



MINUTES

County Council
Regular Meeting

County of Grande Prairie No. 1

April 22, 2013 Council Meeting

Meeting Type : Regular Council Meeting

Date : Monday, April 22, 2013

Start time : 10:00 AM

Location : County of Grande Prairie No. 1 Council Chambers

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Present were:

County Council

- Brock Smith
- Harold Bulford
- Leanne Beaupre
- Lois Dueck
- Mary Ann Eckstrom
- Richard Harpe
- Ross Sutherland
- Sharon Nelson

Absent: Pat Jacobs

Chief Administrative Officer

- Bill Rogan

Directors Group

- Arlen Miller
- Barry Donovan
- Herb Pfau
- John Simpson

Legislative Services

- Sheryle Runhart
- Amanda Oravec

Planning & Development

- Nick Lapp
- Anna Martin

- Matt Konowalchuk

Media

- Aaron Hinks (DHT)
- Brad Whisker (Big Country- Afternoon only)

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. with the singing of O' Canada.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Resolution #CM20130422.1001

MOVED by R. SUTHERLAND to the approve agenda for the April 22, 2013 Council Meeting (2013/04/22) with the following amendments:

- addition of Contract for Executive Director of Pipestone Creek Dinosaur Initiative under In Camera discussion.

CARRIED

STAFF INTRODUCTION

(PRESENTATIONS AND INTRODUCTIONS)
(Issue #20130410001)

Kathleen Turner, Director of FCSS, presented Lillian Whitford who joined FCSS at the Wellington Resource Centre as a part time administrative assistant on February 19th, 2013.

Ms. Turner noted that Ms. Whitford has lived in the area for many years - and has worked in the customer service industry. Her quiet, welcoming personality is an asset to the FCSS program in Clairmont.

Reeve Beaupre welcomed Ms. Whitford to the County of Grande Prairie.

INTRODUCTION OF CHERYL HARRIS - EXECUTIVE

Bill Rogan, CAO, introduced Cheryl Harris as the new Executive Assistant to CAO and Council.

ASSISTANT TO CAO AND COUNCIL

(PRESENTATIONS AND
INTRODUCTIONS)
(Issue #20130416006)

He noted that Cheryl worked for the County of Grande Prairie in the Public Works department in 2007. She has a variety of private sector and municipal experience including working in the Public Works department in the City of Fort Saskatchewan. Cheryl also has her Bachelor of Commerce from St. Mary's University in Halifax.

Her start date will be on April 22, 2013 at which time she will be training with Sheryle Runhart and will be located in her office. After Shirley's retirement Cheryl will be re-located into Shirley's office.

Council joined Administration in welcoming Cheryl Harris back to the County of Grande Prairie and Reeve Beaupre thanked her for returning back to work for the County.

MINUTES APPROVAL

The following corrections were noted for the March 25, 2013 Council meeting minutes:

- Councillor Nelson noted that on Page 13 in regards to remarks to a presentation from Bernie Smasknuk and the "foul odors in Wembley"; it should reflect that PAZA had not received any written complaints to her knowledge about the smell.
- Reeve Beaupre noted that on Page 7 in regards to representation from ASGA, the name should be Dallas Frith not Fritz. Also noted was the resolution to attend and sponsor the FCSS dinner from the Community Assistance Line; it was to be put in Council calendars and it was not inputted into the calendar.
- Councillor Bulford noted that on Page 22 he had spoke about metal frames in the regional junior high school in Hythe not in Bezanson.
- Councillor Eckstrom asked for clarification on a comment from Councillor Sutherland on page 13: "Council wants to keep ownership within the County" but it is located in Wembley. Councillor Sutherland responded that the bone-bed is in County and he wants to keep as much as possible within the County boundaries.
- Councillor Sutherland noted that a correction from the Mr. Smashnuk presentation: it is the lagoon and the feedlot/cattle operation located north of the highway that

emit the smell.

Resolution #CM20130422.1002

MOVED by M. ECKSTROM to approve minutes for the March 25, 2013 Council Meeting (2013/03/25) with amendments as were presented.

CARRIED

**PT. SW-11-72-06-W6M
- AG TO RR-2 - FOCUS
SURVEYS /
CROSSLINK
LEASEHOLDS (FILE
PLLUB20130061)
BYLAW 2680-13-011**

(PUBLIC HEARINGS)
(Issue #20130403012)

Resolution #CM20130422.1003

MOVED BY H. BULFORD that a Public Hearing be held to hear comments regarding the application to re-designate PT. SW-11-72-06-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a Rural Residential (RR-2) District.

The Public Hearing commenced at *10:10 a.m.*

CARRIED

Nick Lapp, Senior Planner, noted that the application is to amend the County Land Use Bylaw by redesignating approximately 7.43 hectares (18.36 acres) of part of SW-11-72-06-W6M from Agricultural (AG) District to Rural Residential (RR-2) District to allow for subdivision for residential use.

The proposed zoning would facilitate the development of approximately 7.43 hectares (18.36 acres) of land within the SW-11-72-6 as part of the next phase of development for Whispering Ridge. The land carries a rural farmland assessment rating between 57% and 69% and is characteristic of flat open field. The proposal is consistent with the requirements of the Municipal Development Plan and is consistent with the Balisky Hodges Area Structure Plan; as such, no land use conflicts are anticipated with the application.

No objections were received. Mr. Lapp noted that the primary access will be located at 154 Avenue (East) and the secondary access will be from Range Road 62 (West).

Chris from Focus was present to answer any questions from Council. He noted that this is the next phase of development and it is in line with the Balisky Hodges ASP. There was no one from audience to speak to this application.

Reeve Beaupre inquired about access and if there are only going to be two access for the area: Range Road 62 and 154 Avenue. Mr. Lapp responded that there will be approximately 3 accesses.

Reeve Beaupre also inquired about usage and whether the area will have a school site. Mr. Lapp responded that there will be a school site and there is approximately 8 hectares that can be used to plan two school sites.

Resolution #CM20130422.1004

MOVED BY S. NELSON that the meeting come out of Public Hearing at *10:17 a.m.*

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1005

MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM that Bylaw 2680-13-001 to re-designate PT. SW-11-72-06-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a Rural Residential (RR-2) District to be read a first time.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1006

MOVED BY S. NELSON that Bylaw 2680-13-011 be read a second time.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1007

MOVED BY B. SMITH that Bylaw 2680-13-011 be given consent for third and final reading.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1008

MOVED BY S. NELSON that Bylaw 2680-13-011 to re-designate PT. SW-11-72-06-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a Rural Residential (RR-2) District be read a third time and finally passed.

CARRIED

**LOT 22, BLOCK 8,
PLAN 072 6739; PT
NE-29-71-05-W6M - RC
TO RE - HELIX (FILE
PLLUB20130070)
BYLAW 2680-13-017**

(PUBLIC HEARINGS)
(Issue #20130415012)

Resolution #CM20130422.1009

MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM that a Public Hearing be held to hear comments regarding the application to re-designate Lot 22, Block 8, Plan 072 6739, PT. NE-29-71-05-W6M from a Residential Condominium (RC) District to a Rural Estate (RE) District.

The Public Hearing commenced at *10:19 a.m.*

CARRIED

Mr. Lapp noted that the proposed zoning would facilitate the development of approximately 4.94 hectares (12.2 acres) of land for Rural Estate use. Surrounding land uses consist of low density residential uses to the south, agricultural uses to the east, with the City of Grande Prairie located immediately to the north and west.

The property is identified as being within the Carriage Lane Estates Area Structure Plan. The applicants are proposing this land use change as they consider that RC District is not marketable, as per section 5.1.2 of the ASP, which states that “provision will be made for medium density housing in the plan area. Should market conditions change the requirement for the

housing style and type, the change shall be accommodated through a land use bylaw amendment.” However, no information has been given to the County to demonstrate that these lots are not marketable. As per section 4.1 & 4.2 of the ASP some of the overall objectives of this plan are “to integrate the development of Carriage Lane Estates with the future urban-style development to the immediate west...” and “to provide for the possible development of a range of land uses including two medium density residential developments” As such, it is considered that the intent of the ASP is for this land to be zoned RC as a transition between the lower density lots of Carriage lane to the east and south, and the potentially higher density lots (single family development) of the City. If the land in question was to be zoned for low density development, then there will be no significant buffer between the two zones.

This application has been circulated to adjacent landowners and no comments were received by our office.

The ERCB noted that they have determined that other wells are located in the area and these wells are licensed as sweet or have an ERCB Level 1 sour designation and meet the recommended setback distance requirement of 100m. The ERCB determined that these pipelines are licensed as sweet or have an ERCB Level 1 sour designation. For these types of pipelines, there is no regulated setback distance however, the right-of-way must be observed.

ATCO Electric noted “...The provision of easements, a right-of-way plan and installation of primary power to meet ATCO Electric standards for a Commercial Industrial development, are conditions of this approval. ATCO Electric is not responsible for expenses to modify existing power lines”.

Alberta Environment noted “...The act of subdividing land or rezoning it is not in itself a concern. However, the activities associated with development of and operations on the land must comply with existing legislation (Water Act)”.

Administration is recommending refusal as the proposal is inconsistent with the ASP for the area.

Randy Glen, Helix, and Todd De Haan, Manager of Carriage Lane Estates, were present to answer any questions from Council.

Mr. Glen spoke to the RC zoning on the south end of Carriage Lane. He noted that they have already created 5 conventional rural estate lots on this parcel. They have been trying to market the balance of the land to the North as a Condominium site since 2007-2008 and it has not been successful. They want to explore continuing the neighborhood further west and the RC zoning does not have a maximum lot size.

Mr. Glen also discussed buffering. The ASP was placed on the overhead showing what has been approved by the City of Grande Prairie. He noted that what has changed since approval is everything in yellow is designated as single family, low density residential with lot sizes or 14 meters/40 foot. These lots are the regular residential zoning as is seen in O'Brien Lake and other subdivisions. He does not think that they need to buffer between two low density land uses. He further noted that the roadway is currently in the City and the same condition is applied on the South side as well.

Mr. De Haan referred to the ASP on the overhead and directed attention towards the green and red parts going South which are 1/2 acre lots (the green is County and the red is City). He noted that the roadway to the North belongs to City and it is the same size as the one located to the South.

Mr. De Haan spoke to marketing and noted that he did not know that he was required to provide evidence of the market not being present; he has had four different developers come in to look at the ASP and they responded that they cannot achieve the appropriate density. It was noted that two developers were from Grande Prairie and they could not get the right price for the houses as the other houses in the area are around \$580,000 - \$600,000 and the price for the small lots would be about \$375,000. They believed that there is too much difference in price.

Mr. De Haan spoke to an application to rezone that was done in December; he circulated letters to all of the residents in Carriage Lane about the zoning, and of the 200 letters sent out, 150

homeowners signed to say they would like to have the RE zoning change done.

There was no one in audience that wanted to speak to the application.

Reeve Beaupre inquired about the park which is located near the south entrance. Mr. Glen showed the whole ASP on the overhead and noted that when the ASP came in it assessed traffic and esthetic areas and there has not been any further development in those areas. Reeve Beaupre posed a question to Mr. Lapp: "RC zoning allows for ownership of road plans etc, could this area become a Gated Community?". Mr. Lapp responded that it could become a gated community. He also noted the differences in housing types and styles and lots sizes but commented that the density can remain the same; this will achieve the buffer between the urban size lots and the RE size lots. Reeve Beaupre also inquired why the lot size was not stipulated in the ASP as the lot size should have been more specific. Mr. Lapp responded that ASP's are not specific to lot and building sizes; Planning could have stipulated but they did not.

Reeve Beaupre commented that the only difference going forward is the maintenance of the roadways by the County instead of the developers by changing the zoning.

Councillor Eckstrom inquired about the RE zoned lots and whether they have been sold. Mr. Glen responded that the lots have been sold and the ASP did not state how big lots needed to be. Councillor Eckstrom noted that because the lots are still zoned as RC, and they have been subdivided, it does not change the fact that they have been sold under the condo zoning. Mr. Lapp concluded that the lots are in Phase 3 of Carriage Lane, they are still zoned RC, people have already built houses there, and zoning is not included on the land title.

Councillor Eckstrom inquired what the difference is between RC and RE zoning. Mr. Lapp responded that there are larger setbacks for RE than RC. The developer is trying to change the zoning to RE because he owns the area to the North (currently zoned RC) and he wants to continue building there.

Bill commented that the balance of the vacant area will likely have cul-de-sac and become a gated community. Without a road, private or otherwise, the area does not allow for further development to be done.

Councillor Eckstrom inquired whether there is enough room for Public Works to do snow removal, and for bussing, mail, garbage, and recycling pickup. Mr. Pfau responded that access will have to come from the north and meet County Standards and there will need to be clean up to the south area; there is enough room for snow removal, bussing, mail and garbage so it could remain the same. Mr. Glen commented that they can fix the area to the south and meet all of the County standards.

Councillor Nelson noted that the County will have to take over the road if the zoning is changed. She is also concerned that there will be conflict as of the 200 landowners, only 150 signed in favour of the zoning change and there are still 50 people that were against it.

Councillor Dueck asked for clarification on the difference between RC and RE zoning. Mr. Lapp reiterated that it is based on lot size, RE allows for a bigger house and a bigger lot. Reeve Beaupre noted that RC allows for higher density and RE is lower density. Councillor Dueck inquired if the houses in RC zoning would be smaller houses. Mr. Lapp responded that she is correct, it is a smaller lot size so a smaller house will be built there.

Councillor Sutherland inquired if there is any difference in assessment costs. Reeve Beaupre responded that it is based on market value so there will be a different value for RE in comparison to RC. Councillor Sutherland noted there will potentially be more taxes then. Bill commented that RC is typically high end in the County but the market value can be higher or lower based on area so it is hard to judge.

Reeve Beaupre noted concern because of the 5 lots that are already in place because it makes it more difficult to ask for the smaller lot size and low density housing now; there has already been a precedent set to change the zoning to RE. She feels like we will be seeing more of a gated community there and there are no restrictions on the lots size. It would have been nice to catch

the zoning issue in the last phase or construction, but nothing can really be done now.

Councillor Eckstrom commented on the petition for zoning change that was sent to landowners; there were about 150 residents that were in favour but she would like to see the comments as there are still 50 residents that have not responded.

Resolution #CM20130422.1010

MOVED BY S. NELSON that the meeting come out of Public Hearing at *10:51 a.m.*

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1011

MOVED BY R. HARPE that Bylaw 2680-13-017 to re-designate Lot 22, Block 8, Plan 072 6739, PT. NE-29-71-05-W6M from a Residential Condominium (RC) District to a Rural Estate (RE) District be read a first time.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1012

MOVED BY S. NELSON that Bylaw 2680-13-017 be read a second time.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1013

MOVED BY R. SUTHERLAND that Bylaw 2680-13-017 be given consent for third and final reading.

DEFEATED

**PT. SW 22-70-6-W6M -
AG TO CR-5 -
BEIRSTO, LEHNERS,
KETCHUM/FOSTER
(FILE PLLUB20130041)
BYLAW 2680-13-012**

(PUBLIC HEARINGS)
(Issue #20130412001)

Resolution #CM20130422.1014

MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM that a Public Hearing be held to hear comments regarding the application to re-designate PT. SW-22-70-6-W6M from a Agricultural (AG) District to a County Residential (CR-5) District.

The Public Hearing commenced at *10:52 a.m.*

CARRIED

Councillor Nelson noted that she will be excusing herself shortly to attend Earth Day celebrations.

Anna Martin, Intermediate Planner, noted that the purpose of this application is to allow for a Country residential development, and would facilitate the development of one new lot for this use. This lot is the first parcel out of the quarter section and as a result of the lot largely consisting of bush pasture, the farmland assessment rating for this site is not available.

The proposed lot is surrounded by a mix of agricultural and Country residential developments, and therefore the potential for conflict is considered low. In the context of the Municipal Development Plan (MDP), the policies set forth in section 6 & 7.3 are most application. The application is consistent with the MDP.

The application has been circulated to adjacent landowners and no comments have been received by our office.

ATCO Electric noted that a utility right-of-way in the name of ATCO Electric must be registered with the new and existing titles.

Alberta Transportation noted that they have no concerns regarding the proposed subdivision and rezoning.

Bruce Beirsto was present to answer any question. He noted that this is the first parcel out and Mr. Foster is aware the size restricts his sewage.

There was no one from audience to speak to the application.

Councillor Eckstrom noted that Rock Solid Gravel Inc. is located beside this parcel and inquired if it is an actual operation for gravel extraction. Bill responded that it is a functioning operation and is located about a mile away from the site. Reeve Beaupre noted that she believes there is a home located on the Rock Solid Gravel Inc. site as well.

Councillor Dueck inquired whether there is house currently located on the area proposed to subdivide. Ms. Martin responded that there is not a house located on the area in discussion.

Resolution #CM20130422.1015

MOVED BY R. SUTHERLAND that the meeting come out of Public Hearing at *10:56 a.m.*

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1016

MOVED BY R. HARPE that Bylaw 2680-13-012 to re-designate PT. SW-22-70-6-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a County Residential (CR-5) District be read a first time.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1017

MOVED BY R. SUTHERLAND that Bylaw 2680-13-012 be read a second time.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1018

MOVED BY L. DUECK that Bylaw 2680-13-012 be given consent for third and final reading.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1019

MOVED BY S. NELSON that Bylaw 2680-13-012 to re-designate PT. SW-22-70-6-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a County Residential (CR-5) District be read a third time and finally passed.

CARRIED

**PT NW-6-69-12-W6M -
AG TO CR-5 -
BEIRSTO, LEHNERS,
KETCHUM/DUPUIS
(FILE PLLUB20130037)
BYLAW 2680-13-013**

(PUBLIC HEARINGS)
(Issue #20130416002)

Resolution #CM20130422.1020

MOVED BY R. HARPE that a Public Hearing be held to hear comments regarding the application to re-designate PT. NW-6-69-12-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a County Residential (CR-5) District.

The Public Hearing commenced at *10:58 a.m.*

CARRIED

Matt Konowalchuk, Intermediate Planner, noted that this application is to rezone and would facilitate the development of one new lot for country residential use. This lot is the first parcel out of the quarter section. The proposed lot is located in a forested area and has not been given a Farmland Assessment rating. The surrounding area also consists of forested area and the potential for conflict is low.

In the context of the Municipal Development Plan (MDP), the policies set forth in section 7.3 are most applicable. The application is consistent with the MDP.

The application has been circulated to adjacent landowners and no comments have been received by our office.

It was noted that there is a **Level One Pipeline** in this area.

The Energy Recourse Conservation Board noted that they have "...determined [that] other wells are located in the area; these wells are licensed as sweet or have an ERCB Level 1 sour designation and meet the recommended setback distance requirement of 100m... ERCB determined that these pipelines are licensed as sweet or have an ERCB Level 1 sour designation. For these types of pipelines, there is no regulated setback distance however, the right-of-way must be observed."

Administration is recommending approval of this application.

Mr. Beairsto noted that he has no comments but will answer any questions. There was no one from audience to speak to this application.

Councillor Dueck noted that this application is in her area and she has heard of no issues from anyone in regards to the application.

Resolution #CM20130422.1021

MOVED BY L. DUECK that the meeting come out of Public Hearing at *11:01 a.m.*

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1022

MOVED BY L. DUECK that Bylaw 2680-13-013 to re-designate PT. NW-6-69-12-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a County Residential (CR-5) District be read a first time.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1023

MOVED BY R. HARPE that Bylaw 2680-13-013 be read a

second time.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1024

MOVED BY H. BULFORD that Bylaw 2680-13-013 be given consent for third and final reading.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1025

MOVED BY L. DUECK that Bylaw 2680-13-013 to re-designate PT. NW-6-69-12-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a County Residential (CR-5) District be read a third time and finally passed.

CARRIED

**PT SW-26-73-10-W6M -
AG TO CR-5 -
BEAIRSTO, LEHNERS,
KETCHUM/FRIESON
(FILE PLLUB20130028)
BYLAW 2680-13-015**

(PUBLIC HEARINGS)
(Issue #20130416003)

Resolution #CM20130422.1026

MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM that a Public Hearing be held to hear comments regarding the application to re-designate PT. SW-26-73-10-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a County Residential (CR-5) District.

The Public Hearing commenced at *11:02 a.m.*

CARRIED

Matt Konowalchuk noted that this application is to rezone would facilitate the development of one new lot for country residential use. This lot is the first parcel out of the quarter section. A majority of the proposed lot has a Farmland Assessment rating between 48 and 53%, while land in the north of this lot is located in a forested area and a Farmland Assessment rating has not been given. There are sparse country residential uses throughout the surrounding area; therefore the potential for conflict is low.

In the context of the Municipal Development Plan (MDP), the policies set forth in section 7.3 are most applicable. The application is consistent with the MDP.

The application has been circulated to adjacent landowners and no comments have been received by our office.

Councillor Nelson left the meeting at 11:04 a.m. to attend the Earth Day celebrations.

It was noted by Mr. Konowalchuk that there are Level 1 and Level 2 Sour wells in the area.

The Energy Recourse Conservation Board has "...determined [that] other wells are located in the area: these wells are licensed as sweet wells and have an ERCB setback distance of 100 metres. The ERCB has determined that these pipelines are licenced as sweet and have no regulated setback distance; right-of-way, however must be observed".

Mr. Beirsto noted that the owners of the land were concerned about getting the bush area in the zoning change and they do realize that sewage will be an issue and will be quite expensive.

There was no one from audience to speak to the application. Administration recommends approval of the application.

Councillor Dueck inquired about the shape of the lot. Mr. Beirsto responded that the shape was requested by the landowner as they want the bush to remain in their lot.

Resolution #CM20130422.1027

MOVED BY R. HARPE that the meeting come out of Public Hearing at *11:06 a.m.*

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1028

MOVED BY H. BULFORD that Bylaw 2680-13-015 to re-designate PT. SW-26-73-10-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a County Residential (CR-5) District to be read a first time.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1029

MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM that Bylaw 2680-13-015 be read a second time.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1030

MOVED BY R. SUTHERLAND that Bylaw 2680-13-015 be given consent for third and final reading.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1031

MOVED BY R. HARPE that Bylaw 2680-13-015 to re-designate PT. SW-26-73-10-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a County Residential (CR-5) District be read a third time and finally passed.

CARRIED

**PT SW-26-73-3-W6M -
AG TO CR-5 -
BEAIRSTO, LEHNERS,
KECHUM/TUTTLE
(FILE PLLUB20130030)
BYLAW 2680-13-014**

Resolution #CM20130422.1032

MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM that a Public Hearing be held to hear comments regarding the application to re-designate PT. SW-26-73-3-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a County Residential (CR-5) District.

(PUBLIC HEARINGS)
(Issue #20130416007)

The Public Hearing commenced at *11:06 a.m.*

CARRIED

Matt Konowalchuk noted that this application to rezone would facilitate the development of one new lot for country residential use. This lot is the first parcel out of the quarter. The Farmland Assessment rating is between 37 and 39%, while a slough is located in the northeast corner of the proposed lot and no Farmland Assessment rating has been given.

The application site is identified within a *Natural Area* for Future Land Uses (Map 6) under the County's Municipal Development Plan. While the lot is approximately one mile south of Kleskun Creek, the proximity and scale of the proposed development does not pose a threat to the Creek.

Adjacent landowners are concerned the proposed lot is situated in a year round wet area. Also, landowners are concerned with respects to ground water availability if the application is approved. County Staff investigated the proposed lot and identified a suitable building site on a hill along the north side of the lot.

Alberta Health Services noted no issues with the location.

The Energy Recourse Conservation Board have "...determined [that] other wells are located in the area; these wells are licensed as sweet or have an ERCB Level 1 sour designation and meet the recommended setback distance requirement of 100m... ERCB determined that these pipelines are licensed as sweet or have an ERCB Level 1 sour designation. For these types of pipelines, there is no regulated setback distance however, the right-of-way must be observed."

Administration is recommending approval of the application.

Mr. Beirsto noted that the shape of the lot was requested by the owners and they have paid for the contours. It will include a hill that is 3 meters higher than area to the south but there are currently no drainage issues on the site. It was also noted that the size fits the sewage regulations.

Mr. Tuttle noted that there is a wet pond located in the northwest

corner that was manmade with a tractor so that is why there is water sitting there. He commented that a friend of his is buying the location and he likes that the water is located there.

There was no one in the audience to speak to the application.

Councillor Eckstrom posed a question to Public Works in regards to concerns with runoff and flooding. Mr. Pfau responded that it is a 12 acre lot and he will review the area prior actual subdivision occurs, but he feels confident that this will not be an issue.

Councillor Smith inquired whether there is a road to the building site there. Mr. Beairsto noted that the site will be located at contour 653/652 so there should not be flooding. He put the vidar outline on the overhead and noted a 3 foot difference; elevations are 655.6 at the highest point. The lowest part of the elevation is southwest of the location and the other low area is even more south of the proposed lot. Elevation is 8 feet up the hill.

Councillor Bulford inquired into the applicants water source and whether he will use dugout water. Mr. Tuttle responded that the new owners will be using solar power and using the dugout. Councillor Bulford noted complaints about the dugout water and cleanliness. Mr. Tuttle responded that they are going to build a new dugout.

Resolution #CM20130422.1033

MOVED BY L. DUECK that the meeting come out of Public Hearing at *11:16 a.m.*

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1034

MOVED BY B. SMITH that Bylaw 2680-13-014 to re-designate PT. SW-26-73-3-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a County Residential (CR-5) District be read a first time.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1035

MOVED BY L. DUECK that Bylaw 2680-13-014 be read a second time.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1036

MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM that Bylaw 2680-13-014 be given consent for third and final reading.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1037

MOVED BY H. BULFORD that Bylaw 2680-13-014 to re-designate PT. SW-26-73-3-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a County Residential (CR-5) District be read a third time and finally passed.

CARRIED

**PT SW-3-73-6-W6M -
AG TO CR-5
BEAIRSTO, LEHNERS,
KETCHUM/KNOBLOCH
(FILE PLLUB20120612)
BYLAW 2680-13-016**

(PUBLIC HEARINGS)
(Issue #20130416008)

Resolution #CM20130422.1038

MOVED BY R. SUTHERLAND that a Public Hearing be held to hear comments regarding the application to re-designate PT. SW-3-73-6-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a County Residential (CR-5) District. The Public Hearing commenced at *11:17 a.m.*

CARRIED

Matt Konowalchuk noted that this application to rezone would facilitate the development of one new lot for country residential use. There is currently no ASP. This application site is located

within the Hamlet of Clairmont and identified as an Urban Area under the County's Municipal Development Plan (MDP). While the proposed residential is in close proximity to other residential uses, Future Land Use designates this area for industrial purposes. There are no foreseen land use conflicts between the single proposed residential use and industrial uses in the area. In the future, it would be pertinent to adopt an Area Structure Plan to reduce potential land use conflicts between residential and future industrial uses.

This lot is the third parcel out of the quarter, and has a Farmland Assessment rating between 59 and 66%. While this land carries a farmland assessment indicative of better farmland, a majority of the land of interest is heavily forested and physically severed by a water course. In the opinion of administration, this lot would be more suitable for the proposed use.

The application has been circulated to adjacent landowners and no comments have been received by our office.

Administration is recommending approval of this application.

Alberta Health Services noted "no objection, provided all distance requirements are met."

The ERCB has "...determined [that] other wells are located in the area; these wells are licensed as sweet or have an ERCB Level 1 sour designation and meet the recommended setback distance requirement of 100m... ERCB determined that these pipelines are licensed as sweet or have an ERCB Level 1 sour designation. For these types of pipelines, there is no regulated setback distance however, the right-of-way must be observed."

There was no one from the audience present to speak to this application.

Councillor Dueck inquired how large the creek on the lot is. Mr. Beirsto responded that the creek is not very big but the property is 13.7 acres. Mr. Pfau noted the bridge sized culvert and that Planning will have restrictions put on at the time of subdivision; road widening will also need to be done to the south. He concluded that there will be a good building site.

Councillor Harpe commented that Northgate Electric cannot access that area because of the two feet of water blocking the entrance. He also noted that a new two story house is currently being built in that area and it is surrounded by water. Mr. Beirsto noted that the house being built belongs to the landowner's son. Bill noted that there has been activity on that parcel since last fall.

Reeve Beaupre inquired whether there was a permit application for the home. Mr. Simpson responded that he is not sure and will have to check.

Councillor Eckstrom noted that Councillor Harpe is correct because she drives by that area often and the electrician has to park by the road because he cannot access the area; it is a slough.

Resolution #CM20130422.1039

MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM that the meeting come out of Public Hearing at *11:25 a.m.*

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1040

MOVED BY R. SUTHERLAND that Bylaw 2680-13-016 to re-designate PT. SW-3-73-6-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a County Residential (CR-5) District be read a first time.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1041

MOVED BY H. BULFORD that Bylaw 2680-13-016 be read a second time.

CARRIED**Resolution #CM20130422.1042**

MOVED BY R. SUTHERLAND that Bylaw 2680-13-016 be given consent for third and final reading.

DEFEATED

**11:15 A.M.
APPOINTMENT -
MIGHTY PEACE
YOUTH SOCIETY -
TEGWYN CURTIS AND
EMMA CHRENEK**

(DELEGATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS)
(Issue #20130410003)

Reeve Beaupre welcomed Keith Curtis, Tegwyn Curtis, and Emma Chrenek who began their presentation on Mighty Peace Day. Ms. Curtis and Ms. Chrenek attend junior high school in Grande Prairie.

Mighty Peace Day will be held in Grande Prairie on October 1, 2014. Ms. Curtis and Ms. Chrenek presented background on the Mighty Peace Youth Society and how they created the concept for Mighty Peace Day.

Ms. Curtis and Ms. Chrenek noted they have modeled their program after Free the Children, Me to We (inspire to take action), and their school program We Act and provided background on each.

Campaigns from the Free the Children movement include:

- We Scare Hunger
- We Are Love

Some Me to We projects:

- the power of girl
- anti-bullying
- We Create Change (pennies for fresh water)
- We Stand Together (aboriginal youth)
- We Act Program (full year engagement)
- We Day and supporters: full day educational event encouraging Free the Children
- 160,000 students will participate in We Day on April 29, 2013 in Ottawa and the Mighty Peace Youth Society will be sending delegates to the event.

Mighty Peace Day will be modeled after We Day. It will be a full day event and each student must raise \$26 or perform four hours of community service to participate.

Ms. Curtis and Ms. Chrenek noted that supporting Mighty Peace Day will give the opportunity to invest in youth and their future. They have obtained full support from the Free the Children movement and are expecting to host 4000 people. The Canada Games arena has already been booked and speakers have already confirmed. The Mighty Peace Youth Society has already raised half of their operating budget. The City of Grande Prairie has already contributed, they are meeting with the M.D. of Greenview on May 1st, 2013 and are meeting with two more school boards shortly.

Their operating budget is \$160,000. Ms. Curtis and Ms. Chrenek noted that they are seeking sponsorship in 3 forms: seeking a funding commitment, seeking guidance with accessing grant funds, and commitment as individuals to get other people engaged.

Ms. Curtis, Ms. Chrenek, and Mr. Curtis answered any questions from Council.

Reeve Beaupre spoke about past initiatives and inquired whether it was a national cause or global. Mr. Curtis responded that Mighty Peace Day is both national and global; it is a day that allows youth to be rewarded for the work and fundraising that has been done to date. Reeve Beaupre commented that she believed this is a lifelong learning opportunity.

Councillor Eckstrom thanked Ms. Curtis and Ms. Chrenek for their very impressive presentation. She noted that a copy of their budget was not included and asked if they could have it sent to Council once the sponsor amounts were included. Mr. Curtis responded that they did not want to publicly release their presenting sponsors but he would send a copy to Sheryle Runhart once the names were removed.

Reeve Beaupre inquired what the target age group is for Mighty Peace Day. It was noted that grades 5-12 will be in attendance. Mr. Curtis noted that the students attending the

event must fit the criteria and spots are on a first come first serve basis; there are 4283 spots that can be registered for students. Reeve Beaupre commented that in the future they could maybe use Evergreen Park for the event as well.

Councillor Dueck commented that this is a very interesting project and that Ms. Curtis and Ms. Chrenek had a very good presentation.

Reeve Beaure inquired about any grants that have been applied for. Mr. Curtis responded that that have received funding from rotary clubs and other municipalities and the City of Grande Prairie was helping them with the grant process. Reeve Beaupre commented that Community Futures is very involved and they have resources to provide funding as well as aiding in grant applications; they can contact Holly Sorgen.

Reeve Beaupre noted that Council will need to see their budget before they can make a firm monetary donation.

Councillor Smith inquired what their request would be from the County. Reeve Beaupre responded that the request is for \$5000 and this item can be brought back on the April 29th, 2013 Council meeting if budget is provided.

Mr. Curtis, Ms. Curtis, and Ms. Chrenek thanked Council and left the meeting.

Resolution #CM20130422.1043

MOVED BY L. DUECK the meeting be recessed at 11:26 a.m. for a 5 minute break.

CARRIED

The meeting was reconvened at 11:35 a.m.

**GPRC 26TH ANNUAL
COLLEGE CLASSIC -
SPONSORSHIP
REQUEST**

(NEW BUSINESS)

(Issue #20130327001)

Megan Schur, Manager of Parks and Recreation and Rikki Christie noted that the GPRC will be hosting the 26th Annual College Classic Event on June 7, 2013, at the Grande Prairie Golf and Country Club. Funds raised from this event will support the enhancements to learning space for students and community in the region.

Sponsorship Opportunities

A list of sponsorship opportunities was attached to the agenda package.

The County of Grande Prairie has sponsored this event in the past:

2011- \$1,000

2012 - \$1,000

Community Assistance Grant Fund Update:

To date, Council has distributed \$4,660 from the Community Assistance Grant fund. As of April 8, 2013, the remaining funds are \$27,760.

Administration recommends sponsoring the event.

Resolution #CM20130422.1044

MOVED BY M. ECKSTOM to sponsor the event to \$1000 as has been done in pervious years to come from the Community Assistance line.

Councillor Harpe inquired who much money is paid out in the scholarship. He would like to know how much is given for the scholarship, what is raised and what is expended.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1045

MOVED BY R. HARPE to have GPRC provide information of

the Scholarship program, how much has been raised and distributed from the program and how many students benefit from the program.

CARRIED

Councillor Eckstrom posed a question for Ms. Schur in regards to recreation grants. Ms. Schur noted that the package for the recreation board applications are available today in hard copy and she will email them to Councillors.

Ms. Schur also commented that they are looking for feedback on the consistency of the application grants.

- Reeve Beaupre noted that she has concerns with the availability of the packages as recreation boards cannot always access email due to the internet speeds in rural areas.
- Councillor Smith commented that he likes the application sent by email.
- Councillor Dueck commented that she likes the way it was done before because the people on the Boards can review them before submission.
- Reeve Beaupre noted she was concerned that there are financial and other confidential information in the packages that should not be released.
- Councillor Harpe commented that he believes that what is happening now is working good.
- Ms. Schur inquired if they should send out a summary for each Recreation Board instead of the full packages.
- Councillor Dueck believes a summary would be sufficient.
- Councillor Sutherland commented that he likes the idea of email.

Resolution #CM20130422.1046

MOVED BY R. HARPE to leave the distribution and review of Grant Application packages for Recreation Boards as it has been done in past years.

CARRIED**REQUEST FOR
SPONSORSHIP -
COMMUNITY
FOUNDATION GALA**

(NEW BUSINESS)

(Issue #20130416005)

Ms. Schur noted that the Community Foundation of Northwestern Alberta will be hosting the 2013 Gala & Auction Evening on September 14, 2013 at the Pomeroy Hotel & Conference Centre.

County Council is invited to attend the event and to bring greetings.

About the event:

Date: September 14, 2013

Location: Pomeroy Hotel & Conference Centre

Reception at 6:00 p.m. with dinner to follow

Tickets are \$250.00 per person

Sponsorship Opportunities: Sponsorship levels range from \$500 to \$6000. Silent Auction items welcome.

A full list of sponsorship opportunities is attached to the agenda package.

In the past:

2011 - two tickets purchased

2012 - \$1000 sponsorship from Community Assistance and two tickets purchased

Community Assistance Fund Update:

To date, Council has distributed \$4,660 from the Community Assistance Fund. As of April 16, 2013, the remaining funds are \$26,760 (after \$1000 sponsor for GPRC).

The options are:

Option 1: purchase tickets for the event and/or sponsor the event from Council Initiatives Budget.

Option 2: do not support the event

Administration recommends approving option one to purchase tickets and/or sponsor the event.

Councillor Eckstrom inquired how much funding is still in the Council Initiatives Fund. Ms. Schur responded that she was not certain but likely around \$12,000.

Resolution #CM20130422.1047

MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM to sponsor \$1000 to the Community Foundation Gala and to be put into Councils calendars for Council to pay to attend at their own expense.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1048

MOVED BY B. SMITH that the meeting be recessed at 12:07 p.m. for lunch, to reconvene at 1:30 p.m.

CARRIED

**1:30 P.M.
APPOINTMENT -
RIVER WATER
MANAGEMENT
PLANS- RHONDA
CLARKE-GAUTHIER,
BOB CAMERON &
ABDI SIAD-OMAR**

(DELEGATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS)
(Issue #20130403011)

The meeting was reconvened at 1:32 p.m.

Steve Madden, Environmental Manager, introduced Rhonda Clarke-Gauthier, Bob Cameron, and Abdi Said-Omar. Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier noted that they are present today to understand the stakeholder side and that they hope to answer any questions from the County.

Water for Life 3 types of Provincial Partnership

- Alberta Water Council (AWC) - province-wide scale
- Watershed Planning and Advisory Council (WPAC) - regional scale
- Watershed Stewardship Groups (WSG) - local scale

Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier noted that the WPAC's are independent non-for-profit organizations that are designated by Alberta Environment to assess the condition of watersheds and prepare

plans to address issues.

Their AGM was held on March 22, 2013 and most of the seats are filled. The Council still needs a member from mining and a First Nations representative. Reeve Beaupe inquired if Cathy Newhook could fill one of the members at large. Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier responded that all of the seats were filled at the AGM, other than those noted previously, Cathy Newhook could be considered as an alternate for watersheds if they chose to include her. They ask every director for the name of an alternate, she will speak to Norm to see if there is an alternate designated already. Councillor Nelson is the Rural Municipality seat as AAMDC Zone 4 has put her name forward. Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier showed a slide of all the board members.

Reeve Beaupe inquired whether there were any government appointees on the board. Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier responded that there are no government appointees but there are a couple people that work for the government, John works for Alberta Agriculture. Councillor Nelson inquired about the seat representing Agriculture and whether they represent through an organization or independently. Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier responded that they are member of an AG organization but do not represent them (for example someone from SARDA).

There was a graph shown on how the partnerships work together: the Alberta Water Council provide timely and strategic advise. WPAC is maintaining leadership in planning and support of stewardship groups and report to the Council. There has been lots of information sharing.

Bill inquired whether the WPAC have a seat at the AWC. Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier responded that they do have a seat.

There are 11 WPACs and all are based on watersheds. The only watershed that has not been identified is the Beaver (Hay) River. Reeve Beaupe inquired whether they have been funded through the ESRD. Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier responded that in the past they have been funded through Alberta Environment. Reeve Beaupe inquired about Provincial core funding and noted that she understood that core funding was based on per capita of the municipality. Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier responded that they have never received the full amount of funding that they require for

their projects. Reeve Beaupre inquired how the Provincial funding is allocated. Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier responded that it is not equal funding and she was not sure how exactly they allocate the funding.

Wapiti River Water Management Plan

- ESRD initiated conversations with stakeholders;
- ESRD is lead on the project with stakeholders contributing expertise, time, and resources;
- MPWA is part of the Steering Committee to bring the voices of stakeholders to the table.

Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier noted that it was felt that the Water Management Plan was the way to proceed and they will have a better idea on further branching out next week.

The difference between a Watershed Plan and a Water Management Plan was outlined: "watershed" targets both the land and water; whereas the water plan are just for the water. Reeve Beaupre inquired how far from the river does the management plan go as the Wapiti River is already being addressed through the Wapiti Corridor Plan. Mr. Siad-Omar answered that the Wapiti River Management Plan is more for water allocation not land use.

Councillor Eckstrom left the meeting at 1:47 p.m. and returned at 1:49 p.m.

Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier noted that they wanted to do a plan because the Wapiti River is an important river due to the stakeholders (Aquaterra and Weyerhaeuser) accessing it and the size of the Grande Prairie population expanding; we need to ensure that the quality and quantity of water is sufficient. They need to balance water withdrawals with addressing future needs.

Reeve Beaupre inquired if the Mighty Peace Watershed Alliance is a legislative authority. Mr. Cameron responded that the management plan will have a legislative mandate and will be going to legislation for approval. Reeve Beaupre inquired if Council will have a chance to provide input for this process. Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier responded that there is a mandate to have public consultation and there will be an opportunity to come back to stakeholder groups who would like to discuss

issues. The consultation process will change going forward to identify more groups that would like to comment on the plan.

Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier commented on the Terms of Reference and noted that they were in contact with the local groups and they commented on what they would like to see changed. Reeve Beaupre inquired if private landowners too were contacted as well. Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier responded that landowners were contacted. The scoping study has already been done and the volumes of info that came from that will be reviewed as well; after the review of the information, they will have a better idea of timelines, financing, and further research that will need to be done. They will know the cost and scope after that is completed.

It was noted that the Framework for Water Management Planning will be followed to create the Water Management Plan.

Reeve Beaupre inquired if the new Watershed Plan will be a similar mandate to the land use that is already being done for the Wapiti Corridor or whether they are looking at using 'outside the box' thinking and suggestions. Mr. Cameron noted that they have seen from Weyerheuser a decrease of 25% over the last few years, and Aquatera is also making changes as well.

Reeve Beaupre commented on the returning of treated water back into the Wapiti River. She has had discussions with other municipalities and they noted they are using the treated water for sale for industry purposes instead of returning it to the river and inquired if the Water Management Plan is addressing that as well. Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier responded that addressing that issue will be included in their mandate under "quality and quantity" and everything will be open for discussion.

Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier discussed the definition of WCO: Water Conservation Objective. She noted that it is a regulator tool under the Water Act, aids in planning and development within a watershed, and establishes water management principles that assist in preserving healthy aquatic ecosystems. The overall goal is to "to develop and recommend a strategy that best balances water consumption, discharge, and the protection of the aquatic environment".

Reeve Beaupre noted that she has an issue with this plan because it will be on the residents to fund this plan; it should be a provincial initiative and they should be funding the majority of this as the licenses are with the province. Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier responded that it will be a lot of funding for the residents but there will also be funding expectations from ESRD and stakeholders. They will prioritize what needs to be done and develop a timeline.

Councillor Nelson commented that the scoping study was to gather the information on what has already been done. One of the main purposes for the study was to have stakeholders and industry information sent forward. She noted that she feels this is a good way for the government to proceed as they do not have to hire anyone externally to gather information. She also inquired about the 35% budget cutbacks for the Water for Life strategy and asked how this can be addressed for individual WPACs. Mr. Siad-Omar noted that the Minister indicated that there will be support for core operations but there is still a \$6 million shortfall and he is not sure how that affects the WPAC projects. He further noted that although the scoping study was mainly provincially funded, some of the information obtained was outside of the scoping study (which was done as a cost share with the County). Mr. Cameron noted that the funding being cut is for Water for Life infrastructure (water and sewer treatment facilities).

Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier concluded that the Steering Committee has been established and the Terms of Reference has been worked on; the Steering Committee will be meeting April 25-26, 2013 to deal with the TOR, review the scoping study, identify a work-plan, timelines, and financial commitments needed to complete the Water Management Plan. She noted that it may take longer than anticipated to accomplish their goals but they will address what needs to be done.

Reeve Beaupre thanked Mrs. Clarke-Gauthier, Mr. Cameron, and Mr. Siad-Omar for their presentation that concluded at 2:07 p.m.

2012 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

(DELEGATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS)
(Issue #20130412002)

from Fletcher Mudryk & Co. presented the consolidated 2012 County Financial Statements. The 2012 draft financial statements were attached for Council's review and approval.

Ms. Vavrek noted that the increase to unrestricted surplus for 2012 was \$24,597, increasing the total unrestricted surplus to \$384,551.

Once the draft statements are approved, a final copy will be posted to the County web site and distributed to Council and Directors along with additional reports (Financial Information Return, West Grande Prairie County Solid Waste Management Authority Financial Statements, and Statement of Revenue & Expenditures for Library Services and Family & Community Support Services). The statements were audited by Fletcher Mudryk & Co, Chartered Accountants.

Ms. Vavrek noted the following:

- The statements are a snapshot in time of how the County is doing financially;
- The statements provide accountability and transparency to County residents and property owners;
- Financial Assets are approximately \$109 million;
- Liabilities are approximately \$57.8 million;
- The net Financial assets are approximately \$52.2 million;
- The non-financial assets are approximately \$297 million;
- Accumulated surplus is approximately \$350 million (cash and non-cash);
- Changes in accumulated surplus (on page 153) resulting in a net increase of approximately \$37.5 million;
- Unrestricted surplus is approximately \$.025 million;
- Reserves have decreased by \$2.71 million;
- Equity in Aquatera is approximately \$.99 million;
- Equity in tangible assets is approximately \$39.29 million

Reeve Beaupre inquired if the value of the tangible capital assets is depreciated. Ms. Vavrek responded that it is the depreciated value (net book value).

Councillor Nelson inquired about the equity in Aquatera and whether there is a percentage of cash flow. Ms. Vavrek

responded that there is a guaranteed dividend of \$389,000 per year; our share of equity stays within Aquatera for operations. Councillor Nelson inquired if we receive discretionary dividends. Reeve Beaupre responded that it is not guaranteed that we receive discretionary dividends as per the new Aquatera Shareholders Agreement.

Ms. Vavrek showed a graph breakdown of Accumulated Surplus and reserves.

- reserves decreased by approximately \$2.7 million to total \$82.7 million;
- transferred funds to reserve \$26 million to complete carry over projects and for future use;
- she noted that on page 150 of the agenda package it includes operational cash amounts and non-cash transactions; but does not include expenditures for capital;
- Ms. Vavrek referred to the graph and noted that the government grants are mainly received through MSI funding;
- noted \$58.8 million for total operational expenditures (the chart includes amortization).

Additional revenue was generated through:

- oil well drilling tax;
- County development permits;
- and from the Clairmont landfill.

Ms. Vavrek also noted any major variances to the budget:

- savings in hired equipment, seasonal staffing, and the gravel contract (mainly in Public Works);
- \$2.98 million and a surplus of 2.2%;
- \$2.18 million transferred to the facility capital reserve;
- \$400,000 transferred to the infrastructure reserve;
- \$400,000 transferred to the resource road reserve;
- \$24, 597 increase to unrestricted surplus (which brings the total to just shy of \$400,000).

Ms. Vavrek referred to page 151 in the agenda package and noted net revenue is at \$49.8 million:

- developer contributed assets are an additional \$6.6 million;
- the County will be responsible for future asset replacement

and rehabilitation (for roads).

Reeve Beaupre inquired whether there are specific requirements for the developer when changing projects over to the County so there are less associated costs to the County (for example waterfalls in signs). Bill noted that we have tried to discourage anything too elaborate. Mr. Pfau commented that Public Works tries to catch things up front so they do not have to maintain it later on (for example the brick wall in Wedgewood Estates).

Ms. Vavrek showed a Graph of the tangible capital assets. She noted that Engineering structures was at approximately \$155.2 million at the end of 2012.

Long Term Debt (on page 166-167 of agenda package):

- 2012 debt limit is \$112.5 million;
- the County is at 36.8% of the limit with \$41.5 million in debt;
- issued debt of \$6.8 million for the Sportsplex (paid \$3.6 million for the principle and 1.5% interest).

Councillor Smith commented that there has been a total of \$15.8 million borrowed for Sportsplex. Ms. Vavrek noted that the original amount proposed to borrow was \$19 million.

Ms. Vavrek showed a graph of the percentage of debt for Future Grants for work being done on County buildings (CSB and Sportsplex) and the shortfall will be coming from MSI funding.

Reeve Beaupre inquired how debt is left to pay on the waterlines going North. Bill responded that there is also debt payment on the waterline going to the CSB building (which was on a 15 year borrowing term); there is \$3 million left on the waterlines. Ms. Vavrek also responded that the regional water line was done on a 25 year borrowing term, so the County is about halfway through the term.

Ms. Vavrek concluded her portion of the presentation and recognized the Finance staff for all of their work done on compiling these statements.

Councillor Eckstrom thanked Ms. Vavrek and the Finance staff

for the presentation and requested that the slideshow be sent to her. Ms. Vavrek commented that she will email Council copies of the Powerpoint presentation.

Councillor Harpe commented on the Operating Expenditures for Administration which was noted at 11% of total costs; he noted the norm is about 10%. Ms. Vavrek responded that the 11% includes some centralized expenditures (for example a new photocopier) and that these will be broke out by department in the future. Reeve Beaupre inquired whether the breakdown will increase costs for other departments. Ms. Vavrek responded that the breakdown will be allocated to the appropriate departments and that the percentages are showing depreciation. Reeve Beaupre commented that, in the future, Administration should be kept to under 10% and we need to ensure that all of the expenditures are split up properly and reflect the proper expenditures for each department.

Reeve Beaupre inquired what the yearly cost for an audit is and how often the audits are done. Ms. Vavrek responded that it is about \$50,000 not including the finance staff time and there are provincial requirements to have the audit done each year.

External Auditor comments:

Mr. Lovrod expressed thanks and kudos to the County Finance staff for their hard work done on the financial statements.

Mr. Lovrod referred to pages 147-148 in the agenda package that outlined the Management and Auditors' Reports. He noted that, as auditors, they look at what the Finance staff had done and tested it to ensure that the statements were accurate. Mr. Lovrod noted that the accountants have never had any issues with a Financial report from the County and they are in agreement with Administration about the financial statements provided today. Furthermore, as more money is spent on various projects they are more confident with the internal systems that are in place for the County Finance department. He also noted that it is very rare for the auditor to come in and just look at the numbers, but that is what happened here; the County Finance staff provide impeccable financial statements. Mr. Lovrod commented that other Accounting firms have higher fees because they have to do additional background work but nothing

additional needed to be provided for the County Financial statements. With the financial statements there were very few errors found (which were then reported to the correct staff to fix), no fraud, and also very good cooperation from everyone at the County.

Reeve Beaupre thanked Ms. Vavrek and the Finance staff as well as Mr. Lovrod.

Bill also thanked Mr. Lovrod and his staff for their work on the 2012 Financial Statements.

Resolution #CM20130422.1049

MOVED BY S. NELSON that Council approve the 2012 Financial Statements as presented.

CARRIED

VOLUNTEER APPRECIATION WEEK

(NEW BUSINESS)
(Issue #20130410002)

April 21 - 27 is National Volunteer Week in Canada

Volunteers have a tremendous impact on the County. They are involved in many different ways, the traditional hands on getting things done, but with the advance in technology volunteers have been able to contribute in new and exiting ways - the internet and smart phones have expanded our ability to reach out to volunteers and engage them. This week is an opportunity to express our appreciation for their social and economic contributions.

55% of Albertans volunteer, compared with a Canadian average of 48%, we can see how strong civic engagement is in this province. The average number of hours volunteered per year in Alberta is 140 hours, with Albertans aged 35-44 years old volunteering more than any other age group.

Resolution #CM20130422.1050

MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM to proclaim April 21 - 27, 2013 as National Volunteer appreciation Week in the County of Grande Prairie No.1.

CARRIED

**SUBDIVISION TIME
EXTENSION REQUEST
- SW-28-70-8-W6M -
FILE NO. 10GP50**

(NEW BUSINESS)
(Issue #20130415010)

Mr. Simpson noted that approval is requested for the following subdivision time extension requests:

File No. **10GP50 (10039)**

Legal: **SW-28-70-08-W6M**

Name: **Mallory Janssen**

Division: **5**

Date Approval Extended to: **April 29, 2014**

Recommend: **Second Time Extension Approval**

The applicant is requesting the subdivision endorsement time extension in order to fulfill the conditions of the approval that applies to this subdivision application.

**SUBDIVISION TIME
EXTENSION REQUEST
- NE-20-74-5-W6M -
FILE NO. 10GP92**

(NEW BUSINESS)
(Issue #20130415011)

Approval is requested for the following subdivision time extension request:

File No. **10GP92 (09329)**

Legal: **NE-20-74-05-W6M**

Name: **Thomas and Hanna Bussemeir**

Division: **9**

Date Approval Extended to: **April 29, 2014**

Recommend: **Second Time Extension Approval**

The applicant is requesting the subdivision endorsement time extension in order to fulfill the conditions of approval that applies to this subdivision application.

SUBDIVISION TIME

Approval is requested for the following subdivision time extension

**EXTENSION REQUEST
- NW-11-72-6-W6M -
FILE NO.
PLSUB20120035**

(NEW BUSINESS)
(Issue #20130415013)

request:

File No. **PLSUB20120035 (06597)**

Legal: **NW-11-72-06-W6M**

Name: **1072662 ALBERTA LTD. C/O Grant Althen**

Division: **2**

Date Approval Extended to: **April 27, 2014**

Recommend: **Second Time Extension Approval**

The applicant is requesting the subdivision endorsement time extension in order to fulfill the conditions of approval that applies to this subdivision application.

**SUBDIVISION TIME
EXTENSION REQUEST
- SW-16-71-6-W6M**

(NEW BUSINESS)
(Issue #20130415014)

Approval is requested for the following subdivision time extension request:

File No. **PLSUB20130035**

Legal: **SW-16-71-06-W6M**

Name: **Wayne and Elaine Streeper**

Division: **3**

Date Approval Extended to: **March 16, 2014**

Recommend: **First Time Extension Approval**

The applicant is requesting the subdivision endorsement time extension in order to fulfill the conditions of approval that applies this subdivision application.

**SUBDIVISION TIME
EXTENSION REQUEST
- SW-28-70-8-W6M -
FILE NO. 10GP50**

(NEW BUSINESS)
(Issue #20130415010)

Resolution #CM20130422.1051

MOVED BY R. SUTHERLAND that the four subdivision time extension requests, items 10.4 to 10.7, on the April 22, 2013 Council meeting agenda be approved in order to fulfill the conditions of approval.

CARRIED

REQUEST FOR

REDUCED SPEED LIMIT

(NEW BUSINESS)
(Issue #20130416001)

Mr. Pfau noted that the location is North of Teepee Creek. Attached to the agenda package is a request received for a speed reduction sign as well as a "No Exit" sign on Range Road #40 north of Township Road #744. As identified on the map Range Road #40 is a dead end road with few residents.

Public Works staff recommend "No Action" on the speed reduction sign. We recommend that the landowners install signs (Children Playing) on their property/fence line at their cost. These signs can not be regulatory reducing speed signs. Public Works do recommend the installation of a "No Exit" sign.

Councillor Eckstrom inquired into the amount of traffic and whether it was oil related. Mr. Pfau responded that he has encouraged the landowners to speak to their neighbours about putting up signs and that there may be a hunting camp located there in the fall. He also noted that he believes there may be only 12 vehicles a day on that road. There will be an issue with enforcement if the speed limit is changed.

Resolution #CM20130422.1052

MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM that "No Action" be taken on the requests for a speed reduction sign and the installation of a "No Exit" sign at the intersection of Range Road #40 and Township Road #744.

CARRIED

PRE-OWNED TRUCK MOUNTED MECHANICAL SWEEPER RFP

(NEW BUSINESS)
(Issue #20130416011)

Don Maisonuue, Procurement Specialist, and Ken Osborne, Shop Manager, presented the RFP for a Pre-Owned Truck Mounted Mechanical Sweeper.

Due to the specific requirements for a pre-owned truck mounted mechanical sweeper, a Request for Proposal (RFP) including specifications (technical) as well as a bid invitation was issued on March 18, 2013 and closed on March 29, 2013 at 2:00 pm. We received two (2) responses and two (2) submissions from each response for a total of four (4) submissions and these were evaluated by four (4) County representatives. The proposal for

the “Pre-Owned Truck Mounted Mechanical Sweeper” – RFP was subject to the provisions of the: Agreement on International Trade (AIT) and New West Partnership Trade Agreement (NWPTA).

The four (4) Proposals received were from; **Joe Johnson Equipment Edmonton** – 1) 2008 Elgin Eagle Dual Mounted on UD Chassis and 2) 2011 Elgin Eagle Dual Mounted on 2009 GMC. **Cubex Ltd. Edmonton** – 1) 2009 Schwarze M6000 – Unit 267 and 2) 2007 Schwarze M6000 – Unit 45

Joe Johnson Equipment Edmonton –

- 2011 Elgin Eagle Dual Mounted on 2009 GMC Chassis (1,200 hours) - Cost per Point = \$1,873 or \$186,871.65 (tax in)
- 2008 Elgin Eagle Dual Mounted on UD Chassis (2,335 hours) - Cost per Point = \$1,856 or \$175,402.50 (tax in)

Cubex Ltd. Edmonton –

- 2009 Schwarze M6000 – Unit 267 (1,335 hours) - Cost per Point = \$2,037 or \$173,250 (tax in)
- 2007 Schwarze M6000 – Unit 45 (2,739 hours) - Cost per Point = \$2,045 or \$141,750 (tax in)

An RFP process was selected over a Request for Quotation (RFQ) to allow vendors the opportunity for recommendations on a Pre-owned Truck Mounted Mechanical Sweeper . Only Proposals meeting all of the mandatory requirements were deemed compliant, The Proposals that met the mandatory requirements were then required to achieve 70/100 (70%) on the point rated criteria. The successful Proposals who achieved 70% or more were then evaluated on their financial Bid (quote). The formula for “Cost per Point” for a successful proposal rating is ***[Bidder’s Price (\$) / Bidder’s Technical Score (out of 100 points)] = Bidder’s Cost Per Point***, allowing a participant with better value to remain competitive with their proposal.

Because it was used equipment they inputted some stipulations. Each submitted 2 submissions for a total of 4. The Budget was \$170,000.00 without taxes and the unit is \$186,871.65. Council

will have to address the budget shortfall.

Mr. Osborne noted that there are three different styles of sweepers: vacuum cleaner type, mechanical sweeper, and air sweeper. He noted that the County has all mechanical sweepers and that he likes Elgin models as they have less wearing parts. He also has experience with the Elgin and he has never encountered any problems; both the City of Grande Prairie and the City of Calgary use Elgin sweepers. Elgin's also have less moving and maintenance parts than the Schwarze models. He further noted that there is no required speed for the sweeper arm to work on the Elgin.

Reeve Beaupre inquired whether purchasing this will replace the use of the spray truck. Mr. Pfau responded that the County hires sweepers for the hamlets and they mostly just use the broom but sometimes spraying is done as well. Mr. Osborne commented that the Elgin has its own dust control mechanisms (a water sprayer to keep the dust low) that are truck mounted so it can go highway speeds.

Councillor Eckstrom noted that the cost of the sweeper is about \$6500 more than what was allocated in the budget. Bill responded that we have some savings from other areas that will accommodate this overage.

Resolution #CM20130422.1053

MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM to approve the purchase of the 2011 Elgin Eagle Dual Mounted on a 2009 GMC Chassis from Joe Johnson Equipment Edmonton for their proposal amount of \$186,871.65 (tax in).

CARRIED

ACTION LIST UPDATE - UP TO AND INCLUDING MAR 4, 2013

(INFORMATION ITEMS)

Updated Action List to March 4, 2013.

Councillor Dueck commented that the Red Willow file has been marked as closed and inquired if anything further came up. Mr. Pfau responded that he was going to try and do one more

(Issue #20130416004)

meeting as he still wants to work with the last landowner. Bill commented that because they did not have all 3 landowners committed there was a motion passed to have the file closed.

**COUNCIL
PROMOTIONAL ITEM
DONATIONS
EXPENDITURE- JAN
1-APR 12**

(INFORMATION ITEMS)
(Issue #20130415004)

Council has given out a total of \$1,200 in promotional items/gifts from January 1, 2013 to April 12, 2013.

The following items were donated on Council's behalf to community groups in the region for fundraising/door prizes/silent auctions:

- \$150.00 promotional items donated to the Bezanson Mens Bonspiel
- \$150.00 promotional items donated to the Teepee Creek Ladies Night fundraiser
- \$150.00 promotional items donated to the Curl for Cancer fundraiser
- \$150.00 promotional items donated to the Sexsmith Curling Bonspiel
- \$150.00 promotional items donated to the Grovedale Fire department fundraiser
- \$150.00 promotional items donated to the Grande Prairie Regional Archives
- \$150.00 promotional items donated to the 15th Annual Saskatoon Island Swan Festival
- \$150.00 promotional items donated to the Community Planning Association of Alberta Annual Planning Conference

Reeve Beaupre commented that had wanted to provide a planter for the CPAA Conference but the item provided was not what was anticipated. Communications had noted that they could not have a specific one ordered as they were waiting until after the branding project was complete to order more. Bill responded that we have a variety of things to make up promotional baskets and that Communications will keep these in stock from now on. However if specific planters and other items need to be ordered prior the Conference or event, Council should ensure they ask Communications for a specific basket in advance.

Councillor Dueck commented on size of the baskets being given out and on value of the silent auction items that are donated. She

would like to see the different selection of silent auction items and how much was received back at the auction for buying the items. Councillor Nelson commented that the donation of a silent auction items is not about receiving equal value for the donation, but it would be nice to have the amount raised from the item sent back to Communications so Council is aware.

Councillor Eckstrom commented that the money raised from the the promotional item donation is used for a variety of projects but in the future she believes it would be easier to donate the funding (cash) instead of silent auction items.

Councillor Harpe noted that Council should not just focus on the price of the donation because it is helping the cause that is important. The County needs to ensure that quality items are donated because people want quality for the money they are spending on the promotional or silent auction items.

Councillor Smith commented that the picture that was supplied by the M.D. of Greenview cost \$500.00 and the Archives sold the picture for \$250.00 so there was a shortfall.

INFORMATION

CORRESPONDENCE FROM DAVID W. LEONARD

(INFORMATION ITEMS)
(Issue #20130417001)

Councillor Smith noted that although Dr. Leonard is retired he will still be working as he is going to be doing another book that will look at Homesteads from 1914 onwards. He may be coming into the County to make a funding request to Council for this project.

COUNTY VEHICLE/EQUIPMENT USAGE POLICY PROPOSAL

(NEW BUSINESS)
(Issue #20130409003)

Charlotte Bierman, Human Resources Coordinator, note that currently the County has information in the Employee Safety Handbook about safe operation of County vehicles and equipment, but we do not have a policy. This proposed policy outlines acceptable and unacceptable usage of County vehicles and equipment, licensing requirements, requirements when an employee takes a County vehicle home, rules for safe operation and consequences of non-compliance. Directors and Managers have provided input into the draft policy.

Reeve Beaupre inquired whether developing the policy was in direct correlation to an incident occurring. Ms. Bierman responded that it was not because of an incident, it was because of reviewing another policy about insurance on personal vehicles for work that they realized there was no actual policy.

Councillor Nelson commented that she thought that we always had a policy so it is a good idea to have one done. Bill responded that it is included in the employee handbook.

Reeve Beaupre referred to taxable benefits. Ms. Bierman responded that it can be a taxable benefit and if it is they must keep an employee log book.

Councillor Dueck inquired if legal counsel had informed HR that we need a policy. Bill responded that it was in the personnel handbook but we need a policy to reinforce the handbook.

Resolution #CM20130422.1054

MOVED BY S. NELSON to approve the proposed County Vehicle/Equipment Usage Policy as presented by Human Resources.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1055

MOVED BY R. SUTHERLAND that the meeting be recessed at 3:10 p.m. for a 5 minute break.

CARRIED

**CONTRACT FOR
EXECUTIVE
DIRECTOR OF
PIPESTONE CREEK
DINOSAUR INITIATIVE**

(IN CAMERA)
(Issue #20130419001)

Resolution #CM20130422.1056

MOVED BY S. NELSON that the meeting go in to In-Camera, at 3:18 p.m., pursuant to Section 197 of the Municipal Government Act, 2000, Chapter M-26 and amendments thereto, and Division 2 of Part 1 of the Freedom of

Information and Protection of Privacy Act, Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000, Chapter F-25 and amendments thereto, to discuss Privileged Information with regards to the Contract for the Executive Director of the Pipestone Creek Dinosaur Initiative.

CARRIED

Attached to the agenda package is the contract for the Executive Director of Pipestone Creek Dinosaur Initiative.

Resolution #CM20130422.1057

MOVED BY S. NELSON that the meeting come out of In-Camera at 4:07 p.m.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1058

MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM to advance the remainder of the In Camera items (14.2-14.4) to the next Council meeting agenda on April 29, 2013.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1059

MOVED BY B. SMITH to remove Executive Director of the PCDI, Brian Brake, from the coordinator position of the Philip J. Currie Dinosaur Museum Building project to allow him to focus on fundraising efforts for the project.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1060

MOVED BY R. HARPE to have Administration identify an individual, internally or externally, to assume the roll of Project Coordinator on the Philip J. Currie Dinosaur Museum Building Construction Committee.

CARRIED

Resolution #CM20130422.1061

MOVED BY B. SMITH that the contract for the Executive Director of PCDI be brought back to Council for review in September 2013 for discussions on renewal.

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

Resolution #CM20130422.1062

MOVED by M. ECKSTROM that the meeting adjourn at 4:10 p.m.

CARRIED

These minutes approved the _____ day of _____ 2013.

Reference # _____

REEVE

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR