

**CLEARWATER COUNTY  
COUNCIL AGENDA  
March 26, 2013**

**11:00 A.M. Land Development Proposal Delegation**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

**B. AGENDA ADOPTION**

**C. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

1. March 12, 2013 Regular Meeting Minutes

**D. PUBLIC WORKS**

1. Approach Construction Guidelines Policy
2. Municipal Road Construction Request - Bunch

**E. CORPORATE SERVICES**

1. Education Property Tax Requisition

**F. COMMUNITY AND PROTECTIVE SERVICES**

1. Community Hall & Community Group Insurance – Caroline SC Drop In Centre
2. RMH Sportsfield Development
3. South East Recreation Grounds (*Item to follow Monday*)

**G. IN CAMERA**

1. Kurt Browning Complex
2. Draft Tax Rate Bylaw
3. 11:00 Land Development Proposal Delegation

**H. INFORMATION**

1. CAO'S Report
2. Public Works Director's Report
3. Accounts Payable Listing
4. Councillor Remuneration

**I. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

## ***TABLED ITEMS***

### **Date**

### **Item, Reason and Status**

04/10/12

#### **Arbutus Hall Funding Request**

- To allow applicant to provide a complete capital projects plan.

**STATUS: Pending Information, Community and Protective Services**

## ***FOLLOW UP***

### **Date**

### **Resolution Item, Action Required and Department**

12/03/13

#### **088/13 Approach Construction Guidelines Policy**

- Amend policy re setback requirements

**DEPARTMENT:** Public Works

12/03/13

#### **091/13 Bylaw 972/13 Williamson**

- Second Reading

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning & Development



## Agenda Item

<b>Project:</b> Approach Construction Guidelines Policy Review	
<b>Presentation Date:</b> March 26, 2013	
<b>Department:</b> Public Works	<b>Author:</b> Erik Hansen
<b>Budget Implication:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Funded by Dept. <input type="checkbox"/> Reallocation	
<b>Strategic Area:</b> Infrastructure & Asset Management	<b>Goal:</b> - To effectively manage the financial and physical assets of the County in order to support the growth and development of the County while obtaining maximum value from County owned infrastructure and structures.
<b>Legislative Direction:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Provincial Legislation (cite) _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County Bylaw or Policy (cite) <u>APPROACH CONSTRUCTION GUIDELINES</u>	
<b>Recommendation:</b> That Council reviews the information provided; amend if required and approves the draft revisions.	
<b>Attachments List:</b> Approach Construction Guidelines Policy	

**Background:** The Administration has made the requested changes to the Approach Construction Guidelines policy including how existing approaches and development will be managed. As per the request Council made at their March 12, 2013 meeting, Staff has also included a setback relaxation for approaches in relation to industrial leases.

# Clearwater County

## APPROACH CONSTRUCTION GUIDELINES

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 15, 2009

**Draft Revision:** March 26, 2013

**SECTION:** Public Works

### POLICY STATEMENT:

The County is responsible to provide reasonable approach from any developed County roadway to each existing adjacent property. With the approval from the County, property owners are responsible for the development of additional approaches beyond those provided for by this policy. The purpose of this policy is therefore to provide direction regarding the responsibility for the construction of approaches from adjacent County roadways and specifications for same.

### DEFINITIONS

- Approach – Any entrance located within a municipal road allowance or right-of-way that provides ingress and/or egress to a field, resident(s), commercial use, or industrial use.
- Intersection – Any junction where two government road allowances or right-of-ways connect.
- Grandfathered – Any approach constructed prior to July 1, 2007, will be accepted by the County in its present condition and location; with the exception of new bare land subdivisions.

### GENERAL

#### General Provisions:

1. ~~Unless directed otherwise by this policy,~~ The Public Works Department has the responsibility to administer this policy.
2. All approaches constructed prior to July 1, 2007 shall be grandfathered; therefore the following policy pertains to only the approaches constructed from July 1, 2007 to the present; unless otherwise specifically stated (i.e. – bare land subdivision).
3. **If a development wishes to utilize an existing approach, which would alter or intensify its use, the approach must meet all applicable Municipal Standards.**
4. **If an industrial lease is proposed in the corner of a property adjacent to an intersection, the approach shall be setback from an intersection a minimum of 100m provided it meets all other municipal standards.**

#### Procedure Provisions:

## Page 2 of 4

1. Where a parcel of land has no approach, the County will supply one approach only, to each existing parcel of land from an adjacent developed roadway. The location of the approach will be determined through consultation with the landowner and all reasonable attempts will be made to place it in a convenient and safe location for the benefit of the landowner and the travelling public. To provide additional clarification, an existing approach will include any approach currently providing access to an existing parcel of land that was constructed by the Road Authority, Industry or landowner.
2. In the event a parcel is severed by a developed County roadway, or a major drainage course, and providing the severed parcel has no approach and is adjacent to a developed County roadway; the County will furnish one additional approach for each severed parcel of land. The landowner shall provide reasonable need or justification for the approach, and it will only be installed if it can be done at a safe location and at reasonable cost.
3. During municipal road improvements conducted by the County, a landowner may request an approach to be widened to accommodate large pieces of equipment. The widening of said approach will not be free of charge (if widening extends beyond a total surface width of 7.3m or 24 feet) to the landowner but can be done in exchange for borrow material or a negotiated exchange approved by the Director of Public Works. If the landowner wishes he could also pay the County an approved amount to widen the approach.
4. During the annual construction program all approaches located adjacent to a rehabilitation project will be evaluated as to how the approach meets both municipal construction standards and municipal safety standards. Any field approaches that are deemed to be located in an unsafe location will be removed or re-located by the construction crew after consultation with the effected landowner. Approaches that are not grandfathered and are found to be constructed to a lower standard than the municipal standard or are deemed to be a safety hazard will be upgraded, relocated or removed at the cost of the municipality. All residential approaches are considered to be grandfathered.

**STANDARDS****Construction Guideline Provisions**

1. Standard approaches will be constructed with a minimum 7.3m (24 feet) finished driving surface. Further approach specifications are outlined on Schedule "A" attached to this policy. Approach specifications may be varied, at the discretion of the County, based on local circumstances and limitations.
2. The following unobstructed sight distance requirements must be obtained for any approach approved under this policy and to be constructed on municipal road allowance:
  - a) 150 m for a roadway with less than 1,000 vehicles per day.
  - b) 200 m for a roadway with a 1,000 vehicles per day or greater
3. The County will determine if a culvert is required and the appropriate size. The size of the culvert must accommodate normal drainage requirements.
4. Approaches will be constructed in a manner that will not restrict or alter drainage patterns, unless specifically approved by the County. Prior to restricting or altering drainage patterns, the County will consult with Alberta Environmental Protection.

## Page 3 of 4

5. The County will, at the request of the landowner, upgrade substandard approaches, when an existing parcel, or severed parcel, is not currently serviced by one standard approach. This will only be done where costs are reasonable, and as budget limitations permit.
6. Should the landowner require an approach with the finished driving surface exceeding 7.3m (24 feet), the additional cost shall be borne by the landowner.
7. Upon receipt of a request to construct an approach, the County reserves the discretion to either approve or not approve the approach and to determine the varying approach specifications based on physical characteristics.
8. Access roads or approaches entering a county road shall be setback from an intersection a minimum of 150m, unless they fall under the grandfather clause **or are specifically identified elsewhere in this policy.**
9. During the municipality's annual rehabilitation program all approaches adjacent to the roadway under construction will be evaluated, upgraded, re-located, or removed (unless it is grandfathered **or specifically identified exempted**) in accordance with this policy. ~~The evaluation shall include all non-grandfathered approaches located within 150m of municipal intersections. Residential approaches shall not be removed or re-located, unless consent is obtained from the landowner.~~
10. A minimum spacing of 50 meters is required between individual approaches.
11. A railway crossing does not constitute as an intersection, therefore the required setback for rail crossings will be a minimum of 35 meters or as determined by the rail authority.
12. No more than four (4) approaches per half (1/2) mile or eight (8) per quarter section are permitted, unless more existed prior to July 1, 2007.
13. In the event a landowner wishes to appeal a decision of the Public Works Department regarding the construction beyond that permitted in this policy, that landowner will have to submit in writing an outline for his/her rationale behind the appeal and will be invited to attend a meeting of Council to discuss his/her concerns or needs.

## SUBDIVISION

### Subdivision Provisions:

1. The County will not supply approaches to parcels of land to accommodate the subdivision of land.
2. During the subdivision approval process, the subdivision approving authority shall ensure that each new parcel created and each remaining parcel has a developed approach, constructed in accordance with this policy.
3. The Public Works Department will inspect existing approaches to any proposed bare land subdivision (i.e. new parcel) and the remaining parcel(s) to ensure one approach to municipal standard exists on each parcel(s).

4. The developer is required to supply; at their cost, one approach to the subdivision and one approach to the remaining parcel that meet municipal standards. If by the creation of the subdivision the number of approaches exceed the permitted amount, the developer will be required to remove the number of approaches on a one to one basis; for example: if the landowner has 6 approaches within the half mile and requires an additional approach to facilitate a new subdivision, one other approach of the landowner's choice must be removed.
5. The subdivision approving authority will identify all approaches that are deemed unsafe and to be removed as a condition of subdivision. Any existing approach accessing an established residence shall not be required to be removed or re-located, unless consent from the landowner is obtained. The cost of removal will generally be the developers.
6. Generally, more than one approach to a subdivided residential parcel will not be considered unless a significant need can be demonstrated by the developer. If two existing approaches are accessing a proposed residential parcel and do not present a safety concern, consideration will be given to allow both approaches to remain. If both approaches are to remain the developer will be required to upgrade both approaches to municipal standard.
7. During the development approval process, the Development Officer, shall ensure, as a condition of development, that the developer provides (at his cost), an approach to suit the approach needs of the development. The Development Officer shall consult with the Public Works Department regarding appropriate standards.



## Agenda Item

<b>Project:</b> Municipal Road Construction Request	
<b>Presentation Date:</b> March 26, 2013	
<b>Department:</b> Public Works	<b>Author:</b> Erik Hansen
<b>Budget Implication:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Funded by Dept. <input type="checkbox"/> Reallocation	
<b>Strategic Area:</b> Infrastructure & Asset Management	<b>Goal:</b> - To effectively manage the financial and physical assets of the County in order to support the growth and development of the County while obtaining maximum value from County owned infrastructure and structures.
<b>Legislative Direction:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Provincial Legislation (cite) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> County Bylaw or Policy (cite)	
<b>Recommendation:</b> That Council reviews the information provided and approve the proposed road construction.	
<b>Attachments List:</b> Air Photo, Request Letter	

**Background:** The Administration has received a request from Dwayne and Shelagh Bunch to construct a municipal standard road on road allowance. The request is a product of an application to create a +-18 acre fragmented parcel on the northwest corner of NE 20- 39- 4 W5M. The request includes constructing approximately 500m of road on the undeveloped portion of Twp. Rd 39-4 to gain access to the proposed parcel. Due to a large ravine on the undeveloped road allowance public works recommend that the road be constructed on the existing road plan 3007 ET then continue east on Twp. Rd 39-4. All costs associated with the construction of this road would be at the developer's expense.



**Proposed Access Road  
on Road Plan 3007 ET and  
Undeveloped County Road Allowance  
Lying Between the North 1/2 Sec 20  
and the South half of Sec 29-39-4 W5**



File.

D2

13/000299  
D13/2021

To: Clear Water County  
Attn: Erik Hansen (Manager, Infrastructure)  
Date: February 21, 2013  
Re: Request to construct a portion of road to Municipal Standard.  
Location: NE-20-039-04W5

To Whom It May Concern:  
Cc: Erik Hansen

If my application to subdivide the fragmented portion of my quarter (NE-20-039-04W5) is approved I would like to request permission to build approx 400 meters of road to Municipal Standards that would allow access to the North West corner of the fragmented parcel. If the subdivision is approved my son would be building a residence on this portion of the property and we would need to have access to it and I believe this would be a requirement of the subdivision approval process. I would also like to know if this portion of road would qualify for consideration to the "Endeavor to Assist Program" as stated in the Access Roads Policy Paragraph 12 (C)

Sincerely,



Dwayne Bunch  
403-350-9910



## Agenda Item

<b>Project: Education Property Tax Requisition</b>	
<b>Presentation Date: March 26, 2013</b>	
<b>Department: Corporate Services</b>	<b>Author: Denniece Crout</b>
<b>Budget Implication:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Funded by Dept. <input type="checkbox"/> Reallocation	
<b>Strategic Area:</b>	<b>Goal:</b>
<b>Legislative Direction:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Provincial Legislation (cite) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> County Bylaw or Policy (cite) _____	
<b>Recommendation: Council accept for information</b>	
<b>Attachments List: Education Property Tax Comparison Report</b>	

**Background:** Please find attached a report generated by Municipal Affairs that shows the amount of change for each municipality.

In 2013/14 Alberta will collect approximately \$2.06 billion in education property taxes which represents an increase of \$79 million, or about four per cent, from the 2012/13 fiscal year. This increase is a result of linking education property tax revenues to achieve 32 per cent of the target operating costs for funding Kindergarten to Grade 12 education. Using target operating costs means that the total amount of education property tax revenue will be known one year in advance, which will increase predictability and allow for more effective local budget planning.

Alberta is also discontinuing capping and averaging which reallocated the education tax requisition among municipalities. Eliminating the mitigation formula will achieve equity in the distribution of the education requisition. Now taxpayers with similar types of properties and with comparable values will be paying similar education taxes.

Once again there has been considerable attention on education funding in the provincial budget that was released earlier this month. As you are aware, we have the task of collecting the education tax on behalf of the province. Alberta Education tells us how much they need from us based on our equalized assessment. We take that amount and divide the current years' assessment into the requisitioned amount which then gives us the school tax rate. This tax rate forms a large component of the combined tax rate which is what is levied to the ratepayer. Last year the education tax made up 49% of the overall tax levy.



The amount requisitioned has been increased by \$930,856 or 6%. This amount will vary as it is based upon the actual current year's assessment. As the current year's non-residential assessment is higher than the equalized assessment, the non-residential school rate will be less than the overall change. If the current year assessment is less than the equalized assessment, the residential school tax rate will see an increase greater than 6%. The preliminary numbers indicate the amount of change for residential could be over 10 % and the non-residential may result in a decrease in the education tax rate.

Education Property Tax Comparison Report  
2013 Tax Year

Municipality	Residential/ Farmland Requisition			Non-Residential Requisition			Total Education Requisition		
	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change
<b>Cities</b>									
City of Airdrie	\$112,300,868	\$15,024,961	22%	\$3,486,234	\$4,121,531	18%	\$15,787,102	\$19,146,492	21%
City of Brooks	\$2,575,143	\$2,584,405	0%	\$1,262,686	\$1,276,062	1%	\$3,837,829	\$3,860,467	1%
City of Calgary	\$443,364,878	\$435,028,050	-2%	\$192,905,689	\$197,033,802	2%	\$636,270,567	\$632,061,851	-1%
City of Camrose	\$4,668,237	\$4,820,016	3%	\$1,769,744	\$2,002,659	13%	\$6,437,980	\$6,822,675	6%
City of Cold Lake	\$3,492,189	\$3,834,092	10%	\$1,439,531	\$1,723,779	20%	\$4,931,720	\$5,557,871	13%
City of Edmonton	\$266,273,648	\$265,293,697	0%	\$123,953,314	\$133,806,332	8%	\$390,226,963	\$399,100,028	2%
City of Fort Saskatchewan	\$6,320,772	\$6,739,400	7%	\$2,932,204	\$3,510,550	20%	\$9,252,976	\$10,249,950	11%
City of Grande Prairie	\$13,132,218	\$12,998,505	-1%	\$7,863,743	\$8,131,841	3%	\$20,995,961	\$21,130,346	1%
City of Lacombe	\$3,111,358	\$3,198,243	3%	\$754,897	\$839,164	11%	\$3,866,255	\$4,037,406	4%
City of Leduc	\$7,032,006	\$7,881,912	12%	\$3,361,478	\$4,126,187	23%	\$10,393,484	\$12,008,099	16%
City of Lethbridge	\$22,846,283	\$23,328,943	2%	\$7,354,317	\$8,646,312	18%	\$30,200,600	\$31,975,256	6%
City of Lloydminster	\$4,237,404	\$4,658,633	10%	\$2,589,544	\$2,789,905	8%	\$6,826,948	\$7,448,538	9%
City of Medicine Hat	\$16,170,868	\$15,722,073	-3%	\$5,101,255	\$5,402,896	6%	\$21,272,123	\$21,124,969	-1%
City of Red Deer	\$26,780,022	\$26,384,287	-1%	\$11,367,494	\$13,223,699	16%	\$38,147,516	\$39,607,986	4%
City of Spruce Grove	\$7,872,878	\$8,798,576	12%	\$1,920,147	\$2,281,614	19%	\$9,793,025	\$11,080,189	13%
City of St. Albert	\$23,533,895	\$22,686,957	-4%	\$3,954,998	\$4,395,512	11%	\$27,488,893	\$27,082,469	-1%
City of Wetaskiwin	\$2,671,379	\$2,602,761	-3%	\$806,054	\$844,683	5%	\$3,477,433	\$3,447,444	-1%
<b>Specialized Municipalities</b>									
Municipality of Crowsnest Pass	\$2,165,572	\$2,124,586	-2%	\$591,317	\$575,960	-3%	\$2,756,890	\$2,700,547	-2%
Municipality of Jasper	\$1,533,958	\$1,918,753	25%	\$1,773,010	\$1,897,797	7%	\$3,306,968	\$3,816,550	15%
Wackenzie County	\$1,227,639	\$1,360,922	11%	\$4,929,725	\$4,861,230	-1%	\$6,157,364	\$6,222,152	1%
Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo	\$19,988,434	\$29,393,371	47%	\$21,987,176	\$28,898,427	31%	\$41,975,610	\$58,291,788	39%
Strathcona County	\$39,052,406	\$39,122,717	0%	\$12,819,393	\$15,122,267	18%	\$51,871,800	\$54,244,984	5%
<b>Rural Municipalities</b>									
Municipal District of Acadia No. 34	\$133,499	\$147,970	11%	\$125,703	\$120,286	-4%	\$259,203	\$268,255	3%
Athabasca County	\$1,898,372	\$2,223,674	17%	\$2,548,871	\$2,563,749	1%	\$4,447,243	\$4,787,423	8%
County of Barrhead No. 11	\$1,450,892	\$1,664,331	15%	\$756,619	\$801,902	6%	\$2,207,511	\$2,466,232	12%
Beaver County	\$1,483,284	\$1,624,745	10%	\$1,543,395	\$1,545,413	0%	\$3,026,680	\$3,170,158	5%
Municipal District of Big Lakes	\$783,867	\$954,412	22%	\$3,822,838	\$4,013,253	5%	\$4,606,705	\$4,967,665	8%
Municipal District of Bighorn No. 8	\$1,028,880	\$994,425	-3%	\$1,123,535	\$1,101,322	-2%	\$2,152,415	\$2,095,747	-3%
Birch Hills County	\$219,265	\$222,441	1%	\$751,277	\$739,180	-2%	\$970,542	\$961,621	-1%
Municipal District of Bonnyville No. 87	\$3,380,401	\$3,990,208	18%	\$6,529,617	\$7,178,543	10%	\$9,910,018	\$11,168,752	13%
Brazeau County	\$2,039,648	\$2,167,474	6%	\$6,696,150	\$7,015,162	5%	\$8,735,799	\$9,182,636	5%
Camrose County (includes New Norway)	\$2,419,578	\$2,729,781	13%	\$1,922,098	\$1,949,963	1%	\$4,341,677	\$4,679,744	8%
Cardston County	\$992,733	\$1,048,478	6%	\$322,900	\$342,130	6%	\$1,315,633	\$1,390,608	6%
Clear Hills County	\$309,340	\$351,477	14%	\$2,622,106	\$2,665,855	2%	\$2,931,447	\$3,017,332	3%
Clearwater County	\$3,931,369	\$4,261,855	8%	\$11,385,318	\$11,985,689	5%	\$15,316,687	\$16,247,543	6%
Cypress County	\$2,642,044	\$2,897,850	10%	\$11,938,918	\$11,937,021	0%	\$14,580,962	\$14,834,871	2%

Education Property Tax Comparison Report  
2013 Tax Year

Municipality	Residential/ Farmland Requisition			Non-Residential Requisition			Total Education Requisition		
	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change
Municipal District of Fairview No. 136	\$334,953	\$379,575	13%	\$505,740	\$522,912	3%	\$840,703	\$902,488	7%
Flagstaff County	\$921,699	\$1,043,401	13%	\$2,725,406	\$2,759,760	1%	\$3,647,104	\$3,803,161	4%
Municipal District of Foothills No. 31	\$15,544,820	\$15,320,771	-1%	\$3,349,416	\$3,391,771	1%	\$18,894,235	\$18,712,542	-1%
County of Forty Mile No. 8	\$828,335	\$941,241	14%	\$1,287,571	\$1,287,114	0%	\$2,115,906	\$2,228,355	5%
County of Grande Prairie No. 1	\$6,624,274	\$7,011,581	6%	\$9,919,707	\$10,656,140	7%	\$16,543,981	\$17,667,721	7%
Municipal District of Greenview No. 16	\$1,356,611	\$1,432,959	6%	\$15,897,375	\$17,483,158	10%	\$17,253,986	\$18,916,117	10%
Kneehill County	\$1,490,529	\$1,632,335	10%	\$4,434,503	\$4,923,413	11%	\$5,925,032	\$6,555,748	11%
Lac La Biche County	\$2,499,424	\$2,787,053	12%	\$6,230,703	\$4,776,369	-23%	\$8,730,127	\$7,563,422	-13%
Lac Ste. Anne County	\$3,229,428	\$3,432,591	6%	\$1,241,642	\$1,219,742	-2%	\$4,471,070	\$4,652,333	4%
Lacombe County	\$4,176,317	\$4,258,211	2%	\$6,187,859	\$6,338,112	2%	\$10,364,176	\$10,596,323	2%
Lamont County	\$1,050,148	\$1,167,863	11%	\$1,370,917	\$1,416,753	3%	\$2,421,065	\$2,584,617	7%
Leduc County	\$5,485,536	\$5,886,146	7%	\$10,775,186	\$12,133,924	13%	\$16,260,722	\$18,020,070	11%
Municipal District of Lesser Slave River No. 124	\$1,019,019	\$1,243,641	22%	\$2,732,065	\$2,833,938	4%	\$3,751,083	\$4,077,578	9%
County of Lethbridge	\$2,414,287	\$2,619,244	8%	\$2,115,562	\$2,110,936	0%	\$4,529,849	\$4,730,180	4%
County of Milkburn No. 27	\$693,567	\$788,295	14%	\$1,318,446	\$1,336,895	1%	\$2,012,013	\$2,125,190	6%
Mountain View County	\$5,730,202	\$5,699,041	-1%	\$5,352,579	\$5,619,786	5%	\$11,082,782	\$11,318,826	2%
County of Newell	\$1,880,477	\$2,071,554	10%	\$9,852,911	\$10,132,403	3%	\$11,733,389	\$12,203,957	4%
County of Northern Lights	\$725,413	\$872,499	20%	\$2,717,532	\$2,735,408	1%	\$3,442,945	\$3,607,907	5%
Northern Sunrise County	\$419,529	\$484,883	16%	\$4,339,330	\$5,309,374	22%	\$4,758,859	\$5,794,257	22%
Municipal District of Opportunity No. 17	\$479,775	\$661,207	38%	\$7,616,943	\$8,390,248	10%	\$8,096,717	\$9,051,455	12%
County of Paintearth No. 18	\$391,105	\$452,361	16%	\$1,737,529	\$1,731,107	0%	\$2,128,634	\$2,183,468	3%
Parkland County	\$12,990,524	\$13,915,924	7%	\$4,519,758	\$5,808,203	29%	\$17,510,282	\$19,724,127	13%
Municipal District of Peace No. 135	\$341,390	\$397,204	16%	\$352,817	\$370,272	5%	\$694,207	\$767,476	11%
Municipal District of Pincher Creek No. 9	\$1,292,502	\$1,401,047	8%	\$1,099,842	\$1,132,632	3%	\$2,392,344	\$2,533,679	6%
Ponoka County	\$3,017,901	\$3,243,600	7%	\$3,347,824	\$3,526,731	5%	\$6,365,725	\$6,770,331	6%
Municipal District of Provost No. 52	\$522,142	\$574,174	10%	\$4,193,801	\$4,365,729	4%	\$4,715,943	\$4,939,903	5%
Municipal District of Ranchland No. 66	\$54,657	\$57,272	5%	\$718,559	\$711,129	-1%	\$773,216	\$768,402	-1%
Red Deer County	\$8,391,062	\$8,272,149	-1%	\$7,570,316	\$8,202,805	8%	\$15,961,378	\$16,474,954	3%
Rocky View County	\$28,938,357	\$28,982,013	0%	\$7,860,495	\$9,332,254	19%	\$36,798,852	\$38,314,268	4%
Saddle Hills County	\$343,173	\$360,088	5%	\$4,306,161	\$4,678,142	9%	\$4,649,334	\$5,038,229	8%
Smoky Lake County	\$762,503	\$822,263	8%	\$1,132,044	\$1,119,674	-1%	\$1,894,547	\$1,941,937	3%
Municipal District of Smoky River No. 130	\$393,616	\$432,645	10%	\$601,033	\$713,221	19%	\$994,649	\$1,145,866	15%
Municipal District of Spirit River No. 133	\$131,571	\$139,629	6%	\$413,494	\$425,195	3%	\$545,066	\$564,824	4%
County of St. Paul No. 19	\$1,619,546	\$1,866,254	15%	\$1,694,705	\$1,725,412	2%	\$3,314,251	\$3,591,666	8%
Starland County	\$395,344	\$402,531	2%	\$1,685,546	\$1,716,005	2%	\$2,080,890	\$2,118,536	2%
County of Stettler No. 6	\$1,618,756	\$1,656,074	2%	\$2,592,134	\$2,644,990	2%	\$4,210,890	\$4,301,064	2%
Sturgeon County	\$7,991,367	\$8,408,338	5%	\$3,742,242	\$3,851,567	3%	\$11,733,608	\$12,259,906	4%
Municipal District of Taber	\$1,409,813	\$1,646,155	17%	\$3,470,981	\$3,560,986	3%	\$4,880,794	\$5,207,141	7%
County of Thorhild No. 7	\$845,356	\$944,033	12%	\$909,774	\$973,431	7%	\$1,755,130	\$1,917,465	9%
County of Two Hills No. 21	\$652,114	\$755,979	16%	\$861,109	\$880,003	2%	\$1,513,222	\$1,635,982	8%
County of Vermillion River	\$2,279,860	\$2,549,589	12%	\$3,504,953	\$3,873,419	11%	\$5,784,813	\$6,423,007	11%

Education Property Tax Comparison Report  
2013 Tax Year

Municipality	Residential/ Farmland Requisition			Non-Residential Requisition			Total Education Requisition		
	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change
Vulcan County	\$1,289,788	\$1,474,890	14%	\$2,262,566	\$2,282,797	1%	\$3,552,355	\$3,757,687	6%
Municipal District of Wainwright No. 61	\$1,189,491	\$1,284,698	8%	\$4,360,888	\$4,430,761	2%	\$5,550,379	\$5,715,459	3%
County of Warner No. 5	\$804,707	\$871,615	8%	\$763,186	\$753,641	-1%	\$1,567,893	\$1,625,256	4%
Westlock County	\$1,629,917	\$1,860,725	14%	\$707,419	\$698,310	-1%	\$2,337,336	\$2,559,035	9%
County of Wetaskiwin No. 10	\$4,119,267	\$4,582,396	11%	\$2,550,932	\$2,770,547	9%	\$6,670,199	\$7,352,943	10%
Wheatland County	\$3,061,320	\$3,032,816	-1%	\$6,775,934	\$7,252,168	7%	\$9,837,254	\$10,284,984	5%
Municipal District of Willow Creek No. 26	\$1,591,033	\$1,697,890	7%	\$1,121,853	\$1,200,723	7%	\$2,712,886	\$2,898,613	7%
Woodlands County	\$1,414,909	\$1,460,291	3%	\$3,938,207	\$4,059,108	3%	\$5,353,117	\$5,519,399	3%
Yellowhead County	\$3,037,034	\$3,265,865	8%	\$16,131,928	\$17,637,425	9%	\$19,168,962	\$20,903,291	9%
<b>Towns</b>									
Town of Athabasca	\$622,167	\$700,910	13%	\$270,298	\$302,148	12%	\$892,466	\$1,003,058	12%
Town of Banff	\$2,783,523	\$3,238,931	16%	\$2,363,484	\$2,510,769	6%	\$5,147,008	\$5,749,700	12%
Town of Barrhead	\$915,336	\$902,593	-1%	\$327,198	\$379,141	16%	\$1,242,533	\$1,281,734	3%
Town of Bashaw	\$129,976	\$137,718	6%	\$49,777	\$52,167	5%	\$179,754	\$189,885	6%
Town of Bassano	\$218,293	\$234,739	8%	\$91,888	\$91,589	0%	\$310,181	\$326,327	5%
Town of Beaumont	\$4,150,140	\$4,957,729	19%	\$315,080	\$390,887	24%	\$4,465,220	\$5,348,616	20%
Town of Beaverlodge	\$504,010	\$486,192	-4%	\$161,191	\$197,602	23%	\$665,200	\$683,793	3%
Town of Bentley	\$236,475	\$229,974	-3%	\$52,387	\$50,865	-3%	\$288,861	\$280,839	-3%
Town of Black Diamond	\$727,025	\$732,700	1%	\$123,821	\$141,359	14%	\$850,846	\$874,059	3%
Town of Blackfields	\$1,270,997	\$1,862,585	47%	\$264,288	\$345,864	31%	\$1,535,284	\$2,208,449	44%
Town of Bon Accord	\$371,008	\$364,374	-2%	\$20,641	\$21,196	3%	\$391,649	\$385,570	-2%
Town of Bonnyville	\$1,404,391	\$1,459,591	4%	\$884,198	\$1,259,133	42%	\$2,288,589	\$2,718,724	19%
Town of Bow Island	\$280,360	\$305,560	9%	\$102,605	\$114,763	12%	\$382,965	\$420,333	10%
Town of Bowden	\$267,263	\$248,999	-7%	\$33,759	\$33,232	-2%	\$301,022	\$282,231	-6%
Town of Bruderheim	\$299,091	\$292,542	-2%	\$28,795	\$36,748	28%	\$327,886	\$329,289	0%
Town of Calmar	\$513,419	\$492,598	-4%	\$88,765	\$132,027	49%	\$602,184	\$624,626	4%
Town of Cammore	\$12,541,725	\$12,000,576	-4%	\$3,315,461	\$3,105,601	-6%	\$15,857,187	\$15,106,177	-5%
Town of Cardston	\$631,196	\$717,660	14%	\$141,077	\$155,066	10%	\$772,273	\$872,725	13%
Town of Carstairs	\$919,772	\$1,040,425	13%	\$172,857	\$216,518	25%	\$1,092,628	\$1,256,942	15%
Town of Castor	\$125,574	\$151,084	20%	\$45,569	\$52,508	15%	\$171,142	\$203,592	19%
Town of Chestermere	\$3,982,332	\$6,078,220	53%	\$236,460	\$355,807	50%	\$4,218,791	\$6,434,027	53%
Town of Claresholm	\$941,631	\$930,937	-1%	\$253,116	\$274,424	8%	\$1,194,748	\$1,205,361	1%
Town of Coaldale	\$1,605,170	\$1,777,106	11%	\$191,263	\$220,204	15%	\$1,796,433	\$1,997,310	11%
Town of Coalhurst	\$360,768	\$518,830	44%	\$30,744	\$36,096	17%	\$391,513	\$554,927	42%
Town of Cochrane	\$7,153,844	\$7,958,976	11%	\$1,511,265	\$1,669,937	10%	\$8,665,109	\$9,628,913	11%
Town of Coronation	\$112,097	\$130,586	16%	\$70,615	\$83,343	18%	\$182,712	\$213,930	17%
Town of Crossfield	\$815,918	\$793,820	-3%	\$433,350	\$599,745	38%	\$1,249,269	\$1,393,565	12%
Town of Daysland	\$147,399	\$166,203	13%	\$23,014	\$27,952	21%	\$170,413	\$194,155	14%
Town of Devon	\$1,874,747	\$1,833,251	-2%	\$373,425	\$374,848	0%	\$2,248,172	\$2,208,099	-2%
Town of Didsbury	\$1,305,653	\$1,196,599	-8%	\$205,365	\$221,244	8%	\$1,511,018	\$1,417,843	-6%

Education Property Tax Comparison Report  
2013 Tax Year

Municipality	Residential/ Farmland Requisition			Non-Residential Requisition			Total Education Requisition		
	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change
Town of Drayton Valley	\$1,648,032	\$1,772,092	8%	\$1,156,889	\$1,482,473	28%	\$2,804,921	\$3,254,565	16%
Town of Drumheller	\$1,700,052	\$1,811,580	7%	\$901,742	\$929,322	3%	\$2,601,794	\$2,740,903	5%
Town of Eckville	\$241,299	\$233,217	-3%	\$56,846	\$70,436	24%	\$298,145	\$303,653	2%
Town of Edson	\$2,005,022	\$2,003,625	0%	\$1,092,930	\$1,089,727	0%	\$3,097,951	\$3,093,352	0%
Town of Elk Point	\$234,396	\$242,251	3%	\$105,600	\$122,776	16%	\$339,995	\$365,027	7%
Town of Fairview	\$584,101	\$613,572	5%	\$250,362	\$264,090	5%	\$834,463	\$877,662	5%
Town of Falher	\$120,800	\$133,492	11%	\$81,352	\$88,534	9%	\$202,152	\$222,025	10%
Town of Fort Macleod	\$626,155	\$637,189	2%	\$247,085	\$270,789	10%	\$873,240	\$907,978	4%
Town of Fox Creek	\$421,373	\$421,939	0%	\$272,088	\$288,685	6%	\$693,461	\$710,624	2%
Town of Gibbons	\$795,611	\$835,426	5%	\$76,303	\$80,677	6%	\$871,914	\$916,103	5%
Town of Grande Cache	\$853,816	\$975,781	14%	\$466,813	\$450,120	-4%	\$1,320,629	\$1,425,901	8%
Town of Gramme	\$77,323	\$85,963	11%	\$9,303	\$10,571	14%	\$86,626	\$96,534	11%
Town of Grimshaw	\$501,073	\$474,274	-5%	\$169,132	\$191,788	13%	\$670,205	\$666,062	-1%
Town of Hanna	\$421,686	\$423,409	0%	\$167,715	\$188,536	12%	\$589,401	\$611,945	4%
Town of Hardisty	\$118,802	\$134,466	13%	\$66,634	\$81,938	23%	\$185,437	\$216,404	17%
Town of High Level	\$525,955	\$572,498	9%	\$644,898	\$674,218	5%	\$1,170,853	\$1,246,716	6%
Town of High Prairie	\$421,921	\$441,946	5%	\$335,588	\$334,461	0%	\$757,509	\$776,407	2%
Town of High River	\$4,174,626	\$4,061,775	-3%	\$1,008,086	\$1,175,684	17%	\$5,182,712	\$5,237,459	1%
Town of Hinton	\$2,426,740	\$2,689,728	11%	\$1,420,308	\$1,514,337	7%	\$3,847,048	\$4,204,065	9%
Town of Innisfail	\$1,960,731	\$1,963,324	0%	\$742,111	\$745,962	1%	\$2,702,843	\$2,709,286	0%
Town of Irricana	\$305,713	\$275,791	-10%	\$27,384	\$26,270	-4%	\$333,097	\$302,061	-9%
Town of Killam	\$158,156	\$175,870	11%	\$68,165	\$72,905	7%	\$226,322	\$248,774	10%
Town of Lamont	\$368,612	\$383,555	4%	\$68,206	\$84,169	23%	\$436,818	\$467,724	7%
Town of Legal	\$286,078	\$289,294	1%	\$31,154	\$29,134	-6%	\$317,232	\$318,428	0%
Town of Magrath	\$406,880	\$447,773	10%	\$43,521	\$43,716	0%	\$450,401	\$491,489	9%
Town of Manning	\$221,361	\$218,143	-1%	\$98,453	\$104,612	6%	\$319,814	\$322,755	1%
Town of Mayerthorpe	\$176,207	\$178,418	1%	\$79,757	\$88,932	12%	\$255,964	\$267,350	4%
Town of McLennan	\$75,505	\$77,319	2%	\$30,128	\$36,468	21%	\$105,633	\$113,786	8%
Town of Milk River	\$124,490	\$142,583	15%	\$39,529	\$40,208	2%	\$164,019	\$182,792	11%
Town of Millet	\$482,320	\$477,958	-1%	\$63,075	\$66,582	6%	\$545,395	\$544,540	0%
Town of Morinville	\$2,204,168	\$2,479,236	12%	\$381,814	\$460,090	21%	\$2,585,982	\$2,939,326	14%
Town of Mundare	\$149,038	\$187,512	26%	\$30,833	\$31,034	1%	\$179,871	\$218,546	22%
Town of Nanton	\$596,029	\$568,021	-5%	\$157,399	\$177,984	13%	\$753,428	\$746,005	-1%
Town of Okotoks	\$7,624,155	\$9,023,284	18%	\$1,815,802	\$2,059,179	13%	\$9,439,957	\$11,082,463	17%
Town of Olds	\$2,414,840	\$2,472,050	2%	\$904,034	\$957,368	6%	\$3,318,874	\$3,429,419	3%
Town of Onoway	\$188,161	\$191,513	2%	\$86,875	\$90,903	5%	\$275,036	\$282,416	3%
Town of Oyen	\$139,614	\$162,330	16%	\$62,088	\$63,047	2%	\$201,702	\$225,377	12%
Town of Peace River	\$1,585,360	\$1,646,186	4%	\$821,062	\$951,910	16%	\$2,406,423	\$2,598,096	8%
Town of Penhold	\$527,796	\$596,075	13%	\$33,011	\$34,047	3%	\$560,807	\$630,122	12%
Town of Picture Butte	\$290,614	\$329,804	13%	\$67,531	\$83,050	23%	\$358,145	\$412,855	15%
Town of Pincher Creek	\$845,472	\$821,869	-3%	\$373,734	\$405,906	9%	\$1,219,206	\$1,227,775	1%

Education Property Tax Comparison Report  
2013 Tax Year

Municipality	Residential/ Farmland Requisition			Non-Residential Requisition			Total Education Requisition		
	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change
Town of Ponoka	\$1,617,881	\$1,592,421	-2%	\$494,081	\$538,785	9%	\$2,111,962	\$2,131,205	1%
Town of Provost	\$323,527	\$338,932	5%	\$226,155	\$255,668	13%	\$549,681	\$594,600	8%
Town of Rainbow Lake	\$151,222	\$150,200	-1%	\$101,047	\$107,488	6%	\$252,269	\$257,688	2%
Town of Raymond	\$560,606	\$682,765	22%	\$52,716	\$54,706	4%	\$613,322	\$737,471	20%
Town of Redcliff	\$1,225,870	\$1,199,576	-2%	\$735,878	\$794,844	8%	\$1,961,748	\$1,994,420	2%
Town of Redwater	\$550,617	\$590,180	7%	\$196,643	\$246,165	25%	\$747,260	\$836,346	12%
Town of Rimbey	\$527,979	\$538,645	2%	\$244,605	\$272,054	11%	\$772,585	\$810,699	5%
Town of Rocky Mountain House	\$1,679,191	\$1,678,966	0%	\$834,451	\$837,408	0%	\$2,513,642	\$2,516,374	0%
Town of Sedgewick	\$147,516	\$170,160	15%	\$44,163	\$49,593	12%	\$191,679	\$219,752	15%
Town of Sexsmith	\$520,563	\$500,737	-4%	\$95,231	\$124,381	31%	\$615,794	\$625,118	2%
Town of Slave Lake	\$1,546,468	\$1,484,564	-4%	\$933,689	\$937,262	0%	\$2,480,158	\$2,421,827	-2%
Town of Smoky Lake	\$206,355	\$208,206	1%	\$65,290	\$71,399	9%	\$271,645	\$279,605	3%
Town of Spirit River	\$155,559	\$161,817	4%	\$62,071	\$64,440	4%	\$217,630	\$226,257	4%
Town of St. Paul	\$1,024,048	\$1,161,681	13%	\$477,975	\$572,903	20%	\$1,502,022	\$1,734,584	15%
Town of Stavely	\$101,727	\$122,890	21%	\$19,844	\$22,052	11%	\$121,571	\$144,942	19%
Town of Stettler	\$1,255,947	\$1,316,847	5%	\$630,543	\$737,845	17%	\$1,886,490	\$2,054,691	9%
Town of Stony Plain	\$4,775,853	\$4,912,937	3%	\$922,107	\$1,163,384	26%	\$5,697,960	\$6,076,321	7%
Town of Strathmore	\$3,674,749	\$3,668,575	0%	\$1,099,826	\$1,155,789	5%	\$4,774,575	\$4,824,365	1%
Town of Sundre	\$720,988	\$723,802	0%	\$738,264	\$260,661	9%	\$959,251	\$984,463	3%
Town of Swan Hills	\$216,635	\$233,601	8%	\$146,189	\$164,381	12%	\$362,824	\$397,982	10%
Town of Sylvan Lake	\$4,432,956	\$4,434,152	0%	\$1,013,524	\$1,150,118	13%	\$5,446,479	\$5,584,270	3%
Town of Taber	\$1,589,096	\$1,705,689	7%	\$735,478	\$814,007	11%	\$2,324,574	\$2,519,697	8%
Town of Three Hills	\$620,528	\$607,413	-2%	\$209,467	\$206,266	-2%	\$829,995	\$813,679	-2%
Town of Tofield	\$502,570	\$496,370	-1%	\$126,427	\$158,604	25%	\$628,995	\$654,974	4%
Town of Trochu	\$181,896	\$197,451	9%	\$47,039	\$55,996	19%	\$228,935	\$253,447	11%
Town of Turner Valley	\$763,311	\$735,128	-4%	\$100,102	\$100,606	1%	\$863,413	\$835,734	-3%
Town of Two Hills	\$142,567	\$166,764	17%	\$34,574	\$41,697	21%	\$177,140	\$208,461	18%
Town of Valleyview	\$280,033	\$288,447	3%	\$228,961	\$237,626	4%	\$508,993	\$526,073	3%
Town of Vauxhall	\$147,679	\$190,264	29%	\$46,168	\$46,574	1%	\$193,847	\$236,838	22%
Town of Vegreville	\$1,240,559	\$1,341,461	8%	\$696,529	\$844,086	21%	\$1,937,088	\$2,185,548	13%
Town of Vermilion	\$805,515	\$877,987	9%	\$354,278	\$414,986	17%	\$1,159,793	\$1,292,974	11%
Town of Viking	\$153,756	\$191,648	25%	\$70,544	\$71,776	2%	\$224,300	\$263,424	17%
Town of Vulcan	\$461,459	\$450,489	-2%	\$161,358	\$173,275	7%	\$622,817	\$623,764	0%
Town of Wainwright	\$1,272,910	\$1,417,563	11%	\$588,763	\$673,526	14%	\$1,861,673	\$2,091,089	12%
Town of Wembley	\$288,709	\$271,998	-6%	\$26,466	\$30,399	15%	\$315,175	\$302,398	-4%
Town of Westlock	\$1,038,526	\$1,015,174	-2%	\$431,364	\$476,620	10%	\$1,469,890	\$1,491,795	1%
Town of Whitecourt	\$2,316,764	\$2,310,635	0%	\$1,845,109	\$1,974,361	7%	\$4,161,873	\$4,284,996	3%
<b>Villages</b>									
Village of Acme	\$129,366	\$125,140	-3%	\$25,891	\$27,030	4%	\$155,257	\$152,169	-2%
Alberta Beach	\$447,322	\$435,060	-3%	\$34,404	\$38,837	13%	\$481,726	\$473,896	-2%

Education Property Tax Comparison Report  
2013 Tax Year

Municipality	Residential/ Farmland Requisition			Non-Residential Requisition			Total Education Requisition		
	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change
Village of Alix	\$162,742	\$174,400	7%	\$51,805	\$55,611	7%	\$214,547	\$230,011	7%
Village of Alliance	\$12,785	\$14,232	11%	\$9,733	\$10,920	12%	\$22,518	\$25,152	12%
Village of Amisk	\$20,910	\$27,053	29%	\$3,008	\$3,018	0%	\$23,918	\$30,071	26%
Village of Andrew	\$67,959	\$70,434	4%	\$17,305	\$17,119	-1%	\$85,264	\$87,554	3%
Village of Arrowwood	\$28,690	\$29,346	2%	\$10,635	\$10,634	0%	\$39,325	\$39,979	2%
Village of Barnwell	\$117,358	\$168,851	44%	\$8,252	\$9,229	12%	\$125,610	\$178,080	42%
Village of Barons	\$32,365	\$41,202	27%	\$14,201	\$15,094	6%	\$46,566	\$56,296	21%
Village of Bawlf	\$72,993	\$73,135	0%	\$9,430	\$10,137	7%	\$82,422	\$83,271	1%
Village of Beiseker	\$182,901	\$168,527	-8%	\$98,196	\$94,682	-4%	\$281,097	\$263,209	-6%
Village of Berwyn	\$58,319	\$76,592	31%	\$14,358	\$14,899	4%	\$72,677	\$91,491	26%
Village of Big Valley	\$47,579	\$47,146	-1%	\$17,191	\$16,505	-4%	\$64,770	\$63,652	-2%
Village of Bittern Lake	\$42,594	\$49,260	16%	\$5,944	\$7,029	18%	\$48,538	\$56,289	16%
Village of Botha	\$29,513	\$31,915	8%	\$2,197	\$2,278	4%	\$31,710	\$34,193	8%
Village of Boyle	\$159,943	\$181,725	14%	\$76,475	\$81,906	7%	\$236,418	\$263,632	12%
Village of Breton	\$80,631	\$95,931	19%	\$28,549	\$33,603	18%	\$109,180	\$129,534	19%
Village of Carbon	\$100,151	\$99,499	-1%	\$11,042	\$10,615	-4%	\$111,194	\$110,114	-1%
Village of Carmangay	\$33,831	\$47,536	41%	\$7,957	\$8,114	2%	\$41,788	\$55,650	33%
Village of Caroline	\$69,365	\$74,894	8%	\$34,554	\$33,009	-4%	\$103,918	\$107,902	4%
Village of Cereal	\$6,339	\$7,404	17%	\$3,777	\$3,283	-13%	\$10,116	\$10,687	6%
Village of Champion	\$49,329	\$63,142	28%	\$6,475	\$6,164	-5%	\$55,805	\$69,306	24%
Village of Chauvin	\$33,635	\$37,322	11%	\$24,300	\$24,188	0%	\$57,935	\$61,509	6%
Village of Chipman	\$36,613	\$55,033	50%	\$5,666	\$15,997	182%	\$42,280	\$71,029	68%
Village of Clive	\$133,358	\$162,970	22%	\$10,703	\$12,333	15%	\$144,060	\$175,302	22%
Village of Clyde	\$68,343	\$71,738	5%	\$6,585	\$6,765	3%	\$74,929	\$78,503	5%
Village of Consort	\$87,853	\$93,335	6%	\$49,402	\$48,950	-1%	\$137,255	\$142,285	4%
Village of Coutts	\$29,370	\$34,374	17%	\$33,619	\$33,116	-1%	\$62,989	\$67,489	7%
Village of Cowley	\$35,875	\$39,108	9%	\$12,615	\$10,587	-16%	\$48,490	\$49,695	2%
Village of Cremona	\$108,541	\$108,281	0%	\$24,456	\$23,930	-2%	\$132,997	\$132,211	-1%
Village of Carz	\$19,573	\$24,060	23%	\$7,914	\$8,279	5%	\$27,488	\$32,340	18%
Village of Delburne	\$178,175	\$182,303	2%	\$38,630	\$38,166	-1%	\$216,805	\$220,470	2%
Village of Delia	\$24,238	\$29,373	21%	\$11,863	\$12,258	3%	\$36,101	\$41,631	15%
Village of Dewberry	\$18,894	\$21,286	13%	\$8,418	\$8,903	6%	\$27,312	\$30,188	11%
Village of Donalda	\$26,140	\$28,383	9%	\$5,990	\$5,867	-2%	\$32,130	\$34,250	7%
Village of Donnelly	\$41,297	\$43,856	6%	\$7,947	\$8,920	12%	\$49,244	\$52,776	7%
Village of Duchess	\$212,619	\$216,746	2%	\$31,387	\$35,688	14%	\$244,006	\$252,434	3%
Village of Edberg	\$15,846	\$18,646	18%	\$1,379	\$1,361	-1%	\$17,225	\$20,007	16%
Village of Edgerton	\$58,089	\$65,429	13%	\$11,380	\$13,286	17%	\$69,470	\$78,714	13%
Village of Elnora	\$48,150	\$51,739	7%	\$10,113	\$11,551	14%	\$58,263	\$63,290	9%
Village of Empress	\$12,579	\$17,621	40%	\$5,525	\$5,808	5%	\$18,104	\$23,430	29%
Village of Ferintosh	\$26,050	\$27,770	7%	\$3,662	\$3,302	-10%	\$29,712	\$31,071	5%
Village of Foremost	\$67,576	\$73,075	8%	\$33,283	\$35,014	5%	\$100,859	\$108,089	7%

Education Property Tax Comparison Report  
2013 Tax Year

Municipality	Residential/ Farmland Requisition			Non-Residential Requisition			Total Education Requisition		
	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change
Village of Forestburg	\$125,921	\$144,441	15%	\$27,045	\$29,390	9%	\$152,966	\$173,831	14%
Village of Gadsby	\$1,571	\$1,746	11%	\$506	\$508	0%	\$2,077	\$2,254	8%
Village of Galahad	\$6,359	\$11,412	79%	\$3,401	\$2,586	-24%	\$9,761	\$13,999	43%
Village of Girouxville	\$27,527	\$27,746	1%	\$8,765	\$9,088	4%	\$36,293	\$36,834	1%
Village of Glendon	\$71,375	\$100,686	41%	\$14,423	\$18,222	26%	\$85,798	\$118,908	39%
Village of Glenwood	\$45,811	\$60,388	32%	\$11,044	\$11,650	6%	\$56,856	\$72,078	27%
Village of Halkirk	\$8,919	\$13,369	50%	\$3,587	\$6,271	75%	\$12,505	\$19,640	57%
Village of Hay Lakes	\$92,702	\$93,300	1%	\$7,306	\$7,315	0%	\$100,008	\$100,615	1%
Village of Heister	\$13,222	\$15,378	16%	\$3,796	\$3,786	0%	\$17,018	\$19,164	13%
Village of Hill Spring	\$34,302	\$37,852	10%	\$3,184	\$3,102	-3%	\$37,485	\$40,954	9%
Village of Hines Creek	\$27,338	\$29,162	7%	\$18,797	\$17,441	-7%	\$46,135	\$46,603	1%
Village of Holden	\$46,263	\$51,185	11%	\$18,579	\$17,904	-4%	\$64,842	\$69,090	7%
Village of Hughenden	\$21,425	\$25,089	17%	\$5,557	\$6,381	15%	\$26,982	\$31,470	17%
Village of Hussar	\$25,716	\$25,390	-1%	\$8,306	\$8,231	-1%	\$34,022	\$33,621	-1%
Village of Hythe	\$106,100	\$100,950	-5%	\$59,825	\$66,671	11%	\$165,925	\$167,621	1%
Village of Inisfree	\$21,382	\$24,183	13%	\$10,397	\$10,473	1%	\$31,779	\$34,656	9%
Village of Irma	\$79,405	\$86,216	9%	\$21,031	\$20,789	-1%	\$100,437	\$107,006	7%
Village of Kitscoty	\$152,513	\$179,285	18%	\$21,997	\$26,523	21%	\$174,510	\$205,808	18%
Village of Linden	\$151,468	\$150,188	-1%	\$46,888	\$53,008	13%	\$198,356	\$203,196	2%
Village of Lomond	\$22,034	\$24,381	11%	\$7,568	\$9,155	21%	\$29,602	\$33,536	13%
Village of Longview	\$97,273	\$98,212	1%	\$38,431	\$39,443	3%	\$135,705	\$137,655	1%
Village of Loughheed	\$21,781	\$29,225	34%	\$11,897	\$12,516	5%	\$33,677	\$41,740	24%
Village of Mannville	\$94,316	\$105,852	12%	\$18,467	\$18,266	-1%	\$112,783	\$124,118	10%
Village of Marwayne	\$81,740	\$92,369	13%	\$12,125	\$14,910	23%	\$93,865	\$107,279	14%
Village of Milo	\$19,219	\$23,901	24%	\$7,550	\$7,525	0%	\$26,769	\$31,426	17%
Village of Minburn	\$3,647	\$6,574	80%	\$1,549	\$1,711	10%	\$5,196	\$8,285	59%
Village of Morrin	\$28,911	\$35,051	21%	\$4,192	\$4,104	-2%	\$33,103	\$39,155	18%
Village of Munson	\$33,902	\$44,166	30%	\$6,387	\$6,239	-2%	\$40,289	\$50,405	25%
Village of Myram	\$31,193	\$34,043	9%	\$5,546	\$5,650	2%	\$36,739	\$39,694	8%
Village of Nampa	\$46,949	\$59,051	26%	\$34,384	\$37,855	10%	\$81,333	\$96,906	19%
Village of Nobleford	\$138,727	\$228,735	65%	\$23,725	\$77,861	228%	\$162,452	\$306,595	89%
Village of Paradise Valley	\$14,699	\$16,429	12%	\$4,662	\$4,940	6%	\$19,361	\$21,369	10%
Village of Rockyford	\$63,847	\$62,116	-3%	\$21,905	\$22,724	4%	\$85,752	\$84,840	-1%
Village of Rosalind	\$21,532	\$26,452	23%	\$4,636	\$4,815	4%	\$26,168	\$31,267	19%
Village of Rosemary	\$56,601	\$63,116	12%	\$4,688	\$4,886	4%	\$61,289	\$68,002	11%
Village of Rycroft	\$81,653	\$84,880	4%	\$47,121	\$46,367	-2%	\$128,774	\$131,247	2%
Village of Ryley	\$57,580	\$70,655	23%	\$36,447	\$38,724	6%	\$94,027	\$109,379	16%
Village of Sprind Lake	\$236,824	\$264,960	12%	\$6,350	\$6,645	5%	\$243,174	\$271,605	12%
Village of Standard	\$70,071	\$70,318	0%	\$35,972	\$50,291	40%	\$106,043	\$120,610	14%
Village of Strling	\$176,977	\$203,951	15%	\$7,695	\$7,912	3%	\$184,672	\$211,863	15%
Village of Strome	\$24,072	\$30,531	27%	\$7,528	\$7,606	1%	\$31,600	\$38,138	21%

Education Property Tax Comparison Report  
2013 Tax Year

Municipality	Residential/ Farmland Requisition			Non-Residential Requisition			Total Education Requisition		
	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change
Village of Thorsby	\$180,768	\$182,126	1%	\$65,345	\$66,886	2%	\$246,113	\$249,012	1%
Village of Tilly	\$46,317	\$48,042	4%	\$9,839	\$9,676	-2%	\$56,156	\$57,718	3%
Village of Veteran	\$20,576	\$22,376	9%	\$7,927	\$7,718	-3%	\$28,503	\$30,094	6%
Village of Vilna	\$30,591	\$28,540	-7%	\$8,904	\$8,958	1%	\$39,495	\$37,497	-5%
Village of Wabamun	\$131,401	\$149,179	14%	\$76,876	\$76,311	-1%	\$208,278	\$225,491	8%
Village of Warburg	\$85,896	\$113,459	32%	\$30,248	\$29,281	-3%	\$116,144	\$142,741	23%
Village of Warner	\$42,284	\$49,860	18%	\$19,897	\$18,698	-6%	\$62,180	\$68,558	10%
Village of Waskatenau	\$41,514	\$44,200	6%	\$9,574	\$9,080	-5%	\$51,088	\$53,279	4%
Village of Willingdon	\$33,115	\$40,386	22%	\$8,721	\$10,197	17%	\$41,837	\$50,584	21%
Village of Youngstown	\$12,420	\$18,494	49%	\$6,780	\$6,901	2%	\$19,200	\$25,394	32%
<b>Summer Villages</b>									
Summer Village of Argentina Beach	\$255,157	\$260,540	2%	\$3,140	\$6,647	112%	\$258,297	\$267,187	3%
Summer Village of Betula Beach	\$35,192	\$41,272	17%	\$179	\$179	0%	\$35,371	\$41,451	17%
Summer Village of Birch Cove	\$27,951	\$32,542	16%	\$190	\$190	0%	\$28,141	\$32,732	16%
Summer Village of Birchcliff	\$444,722	\$436,906	-2%	\$6,914	\$6,990	1%	\$451,636	\$443,897	-2%
Summer Village of Bondiss	\$128,998	\$136,950	6%	\$2,591	\$2,523	-3%	\$131,589	\$139,473	6%
Summer Village of Bonnyville Beach	\$61,113	\$71,650	17%	\$627	\$637	2%	\$61,740	\$72,288	17%
Summer Village of Burnstick Lake	\$49,710	\$57,141	15%	\$126	\$126	0%	\$49,836	\$57,266	15%
Summer Village of Castle Island	\$29,982	\$30,776	3%	\$49	\$49	0%	\$30,030	\$30,825	3%
Summer Village of Crystal Springs	\$231,489	\$216,052	-7%	\$1,723	\$1,578	-8%	\$233,211	\$217,630	-7%
Summer Village of Ghost Lake	\$99,064	\$126,630	28%	\$239	\$239	0%	\$99,304	\$126,869	28%
Summer Village of Golden Days	\$425,332	\$392,290	-8%	\$2,670	\$2,475	-7%	\$428,002	\$394,765	-8%
Summer Village of Grandview	\$331,114	\$273,409	-17%	\$3,726	\$3,135	-16%	\$334,841	\$276,545	-17%
Summer Village of Gull Lake	\$229,780	\$221,901	-3%	\$4,275	\$4,126	-3%	\$234,056	\$226,027	-3%
Summer Village of Half Moon Bay	\$97,608	\$100,056	3%	\$148	\$147	0%	\$97,756	\$100,203	3%
Summer Village of Horseshoe Bay	\$28,477	\$36,783	29%	\$686	\$677	-1%	\$29,164	\$37,460	28%
Summer Village of Island Lake	\$186,938	\$228,338	22%	\$2,049	\$2,090	2%	\$188,987	\$230,429	22%
Summer Village of Island Lake South	\$45,835	\$54,561	19%	\$378	\$380	1%	\$46,213	\$54,941	19%
Summer Village of taska Beach	\$135,054	\$123,016	-9%	\$469	\$466	-1%	\$135,523	\$123,482	-9%
Summer Village of Jarvis Bay	\$382,466	\$405,544	6%	\$1,207	\$1,205	0%	\$383,674	\$406,749	6%
Summer Village of Kapasiwin	\$60,413	\$63,730	5%	\$131	\$129	-1%	\$60,544	\$63,859	5%
Summer Village of Lakeview	\$22,749	\$34,023	50%	\$346	\$346	0%	\$23,095	\$34,369	49%
Summer Village of Larkspur	\$40,109	\$50,537	26%	\$201	\$208	4%	\$40,310	\$50,745	26%
Summer Village of Ma-Me-O Beach	\$290,914	\$288,400	-1%	\$10,776	\$9,396	-13%	\$301,690	\$297,795	-1%
Summer Village of Mewatha Beach	\$105,072	\$118,406	13%	\$884	\$872	-1%	\$105,956	\$119,278	13%
Summer Village of Nakamun Park	\$65,435	\$75,153	15%	\$523	\$522	0%	\$65,958	\$75,674	15%
Summer Village of Norrglenwold	\$541,256	\$530,712	-2%	\$1,800	\$1,869	4%	\$543,056	\$532,581	-2%
Summer Village of Norris Beach	\$107,855	\$105,696	-2%	\$564	\$514	-9%	\$108,420	\$106,210	-2%
Summer Village of Parkland Beach	\$176,004	\$179,618	2%	\$7,286	\$7,800	7%	\$183,290	\$187,418	2%
Summer Village of Pelican Narrows	\$133,088	\$159,725	20%	\$736	\$723	-2%	\$133,824	\$160,449	20%

Education Property Tax Comparison Report  
2013 Tax Year

Municipality	Residential/ Farmland Requisition			Non-Residential Requisition			Total Education Requisition		
	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change
Summer Village of Point Alison	\$41,123	\$51,768	26%	\$290	\$297	2%	\$41,413	\$52,065	26%
Summer Village of Poplar Bay	\$306,623	\$281,894	-8%	\$1,109	\$1,104	0%	\$307,731	\$282,998	-8%
Summer Village of Rochon Sands	\$137,353	\$144,475	5%	\$1,529	\$1,503	-2%	\$138,882	\$145,977	5%
Summer Village of Ross Haven	\$134,772	\$160,799	19%	\$1,943	\$2,952	52%	\$136,715	\$163,751	20%
Summer Village of Sandy Beach	\$115,270	\$106,912	-7%	\$2,399	\$2,304	-4%	\$117,669	\$109,216	-7%
Summer Village of Seba Beach	\$292,806	\$337,625	15%	\$14,294	\$14,413	1%	\$307,100	\$352,038	15%
Summer Village of Silver Beach	\$286,776	\$248,940	-13%	\$914	\$907	-1%	\$287,691	\$249,847	-13%
Summer Village of Silver Sands	\$152,461	\$157,866	4%	\$5,693	\$5,608	-1%	\$158,154	\$163,474	3%
Summer Village of South Baptiste	\$42,142	\$43,932	4%	\$794	\$657	-17%	\$42,936	\$44,589	4%
Summer Village of South View	\$45,547	\$56,190	23%	\$439	\$438	0%	\$45,986	\$56,629	23%
Summer Village of Sunbreaker Cove	\$342,488	\$339,430	-1%	\$562	\$561	0%	\$343,050	\$339,991	-1%
Summer Village of Sundance Beach	\$168,206	\$158,478	-6%	\$300	\$299	0%	\$168,506	\$158,777	-6%
Summer Village of Sunrise Beach	\$65,438	\$61,533	-6%	\$490	\$487	0%	\$65,928	\$62,020	-6%
Summer Village of Sunset Beach	\$67,103	\$73,496	10%	\$581	\$581	0%	\$67,684	\$74,077	9%
Summer Village of Sunset Point	\$170,060	\$161,945	-5%	\$772	\$766	-1%	\$170,832	\$162,711	-5%
Summer Village of Val Quentin	\$113,391	\$124,738	10%	\$711	\$715	1%	\$114,101	\$125,453	10%
Summer Village of Walparous	\$70,717	\$77,312	9%	\$186	\$168	-10%	\$70,903	\$77,480	9%
Summer Village of West Baptiste	\$60,514	\$66,511	10%	\$489	\$483	-1%	\$61,003	\$66,994	10%
Summer Village of West Cove	\$113,128	\$135,336	20%	\$762	\$761	0%	\$113,889	\$136,096	19%
Summer Village of Whispering Hills	\$88,226	\$100,127	13%	\$804	\$814	1%	\$89,030	\$100,942	13%
Summer Village of White Sands	\$201,933	\$248,878	23%	\$1,669	\$1,742	4%	\$203,602	\$250,620	23%
Summer Village of Yellowstone	\$77,512	\$91,985	19%	\$563	\$560	0%	\$78,074	\$92,545	19%
<b>Improvement Districts</b>									
Improvement District No. 4 (Waterton)	\$173,975	\$261,515	50%	\$121,945	\$155,066	27%	\$295,920	\$416,580	41%
Improvement District No. 9 (Barff)	\$109,967	\$164,920	50%	\$1,428,300	\$1,301,561	-9%	\$1,538,267	\$1,466,481	-5%
Improvement District No. 12 (Jasper)	\$9,452	\$14,615	55%	\$120,217	\$162,244	35%	\$129,670	\$176,858	36%
Improvement District No. 13 (Elk Island)	\$1,850	\$2,935	59%	\$15,422	\$20,828	35%	\$17,272	\$23,763	38%
Improvement District No. 24 (Wood Buffalo)	\$5,850	\$8,214	40%	\$3,778	\$4,322	14%	\$9,628	\$12,536	30%
Improvement District No. 349	\$0	\$0	n/a	\$0	\$3,065,560	n/a	\$0	\$3,065,560	n/a
Kananaskis Improvement District	\$128,853	\$186,496	45%	\$470,502	\$473,279	1%	\$599,355	\$659,775	10%
<b>Special Areas</b>									
Townsite of Redwood Meadows	\$418,545	\$398,924	-5%	\$0	\$0	n/a	\$418,545	\$398,924	-5%
Special Areas	\$1,144,521	\$1,352,903	18%	\$11,399,632	\$11,288,554	-1%	\$12,544,153	\$12,641,457	1%



## Agenda Item

<b>Project: Community Insurance</b>	
<b>Presentation Date: March 26, 2013</b>	
<b>Department: Community and Protective Services</b>	<b>Author: Tyler McKinnon</b>
<b>Budget Implication:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Funded by Dept. <input type="checkbox"/> Reallocation	
<b>Strategic Area:</b>	<b>Goal:</b>
<b>Legislative Direction:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Provincial Legislation (cite) _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County Bylaw or Policy (cite)	
<b>Recommendations:</b>  1) That Council approve the addition of the Caroline and District Senior Citizens Drop in Centre to the “Community Hall and Community Group Insurance” policy as a group eligible for liability insurance on a cost recovery basis.  2) That Council provide staff with direction around desired changes to the policy.	
<b>Attachments List:</b> “Draft Community Hall/Association Insurance Policy”	

### Background:

Council’s “Community Hall and Community Group Insurance” policy outlines insurance coverage that Clearwater County will provide for community halls and select not-for-profit community groups. According to the policy, the County provides liability insurance for all community halls located in Clearwater County. At the request of individual halls, building and contents insurance can be provided on a cost recovery basis. The policy also notes other community groups that can receive liability insurance, some paid by the County and some provided on a cost recovery basis.

The Caroline and District Senior Citizens Drop in Centre Association has requested that they be included under this policy. Liability insurance for this group would be provided on a cost recovery basis, so inclusion of the group does not result in any budgetary impact for the County. As with the addition of any group to Clearwater County’s liability insurance policy, there is



always the potential that the group will have a claim under the policy, which could lead to increased insurance rates overall. A similar group, the Leslieville Leisure Club, is currently included under Clearwater's policy so staff recommend that Council approve the addition of the Caroline and District Senior Citizens Drop in Centre Association to the policy. A draft copy of Council's policy, which includes the Caroline and District Senior Citizens Drop in Centre Association has been included for your review.

Currently, Council reviews each individual group request on a case by case basis. Staff are seeking Council's direction around whether or not they would like the policy to be amended to include the criteria around which groups may be added so that future requests could be dealt with administratively. Should Council wish to do so, staff recommend that the following inclusion criteria be considered. These criteria are largely based off of Council's existing policy practice:

**All groups currently included under the existing policy would continue to be eligible for the insurance coverage they currently receive.**

**Liability insurance provided at no cost to the following groups**

- All community halls in Clearwater County
- All cemeteries in Clearwater County
- Any campground or recreation area that Clearwater County holds the recreation lease for
- Registered historical societies that operate within Clearwater County
- Registered societies or non-profit groups that provide a direct service on behalf of Clearwater County (such as the David Thompson Recreation Board)

**Building and Contents Insurance provided on a cost recovery basis to the following groups**

- Any community hall/association in Clearwater County (upon their request)

**Liability insurance provided on a cost recovery basis to the following groups**

- Registered non-profit societies that host specific community events, that are held within Clearwater County (such as Leslieville Antique Days)
- Registered Senior Citizen Service groups

Does Council wish to see the policy amended so that future requests may be dealt with administratively? Barring that, does Council wish to outline the specific criteria that they wish to use when determining which groups may or may not be included in the future? With Council's direction on this matter, staff can bring forward an amended policy to reflect any desired changes.

# Clearwater County

## COMMUNITY HALL AND COMMUNITY GROUP INSURANCE

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 2010

**SECTION:** Administration

### **POLICY STATEMENT:**

This policy is intended to outline the cost of insurance coverage that the Municipality may provide to Community Halls and select not-for-profit Community Groups.

### **PROCEDURE:**

The Municipality will provide insurance coverage as follows.

#### Community Halls:

Liability insurance will be provided to all community halls within the boundaries of Clearwater County with the same coverage as the County currently has. The County will pay for the cost of this insurance.

Building and contents insurance covering: fire, theft and damage, are eligible to Community Halls within Clearwater County at their cost. This Insurance is for the community hall and contents only. Those Community Halls are:

- Alhambra Community Center
- Arbutus Community Hall
- Aurora Community Hall
- Bingley Community Center
- Buster Creek/Crimson Community Assoc.
- Butte Community Hall Association
- Centreview Community Club
- Condor Community Hall Association
- Crammond Community Hall Association
- Dovercourt Community Hall Association
- Everdell Community Hall Association
- Evergreen Community Hall Association
- Faraway Community Club
- Ferrier Community Club
- Frisco Community Club
- Gimlet Community Hall Association
- Gwendale Community Hall Association
- Hardindell Community Association
- Hazeldell Community Hall Association
- Hespero Community Association
- Leslieville Community Hall Society
- Nordegg Community Association

- Oras Community Club
- Prairie Creek Community Hall Association
- Ricinus-Wooler Community Association
- Shilo Community Club
- Taimi Community Club
- Withrow Community Association

No other property, building, vehicle or equipment will be provided Insurance, unless approved by Council, upon written request.

Other Community Groups:

Liability Insurance may be provided to the following community groups within the boundaries of the County in support of the service that these groups provide directly for Clearwater County. These facilities and groups are

- Cow Lake Campground (Hardinell Community Center)
- Burnstick Lake Campground (Caroline Chamber of Commerce)
- Open Creek Campground (Rimbey Fish & Game)
- David Thompson Recreation Board
- Nordegg Volunteer Ambulance Services
- Rocky Mountain House Search and Rescue Society
- Chedderville All Hallows Church and Cemetery Society
- Community Historical Society of Caroline
- Nordegg Historical Society
- **Caroline and District Senior Citizens Drop-in Centre Association**

The County will pay for the cost of this insurance.

Upon written request, liability insurance may be provided to other community groups within Clearwater County subject to Council approval. Such insurance will be provided on a cost recovery basis. Community groups eligible for insurance coverage through the County are:

- Central Alberta Antique and Model Club
- Grey Wooded Forage Association
- Rocky Mountain House Agricultural Society
- Rocky Stampede Association
- Leslieville Leisure Club

The cost of this insurance will be provided on a cost recovery basis.

Vehicle and equipment Insurance may be provided to a community group, providing that the vehicle or equipment is used primarily to provide a service to Clearwater County.

Special Events Insurance:

Upon the Community Group's request, special events insurance may, subject to the availability of such insurance through the County's Insurer, be provided to the Rocky Stampede Association, David Thompson Days Country Fair Society, Ricinus Wooler Rodeo and related additional named insurance, for these annual events. The cost of this insurance shall be the responsibility of the Community Group.

No other groups will be eligible for Special Events Insurance unless approved by Council.



## Agenda Item

<b>Project: Town Rectangular Field Upgrades</b>	
<b>Presentation Date: March 26<sup>th</sup>, 2013</b>	
<b>Department: Community and Protective Services</b>	<b>Author: Mike Haugen</b>
<b>Budget Implication:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Funded by Dept. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reallocation	
<b>Strategic Area: Quality of Life</b>	<b>Goal:</b>
<b>Legislative Direction:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Provincial Legislation (cite) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> County Bylaw or Policy (cite) _____	
<b>Recommendation: The Council reallocate \$273,381.00 from Contingency to Recreation for rectangular field upgrades in the Town of Rocky Mountain House.</b>	
<b>Attachments List: Aerial Photo/ Concept Plan</b>	

### Background:

At the Regular Council Meeting of October 9<sup>th</sup>, 2012 Council committed funding in the amount of \$84,150.00 (50%) for the upgrade of Curtis Field. As discussed at the time, the proposed upgrades were part of a larger plan that would see the current practice field, located immediately north of Curtis Field, upgraded as well. The larger plan was developed as a result of the Town's Needs Assessment which indicated a large shortage of rectangular fields used for sports such as football, soccer and rugby.

The total cost of upgrading the two fields is estimated to be \$715,063.00. As the Town and County share this cost on an equal basis the County's share would be \$357,531.50. Given that Council has already committed \$84,150.00 to the project, an additional \$273,381.50 is being requested.

The Town has applied for a Community Infrastructure Improvement Fund (CIIF) grant for this project and it does not appear that this grant will be successful. Given the timelines of completing the project so that the fields are useable by the fall, and to maximize costs savings by upgrading both fields at the same time, Town Council has



opted to put more money into the project and move forward at this time. Having the funding in place would allow for the tendering process to occur.

Attached is a modified aerial photo depicting the scope and some details of the project. Staff would note that in order to preserve the fields, they would be fenced to prevent pedestrian traffic across them. The Town would also take over the management and maintenance of the fields, which would include the ability to close them when weather conditions dictated.

Should Council opt to fund 50% of the project costs, the \$273,381.50 could be taken from Contingency.



# ROCKY MOUNTAIN HOUSE - SPORT FIELD REDEVELOPMENT

OPEN SPACE / CONNECTIVITY PLAN

*File*

# Clearwater County

## Councilor and Board Member Remuneration Statement

For the Year of ~~2012~~ 2013

Name of Councilor / Board Member Shik Wymenga

Payment Periods

January                      February                      May                      June  
 March                          April                                  July                      August  
 September                  October                          November              December

Supervision Rate – \$550.00 Monthly  
 Reeve Supervision Rate - \$850.00 Monthly

Date	Type of Meeting Attended	First 4 Hours \$145.00	Next 4 Hours \$116.00	Next 4 Hours \$116.00	Regular Council Meeting \$263.00	Lunch \$16.00	Mileage @ \$0.53 / km
8	AAMDC Zone <sup>working</sup>	✓	✓				105
12	Council				✓		53
13	FCSS	✓					54
15	Reeves Economic Summit	✓					53
21	Community futures	✓	✓				160
22	ASB	✓					53
26	Council				✓		53
28	Reeves Economic Summit	✓					53

{more Space on Back of Page}

### Remuneration Calculation

6	Meetings @ \$149.00=	894.00 ✓	534	Kms @ \$0.53 =	288.36 ✓
2	Meetings @ \$116.00=	232.00 ✓		Lunch @ \$16.00=	/
2	Meetings @ \$271.00=	542.00 ✓			
	Supervision=	550.00 ✓			
	<b>TOTAL=</b>	<b>2224.00</b>		<b>TOTAL=</b>	<b>288.36</b>

Signature {Councilor / Board Member} Shik Wymenga

# Clearwater County

## Councilor and Board Member Remuneration Statement

For the Year of ...2013.....

Name of Councilor / Board Member ..... Bob Bryant .....

Payment Periods

**January**                      **February**                      **May**                      **June**  
**March**                      **April**                      **July**                      **August**  
**September**                      **October**                      **November**                      **December**

Supervision Rate – \$550.00 Monthly  
 Reeve Supervision Rate - \$850.00 Monthly

Date	Type of Meeting Attended	First 4 Hours \$149.00	Next 4 Hours \$119.00	Next 4 Hours \$119.00	Regular Council Meeting \$271.00	Lunch \$16.00	Mileage @ \$0.54 / km
Feb 4/13	Nordlegg Recreation Trail Plan	✓					4km
Feb 5/13	RDRWA Exec.	✓					172km
Feb 6/13	MPC	✓					4km
Feb 8/13	CAAMDC Zone Caroline	✓	✓				80km
Feb 12/13	Regular Council				✓		4km
Feb 21/13	Brownlee LLP Law Seminar	✓	✓				438km
Feb 23/13	Festival of Culture Booth Rocky Council	✓					4km
Feb 26/13	Regular Council				✓		4km
* Feb 27/13	Rocky Senior Housing						
Feb 27/13	Rocky Library Board -						4km
Feb 28/13	Parkland Regional Lib	✓					200km

{more Space on Back of Page}

### Remuneration Calculation

1 Rocky Senior - @ 69	69.00 ✓			
7 Meetings @ \$149.00=	1043.00 ✓	914		Kms @ \$0.54= 493.56 ✓
2 Meetings @ \$119.00=	238.00 ✓			Lunch @ \$16.00=
2 Meetings @ \$271.00=	542.00 ✓			
Supervision=	550.00 ✓			
<b>TOTAL=</b>	<b>2442.00</b>			<b>TOTAL= 493.56</b>

Signature {Councilor / Board Member} ..... R. J. Bryant .....

# Clearwater County Councilor and Board Member Remuneration Statement

For the Year of **2013**

Name of Councilor / Board Member EARL GRAHAM

Payment Periods

January	<b>February</b>	May	June
March	April	July	August
September	October	November	December

**Supervision Rate – \$550.00 Monthly  
Reeve Supervision Rate - \$850.00 Monthly**

Date	Type of Meeting Attended	First 4 Hours \$149.00	Next 4 Hours \$119.00	Next 4 Hours \$119.00	Regular Council Meeting \$271.00	Lunch \$16.00	Mileage @ \$0.54 / km
Feb 1/13	SPOG	✓				✓	92
Feb 4/13	REEVES Summit	✓					92
Feb 16/13	MPC	✓					92
Feb 21/13	SPIRT	✓					90
Feb 25/13	CAAM D+C	✓	✓				92
Feb 14/13	CGI	✓	✓				82
Feb 15/13	REEVES Summit	✓					90
Feb 12/13	Council				✓		92
Feb 26/13	Council				✓		82
* Feb 27/13	WESTVIEW						
Feb 28/13	REEVES Summit	✓	✓				92
Feb 25/13	SPOG	✓					92

1 Rock SR mtg = 69.00 ✓	1 Lunch @ 16.00 = 16.00 ✓
9 Meetings @ 149.00 = 1341.00 ✓	
3 meetings @ 119.00 = 357.00 ✓	
2 meetings @ 271.00 = 542.00 ✓	
1 Supervision = 550.00 ✓	
2859.00	Mileage 1006 Km @ 0.54 = 543.24 ✓
	559.24