Cashier

##### Current State

Taxation is staffed to collect property taxes but has, by default, extended current County resources to collect monies on behalf of other County services. Currently, the County lacks a cashiering sub-service, which has resulted in inconsistent customer experience for residents in dealing with payment remittances to the County.

##### Target State

This position will be a County-wide support as there has been a significant increase in cashiering requests from County departments to assist in processing payments and the collection process, customer inquiries and payment reconciliations, and from residents in the form of customer-facing activities as it relates to receiving utility payments, animal license payments, map request, planning and development, and building services requests. In addition to increased volume, the payment types have changed in complexity, leading to increased batch processing and reconciliation.

#### Investment: General Expenses

##### Current State

The investment in general expense price increases is needed to keep with the cost related to tax notifications as well as the increases in travel and subsistence due to the increase supplier costs for meals and accommodation.

##### Target State

The investment in general expenses will allow the budget for services to align with actual costs to retain the existing level of service.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
1 FTE - Cashier	Operating	Tax	-	72,200	72,000
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	-	2,000	2,000
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>74,200</b>	<b>74,200</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>74,200</b>

### Strategic Alignment

This investment aligns with the County's strategy of Effective Service Delivery:

- **SD2:** *Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.*
- **SD2.1:** *Citizens satisfied with the range of County services available/delivered.*

### Alternative

Investment: **1 FTE – Cashier**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

Investment: **General Expenses**

N/A

### Risk to Alternative

Investment: **1 FTE – Cashier**

Inconsistent customer experience for residents in dealing with payment remittances to the County, as well as the taxation service may experience staff turnover due to prolonged periods of heavy workloads.

Investment: **General Expenses**

N/A

## INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

SUMMARY OF SERVICE REQUEST Infrastructure Services						
Services	Investment Type	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Budget Request
Agricultural Programming	Growth in Service Request	Operating	Tax	50,000	-	50,000
Cemetery Services	Price Increase	Operating	Tax	-	204,200	204,200
Emergency Management	Growth in Service Request	Operating	Tax	15,000	53,700	68,700
Engineering Design and Construction	Growth in Service Request; Price Increase	Operating	Tax	-	85,800	85,800
Environmental Protection and Awareness	Growth in Service Request; Price Increase	Operating	Tax	-	160,200	160,200
Facility Access	Price Increase; Capital Asset Replacement	Operating; Capital	Tax; Reserve	50,000	84,900	134,900
Fire Services Planning and Response	Growth in Service Request; Price Increase; Capital Asset Replacement; New Initiative	Operating; Capital	Tax; Debt; Reserve	6,729,000	1,651,000	8,380,000
Fleet Provision	Price Increase; Capital Asset Replacement;	Operating; Capital	Tax; Reserve	2,849,000	429,800	3,278,800
Incident Response	Growth in Service Request; Price Increase	Operating	Tax	-	488,200	488,200
Land Administration	Price Increase	Operating	Tax	-	17,500	17,500



**SUMMARY OF SERVICE REQUEST**  
**Infrastructure Services**

Services	Investment Type	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Budget Request
Prevention and Compliance	Price Increase	Operating	Tax	-	4,000	4,000
Roadway Access	Price Increase; Capital Asset Replacement; Growth in Service Request	Operating; Capital	Tax; Levy; Provincial & Federal Grant; Reserve	17,725,000	114,000	17,839,000
Roadway Special Access	Price Increase	Operating	Tax	-	10,900	10,900
Stormwater Drainage	Growth in service request	Operating	Tax	-	231,800	231,800
Utility Permission and Locating	Growth in service request	Operating	Tax	-	10,500	10,500
Vegetation and Pest Management	Price Increase	Operating	Tax	-	48,300	48,300
Waste Collection and Processing	Price Increase; New Initiative	Operating	Tax	-	71,300	71,300
Wastewater Collection and Treatment	Price Increase; Capital Asset Replacement; Growth in Service Request; New Initiative	Operating	Tax; Reserve	297,600	375,500	673,100
Water Treatment and Distribution	Price Increase; Capital Asset Replacement; Growth in Service Request;	Operating	Tax; Reserve; Debt	323,700	680,200	1,203,900
<b>Total</b>				<b>28,239,300</b>	<b>4,721,800</b>	<b>32,961,100</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>						<b>4,965,800</b>

SERVICE REQUEST BY INVESTMENT TYPE Infrastructure Services	
Investment Type	Budget Request
New Initiative	59,300
Growth in Service Request	3,795,800
Price Increase	3,575,700
Capital Asset Replacement	25,530,300
<b>Total</b>	<b>32,961,100</b>

SERVICE REQUEST BY INVESTMENT TYPE Infrastructure Services (Tax Funded)	
Investment Type	Budget Request
New Initiative	59,300
Growth in Service Request	1,200,800
Price Increase	3,575,700
Capital Asset Replacement	130,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,965,800</b>

## 15. Agricultural Programming

### Request Summary

The Agricultural Programming service is requesting an investment of \$50,000 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Agriculture Master Plan	Agricultural & Environmental Services	Agricultural Service Board	Growth in Service Request	50,000
<b>Total</b>				<b>50,000</b>

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$50,000 to update the Agricultural Master Plan.

### Justification

#### Investment: Agriculture Master Plan

#### Current State

Agricultural Programming service, in consultation with the Agricultural Service Board, is updating the Agricultural Master Plan (AMP). The AMP is a strategic guiding document that identifies the needs and priorities of the agricultural community, sets goals for future growth and innovation, and provides a roadmap for achieving objectives.

#### Target State

That the AMP goes for Council's consideration in Q1 of 2025 and that Strategic Plan for the Agricultural Service Board will be updated in 2025. The update to the Strategic Plan will ensure alignment with the goals of the Agricultural Master Plan and tie into the Agricultural Service Board grant cycle.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Agriculture Master Plan	Operating	Tax	50,000	-	50,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>50,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>50,000</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>50,000</b>

### Strategic Alignment

This investment aligns with the County's strategy of Effective Service Delivery:

- **SD1:** *Services levels are clearly defined, communicated and transparent to citizens.*

### Alternative

#### Investment: Agriculture Master Plan

An alternative considered by Administration is that the Agricultural Master Plan does not get completed and implementation is delayed.

Risk to Alternative
<p><u>Investment: Agriculture Master Plan</u></p> <p>This alternative increases the risk that the County does not update the Strategic Plan for the Agricultural Service Board, which is a legislated requirement to be completed in 2025.</p>

## 16. Cemetery Services

### Request Summary

The Cemetery service is requesting an investment of \$310,700 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Operational Services	Cemetery Services	Price Increase	204,200
<b>Total</b>				<b>204,200</b>

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses includes wages and service contracts.

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$204,200 for an increase in compensation for seasonal and contract staff (\$219,000) and increased costs from suppliers (\$58,500).

### Justification

#### Investment: General Expenses

An increase in seasonal staff costs is a result of the compensation review, there are no additional staff being requested. The materials and contracted service costs increased due to supplier costs increase.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	-	204,200	204,200
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>204,200</b>	<b>204,200</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>204,200</b>

### Strategic Alignment

This investment aligns with the County's strategy of Effective Service Delivery:

- **SD2:** *Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.*
- **SD2.1:** *Citizens satisfied with the range of County services available/delivered.*

### Alternative

#### Investment: General Expenses

Alternatives considered by Administration are to reduce the number of seasonal staff for cemetery and parks maintenance and provide less burial and memorial services.

### Risk to Alternative

#### Investment: General Expenses

Reducing seasonal staff numbers would reduce the amount of cemetery, parks, and pathway maintenance that could be completed throughout the year. There would be delays in the cemetery, parks, and MR mowing and snow clearing. A reduction in burial and memorial services will negatively impact revenues collected for this service.

## 17. Emergency Management

### Request Summary

The Emergency Management service is requesting an investment of \$68,700 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Operational Services	Emergency Management Planning and Implementation	Growth in Service Request	68,700
<b>Total</b>				<b>68,700</b>

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses include public engagement, events cost, and statutory training for fire personnel.

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$68,700 to support the increased demand for education of community groups on the fire safety protocols, consultation with community groups on risk mitigation (\$32,300), and legislated training of fire department staff (\$36,500).

### Justification

#### Investment: General Expenses

#### Current State

There has been increased demand from community groups for training on safety protocols and risk mitigation. This has resulted in increases community outreaches. Additionally, in 2025 all County departments will participate in consultant-led, fully simulated emergency preparedness training; this will reduce to a tabletop exercise in subsequent years. Currently the community outreaches have been performed as overtime cost to the County.

#### Target State

The requested investment in this service will allow for proper planning of community engagement events and ensure the County meets all legislated training requirements.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	15,000	53,700	68,700
<b>Total</b>			<b>15,000</b>	<b>53,700</b>	<b>68,700</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>68,700</b>

Strategic Alignment
<p>This investment aligns with the County’s strategy of Effective Service Delivery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>SD2:</b> <i>Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.</i></li> <li>• <b>SD2.1:</b> <i>Citizens satisfied with the range of County services available/delivered.</i></li> </ul> <p>Emergency preparedness training is a legislative requirement.</p>
Alternative
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>General Expenses</b></p> <p>An alternative considered by Administration is to reduce the number of community engagements.</p>
Risk to Alternative
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>General Expenses</b></p> <p>Reduction in community engagement via education and risk mitigation may lead to an increased number of fire incidents at the County.</p>

## 18. Engineering Design & Construction

### Request Summary

The Engineering Design and Construction service is requesting an investment of \$85,800 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Capital Planning – Contract Employee	Capital & Engineering Services	Capital Planning	Growth in Service Request	40,000
Development Engineer – Contracted Services	Capital & Engineering Services	Development Engineering Review	Growth in Service Request	45,200
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Capital & Engineering Services	-	Price Increase	800
<b>Total</b>				<b>85,800</b>

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses include year-over-year price increases in materials, cell phone replacement cost, and travel and subsistence.

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$85,800 for Engineering Design and Construction service due to growth in volume and complexity of construction projects and development permits at the County.

### Justification

#### Investment: **Contract Employee – Capital Planning**

##### Current State

This service is unable to meet its Engineering Design commitments such as keep up with the regular updating of the offsite Bylaw and County policies as it relates to construction activities at the County because construction projects are increasing in volume and value. Completion of technical assessments to justify infrastructure upgrades for the Capital Plan is being completed ad hoc due to resource and expertise constraints. Additionally, no resources have been allocated to grant writing.

The County has recently approved two major interchange projects in 2023 and is anticipated to construct two, or possibly three, recreation facilities in the coming years. This demonstrates an immediate need for increased resources.

##### Target State

Investment in capital planning will allow review of the road plan for pre-engineering to transition to a 2-year revolving planning process, updating levy frequencies, meeting policy update timelines, and enhancing grant application capabilities. Additional resources would provide the necessary capacity to manage these tasks effectively, ensuring that all initiatives are completed on time and to a high standard

#### Investment: **Contract Services – Development Engineer**

##### Current State

Development Engineering Review sub-service has experienced a consistent year-over-year increase in development applications, accompanied by growing complexity in each project. Consequently, our team has increasingly required additional third-party assistance to meet our service commitments effectively.



The Prairie Gateway Project is expected to intensify and increase in development. As such, the additional investment in the development review fees is required to ensure we meet the demand of the applications. The County billed back \$340,000 to the Developer for third party review fees in 2023.

### Target State

With the increase in the volume and complexity of the development proposals within the County, additional resources are required to continue to support the review of those applications.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Capital Planning – Contract Employee	Operating	Tax	40,000	-	40,000
Development Engineer – Contracted Services	Operating	Tax	45,200	-	45,200
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	800	-	800
<b>Total</b>			<b>85,800</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>85,800</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>85,800</b>

### Strategic Alignment

This investment aligns with the County's strategy of Effective Service Delivery:

- **SD2:** *Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.*
- **SD2.1:** *Citizens satisfied with the range of County services available/delivered.*

### Alternative

#### Investment: **Contract Employee – Capital Planning**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

#### Investment: **Contract Services – Development Engineer**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

### Risk to Alternative

#### Investment: **Contract Employee – Capital Planning**

There is a potential negative impact on employee well-being, work quality, and the ability to meet strategic objectives carrying significant risks.

#### Investment: **Contract Services – Development Engineer**

Remaining as status quo will potentially cause delays in the time it takes to process development applications.

## 19. Environmental Protection Service

### Request Summary

The Environmental Protection service is requesting an investment of \$160,200 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
1 FTE – Environmental Specialist	Agriculture & Environmental Services	Environmental Protection and Awareness	Growth in Service Request	142,600
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Agriculture & Environmental Services	Environmental Protection and Awareness	Price Increase	17,600
<b>Total</b>				<b>160,200</b>

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses includes materials and contracted services.

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$160,200 for Environment Protection Services for a Senior Environmental Specialist and increasing prices for general expenses.

### Justification

#### Investment: 1 FTE – Environmental Specialist

##### Current State

The County is currently at capacity. meaning it is not able to provide any additional environmental monitoring. resulting in increased risk in not meeting the regional expectation for increased participation in environmental projects and initiatives.

##### Target State

Environmental Protection Services requires a \$142,600 adjustment to engage a Senior Environmental Specialist who will have an expanded scope of work to include watershed and airshed stewardship, environmental monitoring and programming, County-wide flood and drought resiliency, and interdepartmental collaboration.

#### Investment: General Expense

##### Current State

There is a year-over-year price increase in general expenses for Environmental Protection Services, evident through a review of the actual cost of general expenses over the last 3-years

##### Target State

Environmental Protection Services 2025 budget requires an adjustment of \$17,600 to accommodate a year-over-year price increase for materials and contracted services.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
1 FTE – Environmental Specialist	Operating	Tax	-	142,600	142,600
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	-	17,600	17,600
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>160,200</b>	<b>160,200</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>160,200</b>

### Strategic Alignment

An investment in Environment Protection Services is in alignment with Effective Service Strategy:

- **SD2:** *Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.*
- **SD2.3:** *Services achieving defined service level targets.*

### Alternative

#### Investment: **1 FTE – Environmental Specialist**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain current staffing levels.

#### Investment: **General Expense**

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

### Risk to Alternative

#### Investment: **1 FTE – Environmental Specialist**

Existing service levels will be maintained as the County will continue to cover the agri-environmental portfolio. There will be limited ability to take on additional environmental monitoring and an increased risk that the County does not meet the regional expectation for increased participation in environmental projects and initiatives.

#### Investment: **General Expense**

N/A

## 20. Facility Access

### Request Summary

The Facility Access Services is requesting an investment of \$134,900 in the following resource:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Bragg Creek Grader Shed Washroom Trailer	Operational Services	-	Capital Asset Replacement	50,000
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Operational Services	-	Price Increase	84,900
<b>Total</b>				<b>134,900</b>

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses include materials, utilities, equipment rental, contracted services, and maintenance.

### Recommendation

The Council approves an investment of \$134,900 for increased service costs, and purchase Bragg Creek Grader Shed Washroom Trailer.

### Justification

#### Investment: Bragg Creek Grader Shed Washroom Trailer

Bragg Creek grader shed washroom trailer has reached end of its useful life and requires replacement.

#### Investment: General Expenses

There is a price increase in general expenses due to increased costs from suppliers (evident through a review of the actual cost over the last 3 years) and an increase in 2024 utility rates.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Bragg Creek Grader Shed Washroom Trailer	Capital	Reserve	50,000	-	50,000
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	-	84,900	84,900
<b>Total</b>			<b>50,000</b>	<b>84,900</b>	<b>134,900</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>84,900</b>

### Strategic Alignment

This investment aligns with the County's strategy of Effective Service Delivery:

- **SD2:** Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.
- **SD2.1:** Citizens satisfied with the range of County services available/delivered.

Alternative
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>Bragg Creek Grader Shed Washroom Trailer/General Expenses</b></p> <p>An alternative considered by Administration for both the General Expenses and Bragg Creek Grader Shed Washroom Trailer replacement is for the County to reduce facility access service levels in these areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Landscaping and Pest Control</b> – Decrease the amount of pest control and landscaping at County facilities.</li> <li>• <b>Preventive Maintenance</b> – Discontinue our preventive maintenance program for the facility mechanical and operating systems.</li> <li>• The following service areas do not have an alternative direction for Council’s consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Utilities Natural Gas, Electricity, and Water</b> – Cost increases in these categories do not have an alternative. Carbon Tax is increasing as well as natural gas and electricity rates.</li> <li>○ <b>Security and Life Safety</b> – These increases are due to contracts increasing with external providers.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Risk to Alternative
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>Bragg Creek Grader Shed Washroom Trailer/General Expenses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Landscaping and Pest Control</b> – Aesthetics of County Hall grounds would not be kept to the same level. Dead or damaged trees would not be replaced.</li> <li>• <b>Preventive Maintenance</b> – Increased costs if we experienced mechanical failures due to reduction of preventative maintenance program.</li> </ul>

## 21. Fire Service Planning & Response

### Request Summary

The Fire Services Planning and Response service is requesting an investment of \$8,380,000 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Fuel station 103 (Bears paw)	Fire Services & Emergency Management	All	Growth in Service Request	37,500
Fuel station 111 (Langdon)	Fire Services & Emergency Management	All	Growth in Service Request	37,500
Collective Bargaining Training & Safety requirements	Fire Services & Emergency Management	Emergency Rescue	New Initiative	121,800
Wildfire Sprinkler Truck Upgrades	Fire Services & Emergency Management	Emergency Rescue	New Initiative	25,000
Fire Inspector Training & Equipment	Fire Services & Emergency Management	All	New Initiative	24,000
Major Fire Response	Fire Services & Emergency Management	Emergency Rescue	Growth in Service Request	362,800
Madden Fire Station #105	Fire Services & Emergency Management	All	Capital Asset Replacement	6,520,000
Gear Washing Machine	Fire Services & Emergency Management	All	Capital Asset Replacement	15,000
Rescue Replacement #5631 - Deposit	Fire Services & Emergency Management	Structure or Vehicle Fire Response	Capital Asset Replacement	70,000
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Fire Services & Emergency Management	Emergency Rescue	Price Increase	1,166,400
<b>Total</b>				<b>8,380,000</b>

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses include reserve payback due to Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) ratification (\$830,000), equipment servicing costs, and contracted expenses.

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$8,380,000 for Fire Services Planning and Response service due to a growth in service request requiring a new fire station and other assets, multiple year price increases in staffing cost from negotiated agreements, and new initiatives that ensure the safety of the County and fire department personnel.

## Justification

### Investment: Fuel Station 103 (Bears paw)

#### **Current State**

Currently, the Langdon Station is fueling at either 12 Mile Coulee Road or in Cochrane. This means service vehicles must spend time and resources to fill trucks with fuel.

#### **Target State**

Fire Services Planning and Response services requires a \$37,500 adjustment to provide an on-site diesel tank to fill up emergency vehicles without leaving the station.

### Investment: Fuel Station 111 (Langdon)

#### **Current State**

Currently, the Langdon Station is fueling at one location of Wenstrom Equipment. This means service vehicles must spend time and resources to fill trucks with fuel.

#### **Target State**

Fire Services Planning and Response budget requires a \$37,500 adjustment to provide an on-site diesel tank to fill up emergency vehicles without leaving the station

### Investment: Collective Bargaining Training and Safety requirements

#### **Current State**

In 2023, Administration ratified a new Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) that outlined additional training and health testing requirements for employees. As best practice, in addition to the employees covered by the CBA, the County will extend the additional training and health testing to volunteer firefighters.

#### **Target State**

Fire Services Planning and Response services requires a \$121,800 adjustment to provide the training and health testing requirements outlined in the CBA to County employees and volunteers.

### Investment: Wildfire Sprinkler Truck Upgrade

#### **Current State**

The current Wildfire Sprinkler Truck does not meet the requirements to be used for cost recovery purposes for wildfire responses. The interphase trailer requires new pumps and hoses to be used for this purpose.

#### **Target State**

Fire Services Planning and Response services requires a \$25,000 adjustment to complete the upgrades on the trailer will allow the County to use it for response in major wildfire events and be reimbursed for the expenses.

**Investment: Fire Inspector Training and Equipment**

**Current State**

The County requires two additional Fire Inspectors to meet the demands of development and businesses to ensure they meet the National Fire Code requirements.

**Target State**

Fire Services Planning and Response services requires a \$24,000 adjustment to equip additional fire inspectors as per new provincial regulations.

**Investment: Major Fire Response**

**Current State**

Major Fire Events (classified in this case as events that require employees to be called in for overtime response) have increased 30% in the past year. We currently do not have this amount of overtime built into the budget.

**Target State**

Fire Services Planning and Response budget requires a \$362,800 adjustment to meet the demand for overtime pay on Major Fire Events.

**Investment: Madden Fire Station 105**

**Current State**

The Madden fire detachment is currently operating out of a repurposed grader shed. The current station is at risk of being closed by OH&S which would result in a service disruption and would also require the County to construct an emergency temporary structure at a cost of nearly \$500,000.

**Target State**

Fire Services Planning and Response services requires a \$1,166,400 budget adjustment to construct a purpose-built station that will replace the grader shed and result in compliance with OH&S standards.

**Investment: Gear Washing Machine**

**Current State**

The current gear washing machine is 15 years old. There are 3 of these machines within the County, and 230 responders with only one set of gear that needs to be cleaned immediately after an incident or once a year, before being placed back into the engines.

**Target State**

Fire Services Planning and Response services requires a \$15,000 budget adjustment to replace the gear washing machine in the Balzac fire station.



### Investment: Rescue Replacement 5631 – Deposit

#### Target State

The current rescue truck is a 20-year-old rescue truck at Irricana Station 108. The truck is used for engine and equipment cleanup and vehicle rescue events, servicing either the east or west of the County. Fire Services currently relies on partners in Redwood Meadows and Cochrane to service Highways 1 and 22.

#### Target State

Fire Services Planning and Response services requires a \$70,000 adjustment to replace the current rescue truck. This replacement will be able to service the areas referenced without relying on partners, allowing for a timelier response to accidents.

### Investment: General Expenses

#### Current State

There is a year-over-year price increase in general expenses for Fire Services Planning and Response as the result of a newly ratified CBA and a review of the actual cost of general expenses over the last 3 years

#### Target State

Fire Services Planning and Response services requires a \$1,166,400 budget adjustment to accommodate the payback of reserves due to the CBA and a review of the actual cost of general expenses over the last 3 years.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Fuel station 103 (Bears paw)	<sup>1</sup> Capital	Reserve	37,500	-	37,500
Fuel station 111 (Langdon)	<sup>1</sup> Capital	Reserve	37,500	-	37,500
Collective Bargaining Training & Safety requirements	Operating	Tax	-	121,800	121,800
Wildfire Sprinkler Truck Upgrades	Operating	Tax	25,000	-	25,000
Fire Inspector Training & Equipment	Operating	Tax	24,000	-	24,000
Major Fire Response	Operating	Tax	-	362,800	362,800
Madden Fire Station #105	Capital	Debt	6,520,000	-	6,520,000
Gear Washing Machine	Capital	Tax	15,000	-	15,000
Rescue Replacement #5631 - Deposit	Capital	Reserve	70,000	-	70,000
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	-	1,166,400	1,166,400
<b>Total</b>			<b>6,729,000</b>	<b>1,651,000</b>	<b>8,380,000</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>1,715,000</b>

There will be future operating impacts as the result of the approval of the Fuel Stations (Bears paw and Langdon). Administration does not yet have an accurate estimate for what these impacts will be, but it is expected cost savings come as the result of bulk fuel purchases and reduced travel time to refuel.

None of the other capital expense outlined above are expected to have future impact on the capital or operational budget. As they are replacements of current capital assets, the operating costs are included in the base operating budget.

### Strategic Alignment

This investment aligns with the County's strategy of Effective Service Delivery:

- **SD2:** *Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.*
- **SD2.1:** *Citizens satisfied with the range of County services available/delivered.*

### Alternative

#### Investment: **Fuel station 103 (Bears paw)**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

#### Investment: **Fuel station 111 (Langdon)**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

#### Investment: **Collective Bargaining Training and Safety requirements**

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

#### Investment: **Wildfire Sprinkler Truck Upgrade**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

#### Investment: **Fire Inspector Training & Equipment**

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

#### Investment: **Major Fire Response**

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

#### Investment: **Madden Fire Station 105**

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

#### Investment: **Gear Washing Machine**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to buy a second set of gear for each responder (estimated at \$650,000).

#### Investment: **Rescue Replacement 5631 – Deposit**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo and continue to rely on partners in Redwood Meadows and Cochrane to service Highways 1 and 22.

#### Investment: **General Expenses**

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

Risk to Alternative
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>Fuel station 103 (Bears paw)</b></p> <p>The members of this station are currently required to drive a fair distance every time their trucks need to refuel, resulting in increased costs and a possible risk due to response times being delayed if trucks are enroute to fuel when an event takes place.</p>
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>Fuel station 111 (Langdon)</b></p> <p>The members of this station are currently required to drive a fair distance every time their trucks need to refuel, resulting in increased costs and a possible risk due to response times being delayed if trucks are enroute to fuel when an event takes place.</p>
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>Collective Bargaining Training &amp; Safety requirements</b></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>Wildfire Sprinkler Truck Upgrade</b></p> <p>With the current configuration of the sprinkler truck, it does not meet the standards to be used for major response.</p>
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>Fire Inspector Training and Equipment</b></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>Major Fire Response</b></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>Madden Fire Station 105</b></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>Gear Washing Machine</b></p> <p>Higher initial cost compared to replacing the gear washing machine.</p>
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>Rescue Replacement 5631 – Deposit</b></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>General Expenses</b></p> <p>N/A</p>

## 22. Fleet Provision

### Request Summary

The Fleet Provision service is requesting an investment of \$3,278,800 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Capital Fleet Vehicle Replacements	Operational Services	Fleet Provision	Capital Asset Replacement	2,150,000
Capital Fleet Equipment Replacements	Operational Services	Fleet Provision	Capital Asset Replacement	699,000
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Operational Services	Fleet Provision	Price Increase	429,800
<b>Total</b>				<b>3,278,800</b>

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses include work clothes, purchased repairs, tools and equipment, shop supplies, parts, and transfer to the Public Works Vehicles and Equipment Reserve.

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$3,278,800 for the Fleet Provision service due to vehicle and equipment replacements and increasing prices for general expenses.

### Justification

#### Investment: Capital Fleet Vehicle Replacements

##### Current State

The County has 128 vehicles to respond to County needs. Replacements support the maintenance of this service level. The end-of-life is determined by condition assessments and operating and maintenance costs.

##### Target State

The target state is to maintain the current service levels by replacing end-of-life vehicles.

#### Investment: Capital Fleet Equipment Replacements

##### Current State

The County has 420 pieces of equipment, including attachments and trailers to respond to County needs. Replacements support the maintenance of this service level. The end-of-life is determined by condition assessments and operating and maintenance costs.

##### Target State

The target state is to maintain the current service levels by replacing end-of-life equipment.

#### Investment: General Expenses

##### Current State

Rocky View County has identified year-over-year price increases for fleet provision due to a need to hire an outside contractor for cleaning of coveralls, an increase in purchased repairs instead of providing in-house repairs to meet timelines primarily for fire services, and overall supplier price increases for materials

and parts. A recent report prepared by an outside contractor has also identified the need to increase the transfer to the vehicle and equipment reserve to fund future capital vehicle and equipment purchases.

### Target State

The investment to cover general expenses will result in the budget being reflective of actual costs needed to provide the existing services, and ensuring that the reserve for vehicle and equipment purchases will be at a sufficient level to cover future replacements needed.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Capital Fleet Vehicle Replacements	Capital	Reserve	2,150,000	-	2,150,000
Capital Fleet Equipment Replacements	Capital	Reserve	699,000	-	699,000
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	-	429,800	429,800
<b>Total</b>			<b>2,849,000</b>	<b>429,800</b>	<b>3,278,800</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>429,800</b>

Future Capital Expenses Obligations: Approval of the one-time capital expense has no future capital expense obligation associated with these assets. There is an expectation that the County will replace these assets at the end of their useful lives.

### Strategic Alignment

An investment in general expenses for fleet provision and the replacement of vehicles and equipment aligns with the Effective Service Delivery and Financial Prosperity strategies:

- **SD2:** *Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.*
- **FP2:** *Ensuring County remains financially sustainable for future generations.*

### Alternative

#### Investment: Capital Fleet Vehicle Replacements

Maintain the status quo and use the existing units beyond the prescribed end-of-life.

#### Investment: Capital Fleet Equipment Replacements

Maintain the status quo and use the existing units beyond the prescribed end-of-life.

#### Investment: General Expenses

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

### Risk to Alternative

#### Investment: Capital Fleet Vehicle Replacements

Increased safety risk as well as maintenance and operational cost increases.

#### Investment: Capital Fleet Equipment Replacements

Increased safety risk as well as maintenance and operational cost increases.

#### Investment: General Expenses

N/A

## 23. Incident Response

### Request Summary

The Incident Response service is requesting an investment of \$488,200 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Enhanced RCMP – Strathmore	Enforcement Services	Police Intervention	Growth in Service Request	447,200
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Enforcement Services	-	Price Increase	41,000
<b>Total</b>				<b>488,200</b>

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses include costs for current RCMP support and uniform and materials for County employees.

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$488,200. \$447,200 is to expand the Langdon RCMP complement by 2 members, \$39,000 is to cover price increases from providing RCMP services to Langdon and \$2,000 is to provide enforcement of Unsightly/ Nuisance property bylaw through property remediation.

### Justification

#### Investment: Enhanced RCMP – Strathmore

##### Current State

The 2024 Police to Population Ratio (PPR) for Rocky View County – Langdon Detachment is estimated at 1,928 persons per Member (RCMP Municipal Detachment average for populations less than 10,000 was 663 persons per Member).

##### Target State

Incident Response service requires a \$447,200 adjustment to fund the increase of 2 Constables that will bring the PPR to 1:1157, and thus, closer to a more appropriate resource level to support the residents of Langdon, and permit the ability to maintain 24/7 in community police presence.

#### Investment: General Expenses

##### Current State

There is a year-over-year price increase in general expenses for Incident Response services, evident through a review of the actual cost of general expenses over the last 3 years and estimates provided by the RCMP.

##### Target State

The Incident Response service requires a \$41,000 adjustment to cover the RCMP-advised cost increase of \$39,000, and \$2,000 for unsightly remediations.

Financial Implication					
Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Enhanced RCMP – Strathmore	Operating	Tax	-	447,200	447,220
General Expenses	Capital	Tax	-	41,000	41,000
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>488,200</b>	<b>488,200</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>488,200</b>
Strategic Alignment					
<p>An investment in incident response services aligns with the Effective Service Delivery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i><b>SD2:</b> Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.</i></li> </ul>					
Alternative					
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>Enhanced RCMP – Strathmore</b></p> <p>An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to continue with the current model where Strathmore Detachment municipal and rural resources provide police coverage when needed. This will result in an investment of 223,600.</p> <p><u>Investment:</u> <b>General Expenses</b></p> <p>Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council’s consideration.</p>					
Risk to Alternative					
<p><u>Investment:</u> <b>Enhanced RCMP – Strathmore</b></p> <p>In this format, Rocky View County – Langdon Detachment is homed with Strathmore Detachment. The Town of Strathmore is aware of and has not opposed this deployment model at this time provided there is balanced reciprocal policing coverage between rural and municipal areas and continued cooperation in support of front-line policing initiatives.</p> <p><u>Investment:</u> <b>General Expenses</b></p> <p>N/A</p>					

## 24. Land Administration

Request Summary

The Land Administration service is requesting an investment of \$17,500 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Transportation Services	-	Price Increase	17,500
Total				17,500

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses includes contracted services and maintenance.

Recommendation

The Council approves an investment of \$17,500 for Land Administration services due to increased contactor costs for assets requiring maintenance.

Justification

Investment: General Expenses

Current State

There is a year-over-year price increase in general expenses for land administration services, evident through a review of the actual cost of general expenses over the last 3 years.

Target State

N/A

Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	-	17,500	17,500
Total			-	17,500	17,500
2025 Tax Impact					17,500

Strategic Alignment

This investment aligns with the County’s strategy of Effective Service Delivery:

- SD2:** *Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.*

Alternative

Investment: General Expenses

N/A

Risk to Alternative

Investment: General Expenses

N/A



## 25. Prevention & Compliance

### Request Summary

The prevention and compliance services is requesting an investment of \$4,000 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Enforcement Services	-	Price Increase	4,000
<b>Total</b>				<b>4,000</b>

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses includes materials and uniforms.

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$4,000 due to price increase of equipping and providing uniforms for the members of the traffic enforcement team.

### Justification

#### Investment: General Expenses

#### Current State

There is a year-over-year price increase in general expenses for Prevention & Compliance services, evident through a review of the actual cost of general expenses over the last 3-years.

#### Target State

Prevention and Compliance services requires an adjustment of \$4,000 to provide traffic enforcement staff with the specialized equipment and uniforms to perform their duties safely and efficiently.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	-	4,000	4,000
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>4,000</b>	<b>4,000</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>4,000</b>

### Strategic Alignment

This investment aligns with the County's strategy of Effective Service Delivery:

- **SD2:** Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.

### Alternative

#### Investment: General Expenses

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

### Risk to Alternative

#### Investment: General Expenses

N/A

## 26. Roadway Access

### Request Summary

The Roadway Access service is requesting an investment of \$17,839,000 to cover Capital Asset replacement and price increases for service contract, materials, and wages.

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Big Hill Springs Road - asphalt overlay	Capital and Engineering Services	Grid Roadway Access;	Capital Asset Replacement	960,000
Burma Road - engineering and land acquisition	Capital and Engineering Services	Grid Roadway Access;	Growth in Service Request	1,500,000
Twp Rd 250 - Realignment at Conrich Road	Capital and Engineering Services	Grid Roadway Access	Growth in Service Request	9,000,000
Township Road 252 - asphalt overlay (Jumping Pound Road to Range Road 43)	Capital and Engineering Services	Grid Roadway Access;	Capital Asset Replacement	1,020,000
BF 01234 - 1 Culvert 2316 x 2560 x 53 SPCSP Ellipse TWPRD285 Between RGERD291 and RGERD292	Capital and Engineering Services	Bridge Repair and Maintenance;	Capital Asset Replacement	810,000
BF 01525 - 1 Culvert 1724 x 1920 x 70 SPCSP Ellipse TWPRD290 Between RGERD292 and RGERD293	Capital and Engineering Services	Bridge Repair and Maintenance;	Capital Asset Replacement	1,775,000
BF 13113 - 1 Culvert 2897 x 3201 x 31M SPCSP Ellipse RGERD274 Between TWPRD264 and TWPRD270	Capital and Engineering Services	Bridge Repair and Maintenance;	Capital Asset Replacement	810,000
BF 75696- 1 Culvert 1524 x 31M CSP - Strutted TWPRD274 Between PANORAMARD and RGERD20	Capital and Engineering Services	Bridge Repair and Maintenance;	Capital Asset Replacement	650,000
BF 74101 - 1 Bridge 4.9 M TT Span Bridge TWPRD261A Between SECHWY772 and RGERD22	Capital and Engineering Services	Bridge Repair and Maintenance;	Capital Asset Replacement	1,200,000
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Transportation Services	Grid Roadway Access; Bridge Repair and Maintenance;	Price Increase	114,000
<b>Total</b>				<b>17,839,000</b>

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses include public engagement events cost, and statutory training for Fire Personnel.

Recommendation
<p>That Council approves an investment of \$17,839,000 for Roadway Access services to cover general expenses of \$114,000 from Tax, and Capital Asset Replacement of \$17,725,000, which will be covered from Reserve, Levy, Federal and Provincial Grants.</p>
Justification
<p><b><u>Investment: Roads and <sup>1</sup>Bridge Capital Assets</u></b></p> <p><b>Current State</b></p> <p><b><u>Big Hill Springs Road – Asphalt overlay – \$960K:</u></b>          Requested investment will be used for standard maintenance requirement identified to extend the road service life. This will maintain current service levels of asphalt paved surface has reached end of life</p> <p><b><u>Burma Road – Engineering and land acquisition – \$1.50M:</u></b>          Requested investment will be used for project detailed design engineering and land acquisition for future construction. This will increase our current level of service from 2 lane paved 7.5m width, to 2 lane paved regional collector standard 9m width.</p> <p><b><u>Township Road 252 – Asphalt overlay (Jumping Pound Road to Range Road 43) – \$1.02M:</u></b>          Requested investment will be used for standard maintenance requirement identified to extend the road service life. This will maintain current service levels of asphalt paved surface until end of life.</p> <p><b><u>Twp Rd 250 – Realignment at Conrich Road – \$9.0M</u></b>          Due to funding limitations (Levy Reserve), this project is proposed to be completed in two phases. Phase 1 will be 2 lanes paved with full 4 lane sub-grade construction; further 2 paved lanes to follow.</p> <p>The requested investment will lead to an increased level of service, and alignments identified in the current Conrich Area Structure Plan by maintaining traffic volume along an alternate and safer route away from the growing residential community.</p> <p>The current state of the asset is a 2-lane paved road, 4-way stop, adjacent to the community. The target state is a signalized intersection with 4-lane arterial paved road.</p> <p><b><u>BF 01234 – 1 Culvert 2316 x 2560 x 53 SPCSP Ellipse TWP RD285 between RGE RD291 and RGE RD292 – \$810K:</u></b>          Replacement of Bridge Culvert 01234, east of Crossfield to maintain current service levels. This Bridge has been in service for 47 years (since 1977) and is near end of useful life. The proposed replacement is based on Based on Alberta Transportation standards.</p> <p><b><u>BF 01525 – 1 Culvert 1724 x 1920 x 70 SPCSP Ellipse TWP RD290 between RGE RD292 and RGE RD293 – \$1.77M:</u></b>          Replacement of Bridge Culvert 01525, northeast of Crossfield to maintain current service levels. This bridge has been in service for 46 years (since 1978) and is near end of useful life. The proposed replacement is based on Based on Alberta Transportation standards.</p>

**BF 13113 – 1 Culvert 2897 x 3201 x 31M SPCSP Ellipse RGE RD274 between TWP RD264 and TWP RD270 – \$810K:**

Replacement of Bridge Culvert 13113-1, north of Kathryn to maintain current service levels. This bridge has been in service for 37 years (since 1987) and is near end of useful life. The proposed replacement is based on Alberta Transportation standards.

**BF 75696 – 1 Culvert 1524 x 31M CSP – Strutted TWPRD274 between PANORAMA RD and RGE RD20 – \$650K:**

Replacement of Bridge Culvert 75696-1, west of Airdrie to maintain current service levels. This bridge has been in service for 61 years (since 1963) and is near end of useful life. The proposed replacement is based on Alberta Transportation standards.

**BF 74101 – 1 Bridge 4.9 M TT Span Bridge TWPRD261A between SECHWY772 and RGE RD22 – \$1.2M:**

Replacement of Standard Bridge 74101-1, northwest of Calgary to maintain current service levels. This bridge has been in service for 61 years (since 1963) and is near end of useful life. The proposed replacement is based on Alberta Transportation standards.

<sup>1</sup>Based on results from a thorough assessment of the County's bridge inventory (completed through Bow Valley Bridge Services in 2024), the bridge request listed above have been reprioritized as needing work completed.

**Investment: General Expenses**

**Current State**

There is a year-over-year price increase in general expenses for road access services, evident through a review of the actual cost of general expenses over the last 3 years.

**Financial Implication**

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Big Hill Springs Road - Asphalt overlay	Capital	Levy; Provincial Grant; Reserve	960,000	-	960,000
Burma Road - Engineering and land acquisition	Capital	Levy; Provincial Grant; Reserve	1,500,000	-	1,500,000
Township Road 252 - Asphalt overlay (Jumping Pound Road to Range Road 43)	Capital	Levy; Provincial Grant; Reserve	1,020,000	-	1,020,000
Twp Rd 250 - Realignment at Conrich Road	Capital	Levy; Provincial Grant; Reserve	9,000,000	-	9,000,000
BF 01234 - 1 Culvert 2316 x 2560 x 53 SPCSP Ellipse TWPRD285 Between RGERD291 and RGERD292	Capital	Provincial Grant	810,000	-	810,000
BF 01525 - 1 Culvert 1724 x 1920 x 70 SPCSP Ellipse	Capital	Provincial Grant	1,775,000	-	1,775,000

TWPRD290 Between RGERD292 and RGERD293					
BF 13113 - 1 Culvert 2897 x 3201 x 31M SPCSP Ellipse RGERD274 Between TWPRD264 and TWPRD270	Capital	Provincial Grant	810,000	-	810,000
BF 75696 - 1 Culvert 1524 x 31M CSP - Strutted TWPRD274 Between PANORAMARD and RGERD20	Capital	Provincial Grant	650,000	-	650,000
BF 74101 - 1 Bridge 4.9 M TT Span Bridge TWPRD261A Between SECHWY772 and RGERD22	Capital	Provincial Grant	1,200,000	-	1,200,000
General Expenses	Operating	Tax		114,000	114,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>17,725,000</b>	<b>114,000</b>	<b>17,839,000</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>114,000</b>

### Strategic Alignment

This investment aligns with the County's strategy of Effective Service Delivery:

- **SD2:** Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.
- **FP2:** Ensuring County remains financially sustainable for future generations

### Alternative

#### Investment: Big Hill Springs Road – Asphalt overlay

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

#### Investment: Burma Road – Engineering and land acquisition

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

#### Investment: Township Road 252 – Asphalt overlay (Jumping Pound Road to Range Road 43)

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

#### Investment: Twp Rd 250 – Realignment at Conrich Road

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

#### Investment: BF 01234 – 1 Culvert 2316 x 2560 x 53 SPCSP Ellipse TWP RD285 between RGE RD291 and RGE RD292

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

#### Investment: BF 01525 – 1 Culvert 1724 x 1920 x 70 SPCSP Ellipse TWP RD290 between RGE RD292 and RGE RD293

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

Investment: **BF 13113 – 1 Culvert 2897 x 3201 x 31M SPCSP Ellipse RGE RD274 between TWP RD264 and TWP RD270**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

Investment: **BF 75696– 1 Culvert 1524 x 31M CSP – Struttred TWP RD274 between PANORAMA RD and RGE RD20**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

Investment: **BF 74101 – 1 Bridge 4.9 M TT Span Bridge TWP RD261A between SEC HWY772 and RGE RD22**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

Investment: **General Expenses**

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

#### Risk to Alternative

Investment: **Big Hill Springs Road – Asphalt overlay**

Road deterioration to an unsafe standard risking full road closure and increased user dissatisfaction.

Investment: **Burma Road – Engineering and land acquisition**

Reduced safety factor of the roadway with no allowance for a shoulder.

Investment: **Township Road 252 – Asphalt overlay (Jumping Pound Road to Range Road 43)**

Road deterioration to an unsafe standard risking full road closure and increased user dissatisfaction.

Investment: **Twp Rd 250 – Realignment at Conrich Road**

Discourage investment and growth in the area; increased safety concerns with rising volumes of industrial traffic adjacent to the community and inadequate intersection control.

Investment: **BF 01234 – 1 Culvert 2316 x 2560 x 53 SPCSP Ellipse TWP RD285 between RGE RD291 and RGE RD292**

Further deterioration of the bridge could lead to increased road maintenance and eventual road failures.

Investment: **BF 01525 – 1 Culvert 1724 x 1920 x 70 SPCSP Ellipse TWP RD290 between RGE RD292 and RGERD293**

Further deterioration of the bridge could lead to increased road maintenance and eventual road failures.

Investment: **BF 13113 – 1 Culvert 2897 x 3201 x 31M SPCSP Ellipse RGE RD274 between TWP RD264 and TWP RD270**

Further deterioration of the bridge could lead to increased road maintenance and eventual road failures.

Investment: **BF 75696– 1 Culvert 1524 x 31M CSP – Struttred TWPRD274 between PANORAMA RD and RGERD20**

Further deterioration of the bridge could lead to increased road maintenance and eventual road failures.

Investment: **BF 74101 – 1 Bridge 4.9 M TT Span Bridge TWP RD261A between SEC HWY772 and RGERD22**

Further deterioration of the bridge could lead to increased road maintenance and eventual road failures.

Investment: **General Expenses**

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

## 27. Roadway Special Access

### Request Summary

The Roadway Special Access service is requesting \$10,900 in the following resource:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Transportation Services	-	Price Increase	10,900
<b>Total</b>				<b>10,900</b>

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses includes contracted services.

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$10,900 for Roadway Special Access due to an increase in price of contracted services costs associated with issuing of permits.

### Justification

Investment: **General Expenses**

#### Current State

There is a year-over-year price increase in general expenses for Road Special Access services, evident through a review of the actual cost of general expenses over the last 3 years.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	-	10,900	10,900
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>10,900</b>	<b>10,900</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>10,900</b>

### Strategic Alignment

This investment aligns with the County's strategy of Effective Service Delivery:

- **SD2:** *Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.*

### Alternative

Investment: **General Expenses**

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

### Risk to Alternative

Investment: **General Expenses**

N/A



## 28. Stormwater Drainage

### Request Summary

The stormwater drainage service is requesting an investment of \$231,800 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
1 FTE – Storm Gap Analysis Position	Capital & Engineering Services	Stormwater Management	Growth in service request	146,800
CSMI Capital Contributions	Capital & Engineering Services	Stormwater Management	Growth in service request	30,000
CSMI Operating Contributions	Capital & Engineering Services	Stormwater Management	Growth in service request	55,000
<b>Total</b>				<b>231,800</b>

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$231,800 for stormwater management services to enable an average level of service delivery in a rural setting and continued participation in the Cooperative Stormwater Management Initiative (CSMI).

### Justification

#### Investment: 1 FTE - Storm Gap Analysis Position

##### Current State

Stormwater drainage has no service lead; however, 3 service partners been identified as high risk (16/20) from the Service Risk Assessment Score. Stormwater Management and Drainage sub-services are currently understaffed by 0.5 FTE. With one stormwater-specific position, Utility Services would become the Service Lead.

##### Target State

The new FTE will increase service capacity from below average to average levels in the rural settings. 1 FTE will allow for a service lead and therefore a higher level of service in terms of stormwater management. With this resource, Utility Services can proactively manage both strategy and operations while acting as the cross-departmental contact.

#### Investment: CSMI Capital Contributions

##### Current State

As a member of the Cooperative Stormwater Management Initiative (CSMI), the County must make Capital Reserve Contributions to the program.

##### Target State

The investment in the CSMI Contributions will enable the County to align with the member requirements and account for the total required annual payments.

### Investment: CSMI Operating Contributions

#### Current State

The County does not have enough capacity to proactively manage stormwater infrastructure (e.g., ditch maintenance) to ensure effective stormwater management in urban and urban areas. CSMI consists of partnerships with the City of Calgary, Strathmore, and WID. The committee operates jointly with a Board of Directors, with all partners sharing the annual operating costs.

#### Target State

Due to the complexity of the CSMI, and as we move forward with the implementation of the regional stormwater system, this service has experience year-over-year operational costs increase. As such, an increase in the budget is requested to accommodate the annual operational costs associated with CSMI.

#### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
1 FTE – Storm Gap Analysis Position	Operating	Tax	-	146,800	146,800
CSMI Capital Contributions	Operating	Tax	-	30,000	30,000
CSMI Operating Contributions	Operating	Tax	-	55,000	55,000
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>231,800</b>	<b>231,800</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>231,800</b>

#### Strategic Alignment

The investment in the 1 FTE Storm Gap Analysis position as well as the CSMI contributions aligns with the Effective Service Delivery strategy:

- **SD2:** Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.
- **SD4:** Services are continually assessed for improvements in cost efficiency, effectiveness and customer experience.

#### Alternative

##### Investment: 1 FTE - Storm Gap Analysis Position

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

##### Investment: CSMI Capital Contributions

No alternative is provided as the contributions are tied to membership.

##### Investment: CSMI Operating Contributions

No alternative is provided as the contributions are tied to membership.

#### Risk to Alternative

##### Investment: 1 FTE - Storm Gap Analysis Position

Average level of service and below average capacity will begin to decrease as development occurs and areas grow. The County will continue to be reactive in responding to stormwater management issues rather than proactive.

Investment: **CSMI Capital Contributions**

N/A

Investment: **CSMI Operating Contributions**

N/A

## 29. Utility Permission & Locating

### Request Summary

The Utility Permission and Locating service is requesting an investment of \$10,500 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Utility Infrastructure Locate	Utility Services	Utility Infrastructure Locating	Growth in Service Request	10,500
<b>Total</b>				<b>10,500</b>

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$10,500 for membership in Utility Safety Partners and equipment relating to health and safety for service staff.

### Justification

#### Investment: Utility Infrastructure Locate

##### Current State

Utility Services manages four water treatment plants (WTP), three wastewater treatment plants (WWTP), and multiple stormwater systems, each with extensive underground piping and infrastructure. With increased development and growth throughout the County, this infrastructure needs to be protected from strikes and disruptions. As the requests for locates has increased, so has the need to respond in an appropriate fashion. The County has joined the Utility Safety Partners as a locates partner and it has more than tripled the amount of locates we are aware of, drastically reducing response time. Additionally, all staff are required to have a cellphone for health and safety reasons in the office and in the field.

##### Target State

This increased expense/service is to provide customers with more support access for utility locates by partnering with Utility Safety Partners.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Utility Infrastructure Locate	Operating	Tax	-	10,500	10,500
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>10,500</b>	<b>10,500</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>10,500</b>

Strategic Alignment
<p>The investment in Utility Permission and Locating aligns with the Effective Service Delivery strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>SD2:</b> <i>Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.</i></li> <li>• <b>SD4:</b> <i>Services achieving defined service level targets.</i></li> </ul> <p>The investment in the partnership with Utility Safety Partners aligns with the strategy of service delivery and effectiveness as an increased use of locates will result in the protection of citizens.</p>
Alternative
<p><b>Investment: Utility Infrastructure Locate</b></p> <p>To be removed from the Utility Safety Partners and advertise on the County website to request locates before digging. The level of service would be maintained, but the access, or awareness, of the service would most likely resort back to less requests, which means more risk of people digging without knowledge of utility underground infrastructure.</p>
Risk to Alternative
<p><b>Investment: Environmental Specialist</b></p> <p>Without this service the locate requests would decrease, creating an increased risk of people hitting utility lines by blindly digging.</p>

## 30. Vegetation & Pest Management

### Request Summary

The Vegetation and Pest Management service is requesting an investment of \$48,300 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
<sup>1</sup> General Expenses	Agricultural & Environmental Services	-	Price Increase	48,300
<b>Total</b>				<b>48,300</b>

<sup>1</sup>General Expense include an adjustment to wages and equipment rentals.

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$48,300 for Vegetation and Pest Management due to increased costs and for talent retention.

### Justification

#### Investment: General Expenses

#### Current State

There is a year-over-year price increase in general expenses for Vegetation and Pest Management services, evident through a review of the actual cost of general expenses over the last 3 years.

#### Target State

Vegetation and Pest Management services requires an adjustment to fund a wage increase for seasonal staff. In 2023, Administration completed a salary and wages review that suggested an adjusted to attract and retain talent (\$46,300), and an increase in the cost of equipment rentals for vegetation and pest management (\$2,000).

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	-	48,300	<b>48,300</b>
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>48,300</b>	<b>48,300</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>48,300</b>

### Strategic Alignment

The investment in Utility Permission and Locating aligns with the Effective Service Delivery strategy:

- **SD2:** Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.
- **SD4:** Services achieving defined service level targets.

Alternative
<u>Investment:</u> <b>General Expenses</b> Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.
Risk to Alternative
<u>Investment:</u> <b>General Expenses</b> N/A

## 31. Waste Collection & Processing

### Request Summary

The Waste Collection and Processing service is requesting an investment of \$71,300 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Roundup Collection (Decreased events and/or scope of materials collected)	Utility Services	Special Collection Programs	New Initiative	(24,500)
Recycle Depot – Site management, waste hauling, and disposal	Utility Services	Special Collection Programs	New Initiative	83,800
<sup>1</sup> General Expense	Utility Services	Waste Collection and Processing	Price Increase	12,000
<b>Total</b>				<b>71,300</b>

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses includes the cost of landfill monitoring.

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$71,300 for the Waste Collection and Processing service due to year-over-year price increases, and additional investment in the Recycling Depot, offset by a reduction of agricultural material recycling activities.

### Justification

#### Investment: Roundup Collection (decrease)

##### Current State

The County hosts agricultural materials roundup events throughout the summer months to offer residents additional opportunities to properly recycle their agricultural materials. There has been a decreasing trend in overall attendance of the roundups over the past four years. However, the County is still collecting high volumes of agricultural materials as more residents are utilizing the County's year-round transfer sites to properly recycle their materials. With the Springhill Chuck Wagon expanding to a transfer site in July 2024, which accepts agricultural materials year-round, there is now a year-round collection site for agricultural materials in all four quadrants of the County.

##### Target State

It is recommended to decrease the scope of the Agricultural Roundups, whether that be reducing the number of events or reducing the scope of materials collected. With the Springhill Transfer Site collecting agricultural materials year-round, there is now a year-round collection site in all four quadrants of the County for these materials. With a reduction in event target, there is still a significant increase in the level of service in agriculture recycling.

#### Investment: Recycle Depot – Site Management, Waste Hauling, and Disposal

##### Current State

The Springbank Recycle Depot accepts recyclables and yard waste organics but does not currently accept garbage due to the site's limited footprint and being located on leased land. Since there is no garbage



currently accepted at this site, residents must go to a different site to properly dispose of their garbage. At the February 27, 2024, Council Meeting, Deputy Reeve Kochan moved that Council direct Administration to pursue relocating the Springbank Recycle Depot to the Springbank Dog Park Municipal Reserve. This supports the Solid Waste Servicing Strategy's Goal 6, Objective J: Replace the Springbank Recycling Depot with a full-service transfer site and recycling depot.

The Springhill Chuck Wagon expanded to a Transfer Site in July 2024. This has helped work towards the Solid Waste Servicing Strategy's Goal 6, Objective J: Replace the Springhill Chuck Wagon with a full-service transfer site and recycling depot. The site accepts garbage, recyclables, and agricultural material. The site experienced 4,818 vehicles in 2023, averaging 91 vehicles per operational day with the highest single day total being 144 vehicles.

#### **Target State**

Expanding the Springbank Recycle Depot to a transfer site and relocating it to the Springbank Dog Park will not only allow for additional services like garbage drop-off, but it will also help accommodate more residents with a larger site footprint, making it a more convenient waste drop-off site for Springbank residents. Residents with trailers will also be accommodated with the proposed site expansion plans. The Springhill Transfer Site will continue to provide a convenient drop-off location for residential garbage and recyclables.

Additional investment would be required to expand both Springbank and Springhill to full-scale transfer sites. This includes increasing the number of staff on site from 1 to 2 members, as well as a skid steer for site management, which matches the level of service at other County transfer sites. For Springbank, the additional investment also accounts for costs associated with garbage hauling and disposal. For Springhill, the additional investment accounts for a full-year of transfer site operating costs.

#### **Investment: General Expenses**

#### **Current State**

Prior year landfill monitoring at the Bragg Creek and Irricana landfills has found new or increased substances that require the expansion of the scope of monitoring to determine the source of substances, as required by AEP, which has resulted in the price increase.

#### **Target State**

Increase budget in order to meet the actual costs required for landfill monitoring.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Roundup Collection (Decreased events and/or scope of materials collected)	Operating	Tax	-	(24,500)	(24,500)
Recycle Depot – Site management, waste hauling, and disposal	Operating	Tax	-	83,800	83,800
General Expense	Operating	Tax	-	12,000	12,000
<b>Total</b>			-	<b>71,300</b>	<b>71,300</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>71,300</b>

### Strategic Alignment

The investment in Waste Collection & Processing aligns with the Effective Service Delivery strategy:

- **SD2:** Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.
- **SD4:** Services achieving defined service level targets.

### Alternative

#### Investment: Roundup Collection (decrease)

Alternative service scope would maintain the status quo for the County's Agricultural Materials Roundup collection events (i.e. same number of events collecting the same materials).

#### Investment: Recycle Depot – Site Management, Waste Hauling, and Disposal

Alternative service scope for the Springbank Recycle Depot would still involve relocating to the Springbank Dog Park Municipal Reserve per Council's direction as the current site lease expires in July 2025. Reduced scope would involve not adding additional services like garbage drop-off.

Alternative service scope for the Springhill Transfer Site would still involve funding for a full-year of an operating a transfer site but continuing with 1 staff member rather than increasing to 2 staff.

#### Investment: General Expenses

N/A

### Risk to Alternative

#### Investment: Roundup Collection (decrease)

Alternative investment to maintain the current level of service may still result in increased risk given the decreasing trend in overall usage of the Agricultural Roundup events. With year-round transfer sites in all four quadrants of the County, there is a reduced need for the current scope/capacity of Agricultural Roundup events. Continuing with the status quo may not be the most efficient use of resources.

#### Investment: Recycle Depot – Site Management, Waste Hauling, and Disposal

For Springbank, additional investment would be required to relocate the site to the Springbank Dog Park, which would include gravelling and fencing the new site. The alternative recommendation does not account for additional services.

For Springhill, alternative investment would involve a full year of site operations for material hauling and processing, as well as site management, with the exception of continuing with 1 staff instead of increasing to 2 staff members.

The alternative recommendation would still support Council's direction to relocate the Springbank Recycle Depot to the Springbank Dog Park Municipal Reserve, and the new site will help accommodate more resident usage as it has a larger site footprint. However, maintaining the current level of service and resources could result in an increased risk such as illegal dumping (e.g. some may illegally dump their garbage to avoid travelling further to a different site that accepts garbage).

Alternative investment for Springhill will still be needed to maintain service for a full year (vs. 6-months) but it will result in increased risk as it will be more difficult to manage a transfer site with 1 staff vs. 2. Risks include a higher probability of material contamination, illegal dumping, or incidents (e.g. staff will have a more difficult time supervising the site and ensuring residents are disposing of their materials in a safe manner).

Investment: **General Expenses**

N/A

## 32. Wastewater Collection & Treatment

### Request Summary

The Wastewater Collection and Treatment service is requesting an investment of \$996,800 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Automation System Asset Replacement for Bragg Creek, Bearspaw and Cochrane Lake	Utility Services	Wastewater Collection and Treatment	Capital Asset Replacement	297,600
Blazer Wastewater – Solid Waste Management Study	Utility Services	Wastewater Collection and Treatment	Growth in Service Request	60,000
Bragg Creek Wastewater – Additional Monitoring and Testing and Critical Spares	Utility Services	Wastewater Collection and Treatment	Growth in Service Request	10,000
Cochrane Lakes Wastewater – Study for Lift Station Solids Control	Utility Services	Wastewater Collection and Treatment	New Initiative	25,000
General Expenses	Utility Services	Wastewater Collection and Treatment	Price Increase	280,500
<b>Total</b>				<b>673,100</b>

<sup>1</sup>General Expenses include utilities, maintenance, materials, communication, engineering and surveying, treatment fees, watershed billing, effluent hauling and travel and subsistence.

### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$673,100 for replacement of the automation system, Lift Station Study, and Blazer and Bragg Creek General expenses price increases.

### Justification

#### Investment: Automation System Asset Replacement

##### Current State

The automation system infrastructure is aging with some equipment showing signs of failure. A lot of the replacements parts are, or are near, obsolete and an upgrade is required to ensure safe and proper operation of the utility systems. There are inconsistencies in the programming and controls, missing drawings, remote access is limited, and there is no backup should it ever fail. The controls and programming are inconsistent and not standardized from system to system, or within a system.

##### Target State

This project will update, replace, and standardize the current control system, improve trending and visualization, increase operational efficiency, and lower operational costs. This will increase service level. It will help ensure compliance and will decrease service disruptions as better monitoring and control of

systems will be available. Additionally, it will provide and strengthen cyber security to maintain uniformity and consistency of procedure automation and reduce the risk, cost, and errors associated with automating procedures in a continuous process.

**Investment: Blazer Wastewater – Solid Waste Management Study**

**Current State**

Wastewater collection and treatment service is provided in compliance with legislation/regulation and external standards. A computerized maintenance management system (CMMS) to be implemented, which will assist asset management. As was identified in recent development applications (Ascension, Damkar), concerns regarding vacuum trucks required at the Bearspaw wastewater plant is an issue for the local residents. This is a result of how the solids management process is managed.

**Target State**

As identified in the third-party capacity assessments, a solids management strategy should be conducted to better understand options to address solids management as the plant continues to receive more flows. Additional smaller scale items have also been identified to optimize the treatment processes and manage capacity increases.

**Investment: Bragg Creek Wastewater – Additional Monitoring and Testing and Critical Spares**

**Current State**

Wastewater collection and treatment service is provided in compliance with legislation/regulation and external standards. Mandatory Utility Service Connections are being enforced to remaining Bragg Creek customers who have yet to connect to system. Drum screen project will be complete in 2024, in addition to new operations and maintenance contractors in 2024 who are utilizing their computerized maintenance management system (CMMS) program to improve asset management. A new operations and maintenance contractor in late 2024 will result in increase to the O&M fees, and an updated approval from AEPA has resulted in requiring more sampling and testing throughout the operations.

**Target State**

A new O&M contract with additional monitoring and testing (services). Critical spare obtained for pump infrastructure under Maintenance and Materials. Additional testing, monitoring, and infrastructure could increase the efficiency of the plant. If the recommended investment occurred, the County would have better management of flows from the EQ tank to the treatment process. There would be redundancy, preventing situations of pump failures and emergency hauling and repairs. The service fee increases are unavoidable due to new contract effective from October of 2024, and water monitoring programs and sampling required for EPEA Approval.

**Investment: Cochrane Lakes Wastewater – Study for Lift Station Solids Control**

**Current State**

Basket Screen system at the Cochrane Lakes Lift Station is failing and needs to be evaluated for either improvements or different approach to solids control. The solids control is required by the Cochrane contract (MSA Requirements).

**Target State**

Evaluation of lift station solids waste to provide recommendation to comply with the existing contract.

## Investment: General Expenses

### Current State

The investment will support price increase for meals and accommodation for employee travel, cellphone cost due to work alone policies, costs related to contract extensions for the Blazer system to match budget to the actual costs required for the current service level of 2 full time operators, system planned repairs, critical spares, automation support costs, an increase to treatment fees, an update to Cochrane Lakes watershed billing to match to actual costs, PLC and SCADA upkeep for all Lift Stations and the Wastewater Treatment Plant, a price increase in effluent hauling and extra lift station matting cleaning, price increases for cistern fills, sludge hauling, and environmental sampling and monitoring, and overall operating and maintenance pricing corrections to match to actual costs being incurred on the systems.

### Target State

The investment in general expenses will allow for the service level to remain at the current level.

### Financial Implication

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Automation System Asset Replacement for Bragg Creek, Bearspaw, and Cochrane Lake	Capital	Tax; Reserve	297,600	-	297,600
Blazer Wastewater – Solid Waste Management Study	Operating	Tax	-	60,000	60,000
Bragg Creek Wastewater – Additional Monitoring and Testing and Critical Spares	Operating	Tax	-	10,000	10,000
Cochrane Lakes Wastewater – Study for Lift Station Solids Control	Operating	Tax	-	25,000	25,000
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	-	280,000	280,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>297,600</b>	<b>375,500</b>	<b>673,100</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>440,500</b>

### Strategic Alignment

An investment in Wastewater Collection and Treatment aligns with the Effective Service Delivery strategy:

- **SD2:** Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.
- **SD4:** Services achieving defined service level targets.

The investment for the automation system, solid waste studies, and investment in critical spares will help to mitigate citizens' concerns and will enable system improvements for overall effectiveness of the wastewater systems.

Alternative
<p><b><u>Investment:</u> Automation System Asset Replacement</b> An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo</p> <p><b><u>Investment:</u> Blazer Wastewater – Solid Waste Management Study</b> An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo</p> <p><b><u>Investment:</u> Bragg Creek Wastewater – Additional Monitoring and Testing and Critical Spares</b> An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.</p> <p><b><u>Investment:</u> Cochrane Lakes Wastewater – Study for Lift Station Solids Control</b> An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo</p> <p><b><u>Investment:</u> General Expenses</b> N/A</p>
Risk to Alternative
<p><b><u>Investment:</u> Automation System Asset Replacement</b> System failure.</p> <p><b><u>Investment:</u> Blazer Wastewater – Solid Waste Management Study</b> N/A</p> <p><b><u>Investment:</u> Bragg Creek Wastewater – Additional Monitoring and Testing and Critical Spares</b> The water monitoring programs must be maintained to meet approval. The alternative is to not replace the EQ pumps and supporting wiring, equipment and installation services, which would mean no redundancy in pumping from EQ to the treatment portion of the plant. If the current EQ pump fails, this may not impact customers as we would be able to haul the influent, but there would be considerable costs associated with hauling and potential overtime work for the operators.</p> <p><b><u>Investment:</u> Cochrane Lakes Wastewater – Study for Lift Station Solids Control</b> Non-compliance with MSA agreement with Cochrane, failure of basket screen system.</p> <p><b><u>Investment:</u> General Expenses</b> N/A</p>

### 33. Water Treatment & Distribution

#### Request Summary

The Water Treatment and Distribution service is requesting an investment of \$880,200 in the following resources:

Resource Request	Requesting Department	Subservice	Investment Type	Total Budget Request
Automation System Asset Replacement for Bragg Creek, Bearspaw and Cochrane Lake	Utility Services	Water Treatment Planning and Management	Capital Asset Replacement	323,700
Blazer Raw water intake planning options	Utility Services	Potable Water Treatment	Capital Asset Replacement	200,000
Blazer Water – Engineering Studies and O&M Contracts	Utility Services	Water Treatment Planning and Management	Growth in Service Request	95,000
Balzac Water System – Power Study	Utility Services	Water Treatment Planning and Management	New Initiative	15,000
Cochrane Lakes Water – Backwash changes	Utility Services	Potable Water Treatment	New Initiative	61,000
General Expenses	Utility Services	Water Treatment & Distributions (All Subservices)	Price Increase	509,200
<b>Total</b>				<b>1,203,900</b>

<sup>1</sup>General expenses include water conveyance, services, maintenance, communication, materials, meter install, engineering, and surveying.

#### Recommendation

That Council approves an investment of \$1,203,900 for the replacement of the automation system, water intake planning options, power study, backwash changes, and price increases to general expenses.

#### Justification

##### Investment: Automation System Asset Replacement

##### Current State

The automation system infrastructure is aging with some equipment showing signs of failure. A lot of the replacements parts are, or are near, obsolete and an upgrade is required to ensure safe and proper operation of the utility systems. There are inconsistencies in the programming and controls, missing drawings, remote access is limited, and there is no backup should it ever fail. The controls and programming are inconsistent and not standardized from system to system, or within a system.

##### Target State

This project will update, replace, and standardize the current control system, improve trending and visualization, increase operational efficiency, and lower operational costs. This will increase service level. It will help ensure compliance and will decrease service disruptions as better monitoring and control of systems will be available. Additionally, it will provide and strengthen cyber security to maintain uniformity and consistency of procedure automation and reduce the risk, cost, and errors associated with automating procedures in a continuous process.



#### Investment: Blazer Raw Water Intake Planning Options

##### **Current State**

The demand for potable water from the Blazer Water Treatment Plant is increasing, and there is concern about the condition and capacity of the Blazer pump house and raw water intake line. The Pump house is in a poor condition.

##### **Target State**

To perform an engineering assessment at the Blazer raw water pump house, create a work plan and execute upgrade to the pumping system to meet system demand and approval requirements.

#### Investment: Blazer Water – Engineering Studies and O&M Contracts

##### **Current State**

Currently meeting regulatory requirements. Balzac Water Treatment Plant (WTP) provides water to all east Rocky View including Balzac. As the County grows, many of the larger new developments, both commercial and residential, are serviced by this WTP. In addition to new developments, existing developments are continuing to grow and need more servicing.

##### **Target State**

To maintain service level with upcoming growth and development.

#### Investment: Cochrane Lakes Water – Backwash changes

##### **Current State**

The current backwash system is not compliant with the Alberta Environment and Protected Areas (AEP) approvals because the service is discharging to storm (to Horse Creek) and not to the sanitary wastewater collection system, as per approval. AEPA is permitting the County to temporarily continue to discharge the backwash water to storm as long as the County dechlorinates the backwash water before discharging. AEPA has given the County until 2025 to complete the project.

##### **Target State**

Complete backwash system changes to meet regulatory requirements. The AEPA approval states the filter backwash shall be discharged to the backwash holding tank and ultimately to the sanitary wastewater collection system. Administration discovered the backwash water is plumbed and being discharged to storm. In order to meet approval standards, it is required to replumb the backwash system, so the backwash water goes to the sanitary wastewater collection system.

#### Investment: Balzac Water System – Power Study

##### **Current State**

Current electrical devices are dated and may be contributing to higher than required electrical cost to operate the Balzac system.

##### **Target State**

To reduce utility costs at sites (identify/optimize items such as LED Lighting, HVAC, VFD's), a power study can help identify ways to reduce electricity costs by evaluating and analyzing equipment and energy

usage, and provide recommendations for improvement. It will identify areas of high energy usage and the systems that offer the best opportunities for savings.

#### **Investment: General Expenses**

Price increases are due to planned repairs for pumps, leaks, ARV, air blower replacement, Blower Building HVAC repair, Train 1 membrane, UV comms, and to provide for critical spares (sump pump, C12 sensor, PH Sensor, pump, blower) . Increases are also due to the new connection of Wintergreen and overall water system servicing which created an increase to the operating and maintenance fees.

Additional costs include the support to install water meters for Bragg Creek under the mandatory connections bylaw, additional chemicals needed to support Cochrane Lakes new reservoir algae and turbidity calibration unit, increase cost of utilities based on actuals and increase of utility costs for Wintergreen pumphouse and reservoir, increased production and inflation on water conveyance, and to align overall utility costs to reflect actuals.

#### **Financial Implication**

Resource Request	Expense Type	Funding	One-time Cost	Yearly Ongoing	Total Budget Request
Automation System Asset Replacement for Bragg Creek, Bearspaw and Cochrane Lake	Capital	Tax; Reserve	323,700		323,700
Blazer Raw water intake planning options	Capital	Debt	200,000	-	200,000
Blazer Water – Engineering Studies and O&M Contracts	Operating	Tax	-	95,000	95,000
Balzac Water System – Power Study	Operating	Tax	-	15,000	15,000
Cochrane Lakes Water – Backwash changes	Operating	Tax	-	61,000	61,000
General Expenses	Operating	Tax	-	509,200	509,200
<b>Total</b>			<b>523,700</b>	<b>680,200</b>	<b>1,203,900</b>
<b>2025 Tax Impact</b>					<b>730,200</b>

#### **Strategic Alignment**

The investment in Water Treatment and Distribution aligns with the County's Effective Service Delivery strategy:

- **SD2:** Services are resourced and delivered to specific groups as intended, and citizens are satisfied with the outcomes.
- **SD4:** Services achieving defined service level targets.

#### **Alternative**

##### **Investment: Automation System Asset Replacement**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo

##### **Investment: Blazer Raw Water Intake Planning Options**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

**Investment: Blazer Water – Engineering Studies and O&M Contracts**

Maintain the level of service without growth, or grow and decrease the level of service and potentially not meet regulatory requirements.

**Investment: Balzac Water System – Power Study**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

**Investment: Cochrane Lakes Water – Backwash changes**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

**Investment: General Expenses**

An alternative considered by Administration is for the County to maintain status quo.

**Risk to Alternative**

**Investment: Automation System Asset Replacement**

System failure.

**Investment: Blazer Raw Water Intake Planning Options**

Unable to meet regulatory standards and flow demands.

**Investment: Blazer Water – Engineering Studies and O&M Contracts**

The cost to assist growth is unavoidable - new meter installation, water conveyance costs, and fees paid for operation and maintenance by the system contractor are unavoidable and will have to be maintained. The alternative is to not increase budget for servicing, which would lead to equipment and/or infrastructure not receiving recommended maintenance or replacement. Improper maintenance of system could lead to issues with water treatment and/or supply.

**Investment: Balzac Water System – Power Study**

The risk would be that efficiency savings would not be achieved as areas for improvement will not have been identified.

**Investment: Cochrane Lakes Water – Backwash changes**

Unable to meet regulatory standards

**Investment: General Expenses**

N/A

# ROCKY VIEW COUNTY

SUMMARY OF SERVICE REQUEST Rocky View County				
Services	Expense Type	Tax Funded	Other (Grant, Levy, Reserve, Debt)	Budget Request
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER				
Communications	Operating	408,300	-	408,300
Corporate Planning and Monitoring	Operating	302,500	-	302,500
Council Representation & Executive Coordination	Operating	39,100	-	39,100
Public Engagement	Operating	131,900	-	131,900
COMMUNITY SERVICES				
Development Planning & Approval	Operating	300,000	-	300,000
CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION				
Election Management	Operating	43,900	6,100	50,000
Human Resource Access	Operating	92,400	-	92,400
Intergovernmental Relations	Operating	137,700	-	137,700
Special Event Permission	Operating	10,000	-	10,000
FINANCIAL SERVICES DIVISION				
Financial Management	Operating	145,900	-	145,900
Information Technology Management	Operating	1,325,100	-	1,325,100
Procurement	Operating	500	-	500

**SUMMARY OF SERVICE REQUEST**  
**Rocky View County**

Services	Expense Type	Tax Funded	Other (Grant, Levy, Reserve, Debt)	Budget Request
Property Tax Assessment and Collection	Operating	74,200	-	74,200
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES DIVISION</b>				
Agriculture Programming	Operating	50,000	-	50,000
Cemetery Services	Operating	204,200	-	204,200
Emergency Management	Operating	68,700	-	68,700
Engineering Design and Construction	Operating	85,800	-	85,800
Environmental Protection and Awareness	Operating	160,200	-	160,200
Facility Access	Operating; Capital	84,900	50,000	134,900
Fire Services Planning and Response	Operating; Capital	1,715,000	6,665,000	8,380,000
Fleet Provision	Operating; Capital	429,800	2,849,000	3,278,800
Incident Response	Operating	488,200	488,200	488,200
Land Administration	Operating	17,500	-	17,500
Recreation, Leisure and Culture Facility Access and Programming	Operating; Capital	430,900	12,370,000	12,800,900
Prevention and Compliance	Operating	4,000	-	4,000
Roadway Access	Operating; Capital	114,000	-	17,839,000
Roadway Special Access	Operating	10,900	-	10,900
Stormwater Drainage	Operating	231,800	-	231,800

SUMMARY OF SERVICE REQUEST Rocky View County				
Services	Expense Type	Tax Funded	Other (Grant, Levy, Reserve, Debt)	Budget Request
Utility Permission and Locating	Operating	10,500	-	10,500
Waste Collection and Processing	Operating	71,300	-	71,300
Wastewater Collection and Treatment	Operating	440,500	232,600	673,100
Water Treatment and Distribution	Operating	730,200	473,700	1,203,900
Vegetation & Pest Management	Operating	48,300	-	48,300
<b>Total</b>		<b>8,408,200</b>	<b>40,371,400</b>	<b>48,779,600</b>

SERVICE REQUEST BY INVESTMENT TYPE Rocky View County	
Investment Type	Budget Request
New Initiatives	13,159,400
Growth in Service Request	5,580,000
Price Increase	3,824,900
Capital Asset Replacement	26,215,300
<b>Total</b>	<b>48,779,600</b>