

**CLEARWATER COUNTY
COUNCIL AGENDA
October 08, 2013
9:00 A.M.
Council Chambers
4340 – 47 Avenue, Rocky Mountain House AB**

10:00 A.M. Delegation: Lee Chambers – Rocky Arena Upgrades

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. AGENDA ADOPTION

C. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

1. September 24, 2013 Regular Meeting Minutes
2. September 24, 2013 Public Hearing Minutes

D. PUBLIC WORKS

1. 2014 Local Roads: Tender Award – Sideslope Improvement & Other Work (*Item to follow*)
2. Metaldog Industrial Park (*Item to follow*)
3. Policy Review: Final DRAFT “Snowplowing and Grading of Gravel Roadways”

E. MUNICIPAL

1. MGA Review Questionnaire
2. 2013/14 Committee Appointments
3. CFIB Report

F. COMMUNITY AND PROTECTIVE SERVICES

1. **10:00 A.M. Delegation:** Lee Chambers – Rocky Arena Upgrades
2. “Rock & Roll on Main Street” Funding Request

G. IN CAMERA

1. Nordegg Development

H. COMMITTEE REPORTS

I. INFORMATION

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

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

09/10/13

Repair of Bridge BF01963

- Reallocation of funds from bridge rehabilitation for the James River Bridge repair

STATUS: Pending Information, Alberta Transportation/Public Works



Agenda Item

Project: Asphalt Overlay 2014 Tender Award	
Presentation Date: October 8, 2013	
Department: Public Works	Author: Erik Hansen/ Marshall Morton
Budget Implication: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funded by Dept. <input type="checkbox"/> Reallocation	
Strategic Area: Infrastructure	Goal: Protection of the investment of the current surfaced infrastructure and existing bridge inventory is a high priority with a view to developing existing surfaced roads to a ban free standard.
Legislative Direction: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None Provincial Legislation (cite) <input type="checkbox"/> County Bylaw or Policy (cite) _____	
Recommendation: That Council reviews this information and approves awarding the 2014 Asphalt Overlay Tender to Lahrmann Construction Inc.	
<p>Background: The Administration has tendered the proposed 2014 Asphalt Overlay program. This program includes re-surfacing, side slope improvement and other work for seven major projects. They include Arbutus Road From: Hwy 11 To: South of Hwy 11- 16.9Km, Old Dovercourt Road From: Hwy 11 To: South of Hwy 11- 1.4Km, Chicken Ranch Road From: Hwy 11 To: North of Hwy 11- 1.3Km, Cougar Ridge Subdivision- Twp. Rd 38-5 and Internal Roads -2.2Km, Prairie Creek Road From: Km 9.1 to Km 10.1- 1Km, Range Road 7-2: From Twp. Rd 40-0 To: North of Twp. Rd 40-0- 1.4Km, Prairie Creek Road and Range Road 7-4A Intersection Improvement – 0.8Km</p> <p>A Tender Opening was held on October 3, 2013 at 2:00 p.m. for the work outlined above. We received 7 bids, with Lahrmann Construction Inc. being the low valid bidder. The cost for this project came in \$416,712.87 under the engineers estimated amount of \$5,794,408.00.</p>	



The following is a summary of the bid prices received:

Lahrmann Construction Inc.	\$4,706,942.60
Border Paving Ltd.	\$4,709,461.00
South Rock Ltd.	\$4,866,520.00
E. Construction Ltd.	\$5,339,606.76
Ledcor Alberta Ltd.	\$5,366,306.93
Knelson Sand and Gravel	\$5,717,037.50
Central City Asphalt Ltd.	\$5,891,646.00

Lahrmann Construction Inc.	<u>Tender Pricing.</u>	<u>Estimated Amount</u>
Construction (less Site occ.)	\$4,549,442.60	\$5,026,000.00
5 % Contingency	\$ 227,472.13	\$ 251,300.00
Potential Site Occ. Bonus	\$ 21,000.00	\$ 21,000.00
Potential EPS Bonus	\$ 114,434.40	\$ 114,434.00
Engineering	\$ 465,346.00	\$ 381,674.00
Total	\$5,377,695.13	\$5,794,408.00



Agenda Item

Project: Range Road 7-2 Upgrades	
Presentation Date: October 8, 2013	
Department: Public Works	Author: Erik Hansen
Budget Implication: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Funded by Dept. <input type="checkbox"/> Reallocation	
Strategic Area: Infrastructure & Asset Management	Goal: Protection of the investment of the current surfaced infrastructure and existing bridge inventory is a high priority with a view to developing existing surfaced roads to a ban free standard.
Legislative Direction: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Provincial Legislation (cite) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> County Policy _____	
Recommendation: That Council review the information presented and approve allowing the developer to include this project on our 2014 asphalt overlay project.	

Background: Clearwater County has approved the development of 13 light industrial lots, known as the Metaldog Industrial Park, located 1.4 Km North of Township Road 40-0 on Range Road 7-2. One of the conditions of this development was to upgrade RR 7-2 to a ban free structure to accommodate the anticipated traffic on this roadway. All costs associated with bring this road to a ban free standard shall be at the developers' expense. The estimated cost for the required upgrades was approximately \$180,000.00.

Clearwater County has since received a request from the developer to include the required road upgrades with the County's 2014 Asphalt Overlay Program.

As there is currently no Policy to deal with this type of a request and the fact that our tender was going out at the middle of September, the administration added this project as a separate schedule to our tender.



The developer was required to enter into an agreement with Clearwater County that was contingent on Council's award of the tender. The developer was also required to provide an irrevocable letter of credit to the County for 150% of the estimated cost to undertake this work.

Staff will bring a Policy back to Council to deal with requests of this nature in the next few weeks.



Agenda Item

Project: Snowplowing and Grading of Gravel Roads Policy Final DRAFT	
Presentation Date: October 8th, 2013	
Department: Public Works	Author: Kurt Magnus/Marshall Morton
Budget Implication: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Funded by Dept. <input type="checkbox"/> Reallocation	
Strategic Area: Infrastructure & Asset Management	Goal: 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.
Legislative Direction: <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Provincial Legislation (cite) _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County Bylaw or Policy (cite) <u>Snowplowing and Grading of Gravel Roads Policy</u>	
Recommendation: That Council reviews the final draft of the policy and accepts it as presented.	
Attachments List: Snowplowing and Grading of Gravel Roads Policy	

Background:

As per the direction provided during the September 24th, 2013 Council meeting, staff is bringing forth the final draft of the Snowplowing and Grading of Gravel Roads Policy for review. If approved, this policy will be added to our current policy list.

Clearwater County

SNOWPLOWING AND GRADING OF GRAVEL ROADS

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 2013

SECTION: Public Works

POLICY STATEMENT:

Provide direction on the level of service regarding snowplowing/grading of gravel roadways.

PROCEDURE:

Winter Maintenance (Snowplowing)

1. Public Works requires 96 hours after a snow storm or series of storms to open up the roadways. An additional pass may be required to clean up after the initial event. Time frames will vary depending on the severity and duration of the storm.
2. Snow Plowing of gravel roadways will only occur when conditions warrant (i.e.: generally more than 10 cm of snow).
3. Snowplowing will be undertaken in a manner that minimizes backtracking or excessive travel.
4. Snowplowing on private property is not permitted.
5. Cemeteries, community halls and churches will receive snow removal upon application and only after the roadways have been opened.
6. Clearwater County is not responsible for the clearing of private or communal mailboxes. This responsibility lies with individual property owners and/or Canada Post respectively.
7. Although it is realized that a certain amount of snow will roll off of the edge of the grader wing, grader operators will strive to minimize the amount of snow that is left in approaches.

Summer Maintenance (Grading)

1. Roads will be graded in a fashion as to maximize efficiency. Graders will not be relocated from one area of their beat to respond to a concern in another area, unless it is deemed by the Gravel Road Supervisor as a significant hazard.
2. All roads will be graded on an as required basis, for example, high traffic volume roads may be graded more often while some lower traffic roads may be graded less often.
3. The Gravel Road Supervisor will respond to all public inquiries in a timely manner.
4. Grading on private property is not permitted.



Agenda Item

Project: MGA Review Questionnaire	
Presentation Date: October 8, 2013	
Department: CAO	Author: Ron Leaf
Budget Implication: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Funded by Dept. <input type="checkbox"/> Reallocation	
Strategic Area: Governance/ Intergovernmental relations	Goal:
Legislative Direction: <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Provincial Legislation (cite) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> County Bylaw or Policy (cite) _____	
Recommendation: MGA Review Questionnaire	
Attachments List: 1) Response from Planning & Development – Keith McCrae 2) AAMDC – “What We Heard” – preliminary report	

Background:

As Council is aware, AB Municipal Affairs is currently reviewing the Municipal Government Act (MGA) and is requesting input and feedback from current municipal councillors. The department has indicated that they wish individual feedback, not a combined response, with respect to the following four areas:

- governance and administration;
- planning and development;
- assessment and taxation; and
- other general provisions of the Act.

Copies of these questionnaires have been e-mailed to councillors. Attached is an AAMDC summary of the comments received at their recent workshops. I also provide the following perspectives on some of the key points:

1. Governance and Administration Working Well

- Natural person powers are a major benefit and allow Council to adopt unique and creative solutions relevant to local need(s).

Not working well

- Limited revenue generation opportunities. Removal of education from property tax needs to again be discussed.

- MGA needs to support municipalities as a government. Too often municipalities are held to industrial standards (e.g. gravel pits) than what Provincial Departments are.
- Implications of “chartered municipalities” needs clarification
- Council submitted resolution calling for recognition as an “order of government”

2. Planning and Development

- Keith’s report – as per attached

3. Assessment & Taxation

Working Well

- Market valuation for residential and commercial properties should be maintained
- Farmland assessed with regulated rate based no productivity not market should be maintained

Not Working Well

- Suggest broaden range of assessment classes (e.g. intensive livestock operations, trappers cabins).
- Provision for split mill rates within non-residential assessment (Clearwater County submitted resolution to this effect)
- Improve collection provisions in the MGA regarding collection on linear properties

4. General Provisions of the Act

- Provisions and procedures related to dissolution should be addressed particularly with respect to how infrastructure deficit is to be addressed by receiving municipality



Response from Planning and Development to the MGA Review Questionnaire	
Presentation Date: October 8, 2013	
Department: Planning	Author: Keith McCrae

What is working well?

Generally, the MGA is working well for Clearwater County. It continues to provide the authority and opportunity to locally establish statutory plans, a land use bylaw, and other regulations necessary to control the orderly development of land within our boundaries without infringing on the rights of individual landowners, except to the extent necessary for the greater public interest.

What is not working well?

The subdivision appeal process is very frustrating when it involves the Municipal Government Board (MGB). Decisions are often being made by the MGB on applications where the government interest as set out in the Subdivision and Development

Regulation is not directly affecting the proposed parcel(s) being applied for. If the Government departments involved choose not to supply referral comments on a subdivision application then how are we expected to obtain a waiver from them allowing for the local SDAB to hear the appeal? This is resulting in too many applications where the MGB is making decisions that really should be made on a local level.

Municipalities may find advantages if aggregate extraction was placed under the provincial jurisdiction, similar to that of confined feeding operations.

The off-site levy provisions of the MGA need to be updated to reflect current circumstances.

Thinking to the future, what types of transformative changes are required in the MGA?

Aggregate resource extraction is becoming a hot button issue to the point that public pressure at times is making it very difficult for operators to receive development approval. Provincial jurisdiction over this non-renewable resource would provide a level playing field throughout the province.



Partners in Advocacy & Business

Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties

MGA Review Consultation Workshops Preliminary Draft 'What We Heard'

September 5, 2013

The following is a draft summary of feedback received from the AAMDC's consultation workshops held in Grimshaw, Hay Lakes and Coaldale during August 2013. Additional feedback will be sourced through future workshops scheduled for St. Paul and Balzac in late September.

Municipal Autonomy & Structures (Discussion Area 1)

AUTONOMY

- **Do municipalities have the necessary powers to provide good government, services and develop/maintain safe and viable communities?**
 - The MGA is only in need of certain refinements and clearer guidelines
 - Need to retain its enabling features to meet local priorities autonomously; however some oversight is beneficial
 - Powers are generally sufficient within the MGA but are impeded by other pieces of legislation, levels of government (ex. ESRD, TRANS, NRCB, DFO, RCMP), industry (ex. rail, telecommunications, utilities), or downloading without matching authority/revenues
 - Limits on powers are usually related to local decision-making with regard to growth and development
 - Lack of understanding about how to apply and leverage municipal powers
 - Powers mean responsibility so there should be mandatory training for new councillors
 - Limited revenue generating tools—suggestions for split-mill rates for non-residential, the ability to provide tax incentives and a share of provincial royalties and/or income tax

- **What is the desired outcome of becoming an order of government? What are potential unintended consequences?**
 - Rooted in recognition and fair treatment as the service provider closest to the people serving their best interests not a bottom line like business
 - Government and business should leverage the knowledge and experience of local government in stakeholder engagement and decision making
 - More obligation on other levels of government, ministries and quasi-governmental organizations to consult and collaborate with municipalities to prevent unintended consequences
 - Increased and more prominent support by other orders of government on the importance of rural; the value of rural Alberta should be promoted not minimized
 - Could increase expectation from citizens to provide more or better services regardless of whose responsibility it is; this is already happening
 - Could mitigate downloading or conversely, increase it
 - Could create greater disparity among municipalities
 - Could impact grants
 - Could further perpetuate the “population” argument

MUNICIPAL STRUCTURES

- **Should all municipalities have the same set of powers or should it be dependent on size, capacity or some other factors (i.e. title to roads, service standards, charters)?**
 - Inconsistent views on whether municipalities already have the same powers so therefore, inconsistent views on whether powers should vary according to some factor
 - It is a difficult but necessary balance to find between recognizing that one size doesn't fit all and yet maintaining some consistency
 - A variety of tools are already available and municipalities can choose what they utilize
 - Undue deference/influence given to population; there must be a balance between supporting

- the people (that vote) and the land (that doesn't)
- Taking on more than you can handle or afford doesn't mean you need more tools
 - Taking on more creates a competition between neighbouring muni's
 - Accountability to taxpayers must stay paramount—tax responsibility and live within your municipal means rather than create special powers.
 - There should be no infringement on autonomy—anything forced does work
 - Caution offered against equating more powers with viability and sustainability
 - Added bureaucracy impacts capacity and viability
 - Rural municipalities should have title to their roads
- **Should sustainability planning be a legislated practice of municipalities to substantiate long-term viability?**
 - Good planning is key if it is meaningful—this includes strategic plans, long-term budgets, asset management and sustainability plans
 - Some do it, some don't—it increases accountability to the taxpayer
 - Inconsistent feedback on being mandated to do plans
 - First, find out if you are viable and then figure out how to sustain yourself if you are
 - Asset management is a good idea but the province should show leadership
 - The best laid plans can be impacted by the availability of grants and related criteria or the requirements of other ministries (i.e. superseding municipal MDPs, IDPs, etc.)
 - Grants to encourage collaboration are good if they support your local priorities but can be a negative if you have to sacrifice your local priorities to get it (ex. areas with geographic dispersion)
 - The province must support municipalities by discontinuing its practice of supporting wants through grants; this impacts autonomy
 - General support for accepting dissolved or amalgamated municipalities if the Government of Alberta takes responsibility for the existing monetary or infrastructure deficit
 - Should be an easier process for amalgamations
 - Residents fear the loss of community but don't acknowledge the cost of services or how they could benefit from different governance
 - Education is needed to inform an apathetic public of the impacts of their wants
 - Lack of viability may be a reflection of political will and decision making—not saying “no”; prioritizing wants over needs
 - **How should the number of councillors and electoral ward boundaries be determined?**
 - One size does not fit all; many variables to consider when determining wards—population, land mass, natural boundaries, etc.
 - Periodic review is needed; should be encouraged with guidelines but not mandated
 - Quality governance is key—support for mandatory training
 - Support for having the choice of mayor/reeve elected from within council versus at large
 - Inconsistent feedback on the merits of even versus odd-numbered councils

Sound Planning and Services (Discussion Area 2)

LAND-USE PLANNING

- **Do statutory plans and land use bylaws allow for effective municipal land use planning? Why or why not?**
 - Overall general support that they are sufficient
 - The number of different plans creates more confusion
 - Need for more accountability on behalf of applicant to follow through with what was presented in a development permit
 - Need for opportunity to use digital tools for public notification re: public hearings
 - Need for provincial support on writing strong bylaws, plans and policies

- **What weaknesses exist in the current land use planning process?**
 - The purpose of municipal reserves and environmental reserves needs to be clarified in the legislation
 - Aggregate extraction should be under the province
 - Inter-municipal development plans can be beneficial but growth and revenue can influence them and they are not always respected
 - Regional planning seems to result in a fear of imposition vs. collaboration
 - Municipalities should have more involvement in NRCB approval/proposals as it impacts local region
 - There is a gap in regulatory enforcement of confined feeding operations
 - Lack of notification on crown land planning decisions
 - Councillors need to be educated in order to ensure proper decision-making is in place
 - Process for informing the public is inadequate which results in misinformation
 - Formal provincial policy on development in floodways would strengthen planning

- **Are municipalities being enabled to contribute to holistic planning through ALSA or unduly restricted through the process?**
 - The majority of members have not yet been affected by the ALSA and therefore, do not yet hold a position
 - The MGA is good; however, the LUF creates some unknowns

ANNEXATION

- **Is the annexation process in Alberta effective? What should stay the same? What should change?**
 - Major cost for rural municipalities to deal with annexation requests
 - Costs should be assumed by the annexing body
 - Urban municipalities should be growing upwards, not out
 - Need to focus on protecting prime agricultural lands instead of allowing the urban development through annexation
 - Creation of agricultural land reserves would limit urban sprawl and protect valuable farm land
 - Annexation should be dealt with using two tiers – large metro vs. small urban
 - Should be mandatory engagement with the affected municipality before an annexation

- application is submitted
 - An inter-municipal development plan should be a mandatory part of an annexation
 - Trend towards annexations just to gain access to industrial tax revenues; can negatively impact the annexed municipality's sustainability
- **Should there be a limit to the number of years of projected growth outlined in an annexation request?**
 - No consistent response
 - Overall support that the application should include a sound long-term business plan that proves the need for additional lands within the set timeframe

DISSOLUTION

- **Is the dissolution process in Alberta effective? What should change?**
 - The receiving municipality can inherit an unknown debt that is not reported in the financial statements – deficit in infrastructure and immediate costs to repair
 - The dissolution process is very lengthy and places strain on current municipal services
 - Challenge of securing expertise in smaller municipalities which is contributing to poor financial planning leading to viability issues
 - It would be beneficial to have an abbreviated process for dissolution of municipalities that jointly agree
 - The province should provide funding support to receiving municipality upon dissolution
 - The province should pay for an infrastructure study prior to dissolution of a municipality
 - The dissolution process should have more focus on understanding of the costs being inherited and how those costs will be addressed

SERVICES

- **Is there a benefit of having a defined legislated list of core municipal services?**
 - No, rural and urban services vary substantially – the current MGA offers flexibility to provide the services which are most needed at the local level
 - There is a trend towards urbans increasingly offering more types of services (i.e. skate parks, splash parks) and are requesting financial support from rurals
 - Transportation services in rural areas needs to be reviewed
 - The MGA should allow digital engagement/communication with the public
 - Growing trend in expectation of urban-type services to be delivered in rural areas
- **Should cost sharing of services continue on a voluntary basis or be required by legislation?**
 - Majority of members support the current voluntary approach
 - Need for more coordination with urbans to determine what services should be offered regionally to promote cost-effectiveness
- **Should municipalities be required to develop long-term asset management plans?**
 - Support for asset management plans but that they shouldn't be mandatory within legislation

Revenue Streams (Discussion Area 3)

LINEAR TAX

- **How can rural municipalities justify the need to maintain the existing policy on the distribution of linear property taxes?**
 - Rural municipalities are already sharing that revenue through existing cost/revenue sharing agreements. These would likely become void if linear assessment was shared.
 - The proposed per capita formula would support just a few municipalities as majority of tax revenue would be shifted to the cities
 - Cities currently under tax for services provided – it is a bargain to live in the city
 - Some members suggested that urban municipalities should be careful about asking to share linear property assessment as that opens up the discussion about whether all commercial/industrial/linear (non-residential) property assessment should be pooled and distributed throughout the region
 - Linear assessment is not permanent as businesses will move and/or close but the infrastructure and expense will remain
 - There is a growing social infrastructure costs in hamlets which rurals are responsible for
 - If linear was redistributed, the MSI formula would need to be redesigned since part of the formula is based on assessment values
 - There would be an impact on industry since urban mill rates are often higher

SPLIT MILL RATES

- **If the new MGA creates additional non-residential property assessment classes, should the rates be linked to avoid a significant increase/decrease to one particular assessment class? Why or why not?**
 - Don't link rates – provide discretion to council
 - There is potential for councils to unfairly abuse specific assessment classes
 - Councils will have to accept the consequences of loss of business if they unfairly target one particular assessment class
 - A link is needed in order to get support from industry to implement this change
 - Challenge in defining the difference between industrial and commercial properties
 - A split mill rate is also needed for intensive vs. extensive farming properties
 - There are potential national implications by targeting the energy industry through different taxation structures
 - Non-residential assessment classes should be classified as rural, urban, and hamlet

INTENSIVE FARMING

- **Should intensive farming operations (i.e. feedlots, confined feeding operations) be assessed differently than the more traditional type of farming operation?**
 - There needs to be clear definition between traditional farming and intensive farming (i.e. animal head count, income levels, or traffic volume)
 - Maintain the existing policy – use road use agreements to target high impact properties
 - Intensive farming operations are 'businesses' and should be taxed similar to any other business
 - Need a better mechanism to apply tools such as road use agreements so that it directly

- targets the properties causing impacts
- Different tax structure is needed as road use agreements won't work when multiple confined feeding operations share the same road
- If the farm is regulated by the NRCB, then it should be taxed differently than farming
- Municipalities should have the ability to tax farming storage properties differently due to the road impacts linked to accessing the storage property
- Needs to be more tax equity between the taxation of farming and energy-based properties
- There is a need to differentiate Hutterite colonies and other similar operations from traditional farms

ASSESSMENT OF LAND, BUILDINGS AND RESIDENCES ON FARMS

- **Is the current productivity rating system still the optimal approach for assessing farm land? If so, are any updates needed?**
 - Overall support that the productivity rating system is the best approach
 - Some support for a market value approach
 - Mixed positions on whether the rates should be updated
 - Needs to be more transparent
 - Land that is used for recreational purposes instead of farming should be assessed at market value

- **Should farm buildings continue to receive 100% exemption from assessment in rural areas? Should farm buildings continue to receive 50% exemption in urban areas? Why or why not?**
 - The current approach is still valid
 - A move to assessing agricultural buildings would put an incredible burden on an assessment industry that is already limited in staffing availability
 - It is becoming more and more unaffordable (capital intensive) for an independent person/family to enter the farming industry and as such all supports are still needed
 - Taxation of agricultural buildings would indirectly affect food costs
 - Montana is prime example of how taxation of farming can negatively affect the health of your farming industry
 - Agricultural buildings should be assessed based on use – have a threshold to help small farmer but tax large-use farm buildings
 - A move to assessing farm buildings would result in the demolition of many historical farm buildings

- **Should farm residences continue to receive the \$61,540 exemption from assessment? Why or why not?**
 - The exemption is no longer needed – all residences, farm, rural or urban, should be assessed at 100% market value
 - The current amount for the exemption needs to be updated and should change annually according to market value changes
 - Farming requires continued support in order to keep people in rural areas and keep Alberta's population spread geographically
 - The MGA should include principle statements that explains the intent of an exemption
 - Exemption on home should not apply to Hutterite colonies or confined feeding operations

- Should a homeowner still receive the exemption if they rent out the land for others to farm?
- The tax advantage is not transparent as it is applied to assessment

SUPPLEMENTARY AND PROGRESSIVE ASSESSMENT

- **Should municipalities be able to use supplementary assessments on linear properties?**
 - Unlikely to happen as the province is responsible for linear assessments – they would need additional staffing to support the efforts while revenue goes directly to municipalities

- **Should municipalities be able to use progressive assessments on linear and M&E property?**
 - Progressive assessments should be implemented for linear and M&E
 - The current assessment approach is sufficient
 - Industry reports on the 'date of completion' should be audited more regularly
 - MGA needs more clarification to avoid appeals of the completion date of linear property
 - The practice of not taxing these properties until operational offers an economic advantage to investing in Alberta

OTHER EXEMPTIONS

- **Are there particular assessment exemptions that should no longer be provided? Should certain properties be provided new/additional exemptions?**
 - Museums should be added to the list of properties that receive exemptions
 - Exemptions for these charitable organizations and provincial support buildings are still necessary as they contribute to the overall good of the community
 - There should be no exemption on any property – all properties should be taxed and provincial grants offered to organizations that need support
 - Grants-in-lieu from the provincial and federal government need to be more stable
 - If a municipality deems that a society should be exempt from municipal tax, they should also be exempt from education tax
 - Need to eliminate loopholes where agricultural societies partner with for-profit organizations so that the for-profit receives the property tax exemption (i.e. construct wireless tower on top of agricultural society building)
 - Exempt properties should continue to be responsible for any local improvement levy that is applied to the property (status quo)

RESTRICTIONS ON INVESTMENTS

- **Should municipalities be granted additional freedom in investing municipal reserves? Or should additional restrictions be placed on municipal investments? Why or why not?**
 - Since they are public funds, they should be kept secure
 - Municipalities should have more flexibility to invest but it shouldn't just be a decision of the council – there should be an independent regulator that oversees investment plans or the municipality is limited to only a small % of its reserves being invested in less secure investments
 - The current process to make special requests to the Minister is overly burdensome

OTHER TAXATION TOOLS

- **Should municipalities have access to other taxation tools beyond what is currently available to them?**
 - A set percentage of provincial royalty revenue should be shared directly with municipalities – this ensures more predictability instead of provincial changes in grants year-to-year
 - No other tools needed
 - If additional taxation tools are provided there needs to be more accountability by municipalities
 - Rural municipalities typically provide property-based services; however, urbans provide other social services that are not linked to property so they should receive other tax tools such as income tax, sales tax, etc.

Appeals, Complaints and Breaches (Discussion Area 4)

ASSESSMENT & DEVELOPMENT APPEALS

- **Is Alberta's one-level property assessment complaint system working? Why or why not?**
 - General support that that it is working
 - If appellant loses, they should bear the costs
 - 60 day appeal period is too long
 - MGB is not accountable
 - CARB and LARB rulings are not legislated to comply with MGA and MRAT
 - If MGB rules against legislation, minister should be able to overturn decision
 - A more timely response from ministry should be mandated
 - Many industrial appeals are due to a lack of clarity in regulations
 - Legislation needs to be more responsive to assessors concerns
 - "Live" date can be manipulated
 - Appeals on home-based businesses fall under CARB's and should be under LARB.

- **Is the planning and development appeal process working? Why or why not?**
 - SDAB appeal process to Queen's Bench is flawed
 - SDAB to MGB needs shorter timelines, tighten up jurisdiction
 - Legislation should allow appeals to MGB rulings based on content
 - MGB is quasi-judicial and can contravene the MGA with their rulings, (and past rulings)
 - There should be a way to appeal MGB rulings when they contravene the Act
 - SDAB can rule in contravention to LUB's. Should not be able to happen.

TRAINING OF ASSESSMENT AND SDAB BOARDS

- **What qualifications, prerequisites or training should the MGA specify as mandatory for assessment review board members?**
 - Training is too costly and onerous – many have been asked to take it and never use it
 - Either simplify training or make it a quasi-professional designation
 - Use an annual refresher instead of a three-year refresher as many forget the necessary knowledge by the time they are asked to hear an appeal

- Training should be offered at different times of the year as well as different locations
 - Many municipalities use regional boards and even then are hard pressed to find enough qualified people to hear appeals. Should be able to pull from a provincial pool of people.
 - For complex industrial appeals training is hard to apply. GOA should hear those.
 - A basic form of assessment training should be given to all new councillors. It would make the CARB and LARB training easier if they had that background and it would make the whole assessment, mill rate process easier to understand.
 - Training should include mock hearings, role playing and/or video's
 - Municipal Affairs should notify municipalities when training of board members expire
- **Should training for SDAB members be left to the local authority?**
 - Members at large are hard to attract, ex-councillors are a good choice
 - Provincial should deal with legal aspects but include a local focus to deal with LUB's, MDP's
 - Provincial responsibility for board members understanding universal premises such as "Apprehension of Bias" and "de Novo". After which local authority takes responsibility for local focus, LUB, MDP ASP, etc.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

- **Is there a conflict of interest for councillors when they participate in planning or development appeals that were originally decided upon by the same councillors?**
 - General consensus was that it is best left to the local council to deal with. Many have policies and bylaws not allowing councillors to sit on the SDAB.
 - Councillors have the knowledge of not only the process, but the issue.
 - Members at large are difficult to attract
 - It should be legislated that neither a councillor nor a member at large can hear an application more than once. If they hear it at the application stage, they would automatically be eliminated from hearing it as an appeal board member
 - There should be a separation, to show accountability

COUNCILLOR DISQUALIFICATION

- **Is the current disqualification process for councillors appropriate?**
 - Mixed positions on majority vote versus unanimous vote to disqualify an errant councillor
 - The rules for disqualification should actually be enforced by Municipal Affairs
 - If a councillor has breached the MGA they should not only be disqualified, but if they refuse to give up their seat, then instead of council having to apply to the court of queen's bench, the onus should be on the disqualified councillor to prove that they were incorrectly removed from council
 - Some expressed concern that putting the onus on the accused councillor could create issues

DIFFERENTIATION OF GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

- **Are governance and administrative roles clear enough in the MGA?**
 - General consensus that the current wording is sufficient
 - New councillor training should be mandatory
 - New CAO's training should be mandatory



Agenda Item

Project: 2013/14 Committee Appointments	
Presentation Date: October 8, 2013	
Department: Council	Author: Ron Leaf
Budget Implication: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Funded by Dept. <input type="checkbox"/> Reallocation	
Strategic Area: Governance and Intergovernmental Relations	Goal:
Legislative Direction: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None Provincial Legislation (cite) <input type="checkbox"/> County Bylaw or Policy (cite) _____	
Recommendation: That Council accepts the update on the 2013/14 Committee Appointments as information.	
Background:	
<p>Staff have now placed advertisements in the local papers (Mountaineer, Western Star, Sundre RoundUp) for two weeks and as well on the Clearwater County website detailing the available board and committee positions to be filled at the upcoming Organizational Meeting on October 23, 2013. (see a copy of the advertisement content attached)</p> <p>Thank you letters have been also been sent to current board/committee members with terms that are expiring, as well as to those members continuing their board commitments. Members with terms that are expiring have been encouraged to reapply for an additional term or for other committees.</p> <p>Should Council know of any parties interested in applying for any of the positions noted in the organizational meeting advertising, please encourage them to submit a letter of interest to Tracy Haight by October 16, 2013.</p>	



NEEDED...COMMITTEE/BOARD REPS

Clearwater County invites applications from interested residents for the following boards:

Agricultural Service Board (ASB) – 1 Member

This Board serves as an advisory body to Council and resident on all matters pertaining to agriculture. It meets on the third Friday of each month during the day. This appointment is for a four year period, starting November 1, 2013.

Caroline and District Recreation and Agricultural Society – 1 Member

This Board facilitates the operation of the Kurt Browning Arena complex in Caroline, as well as acts as the review body for recreation grant funding to groups in the Caroline area. This Board generally meets once per month. This appointment is for a two year period, starting November 1, 2013.

Caroline Municipal Library Board – 1 Member

This Board meets the first Tuesday of the month at 7:00 p.m. at the Library. This position is for a three year term, beginning January 1, 2014.

Central Alberta Economic Partnership (CAEP) – 1 Member

CAEP is a regional economic development alliance made up of 42 members and 14 associate members. CAEP's primary goal is to cultivate, advocate and market the collective voice of the region. This Board generally meets once every two months. This appointment is for a one year term, starting November 1, 2013.

Clear Water Landcare Board – 3 Members (to be selected by ASB)

A sub-committee of the Agricultural Services Board, Clear Water Landcare (CWL) provides leadership, support and awareness of grassroots land and water stewardship. The CWL board meets about five times per year. The appointment is for a three year term, starting in November 2013 and CWL requires one member from the farm community, one member from rural lifestyle (acreage) community and one member from non-government sector (agricultural and/ or conservation organization).

Clearwater Regional Family and Community Support Services (FCSS) – 1 Member

This position will provide assistance in developing policies and guidelines on matters relating to Family and Community Services. The member must be a resident of Clearwater County. The FCSS board meets ten times a year at noon on the second Wednesday of each month, excluding July and August. This appointment is for a term ending October 31, 2016.

Development/Subdivision/Environmental Review Appeal Board – 2 Members and 1 Alternate Member

The purpose of this Board is to provide an appeal mechanism for development and subdivision applications. This Board meets when required (on an average of five times per year). This appointment is for a one year period, starting November 1, 2013.

Municipal Planning Commission – 2 Members

This Board reviews and makes decisions concerning development and subdivision applications, and makes recommendations on rezoning. MPC generally meets on the second Thursday of each month during the day. This appointment is for a one year period, starting November 1, 2013.

**Physician Recruitment and Retention Committee – 2 Members**

The purpose is to provide policy governance for attracting and retaining physicians to the area. This appointment is for a one year period, starting in November 2013.

Rocky Mountain House Municipal Library Board – 1 Member

This Board acts as an advisory board to the Town and County Councils regarding Rocky Mountain House Library issues. It meets on the fourth Wednesday evening of each month. This is a three year term appointment, effective January 1, 2014.

Rocky Senior Housing Council – 1 Member

The purpose is to provide policy governance for senior housing in the area. It meets on the second Wednesday evening of each month. This appointment is for a one year period, starting in November 2013.

All applications will be received for the above positions from County residents at the County Office until **October 16, 2013 at 4:30 p.m.** Applications should be mailed to Clearwater County, Box 550, Rocky Mountain House, Alberta T4T 1B4, Attention: Tracy Haight; faxed to 403-845-7330 or emailed to thaight@clearwatercounty.ca

Should you have any questions regarding the duties for any of the above appointments, please phone 403-845-4444.

Ron Leaf, Municipal Manager



Agenda Item

Project: CFIB Municipal Spending Watch 2013 report	
Presentation Date: October 8, 2013	
Department: CAO	Author: Ron Leaf
Budget Implication: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Funded by Dept. <input type="checkbox"/> Reallocation	
Strategic Area:	Goal:
Legislative Direction: <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Provincial Legislation (cite) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> County Bylaw or Policy (cite) _____	
Recommendation: That Council accepts this report and attachment for information	
WEB LINK: CFIB Municipal Spending Watch 2013: (http://www.cfib-fcei.ca/cfib-documents/rr3302.pdf)	

Background: On September 18, 2013 the Canadian Federation of Independent Business (CFIB) released the 4th edition of its *Alberta: Municipal Spending Watch* report. While my initial intent was to provide Council with a summary of Clearwater County's "performance" as reflected in the four reports, such a summary proved to be difficult given the different reporting profiles used by the CFIB within their various studies. However, what have been consistent between the reports are the evaluation criteria and the recommendations. Before commenting on the evaluation criteria I wish to provide the following highlights:

- The CFIB reports have reflected well for Clearwater County. Examples:
 - Clearwater County ranked 3rd best of 181 municipalities – 4th Edition
 - Clearwater County within \$88 of spending average for M.D./Counties with population over 10,000 – 3rd Edition
 - Clearwater County was the "only municipality within this group (M.D.s/Counties pop. Over 10,000) to control spending to less than population and inflation" – 2nd Edition
 - Clearwater County 2nd lowest "Fiscal responsibility gap" (1.25) for M.D./Counties population over 10,000 – 1st Edition
- While these results are complimentary, I do have concerns with the evaluation metrics used by the CFIB, particularly as they apply to future reports. The CFIB uses three evaluation criteria: population growth, inflation and operational spending. Some concerns I have with the CFIB methodology are:

- Using 2000 as the baseline for its study fails to recognize the impact of the Provincial cancellation of a number of grant programs on municipal operating and capital budgets. In 2008, the AUMA and AAMDC undertook studies using data starting in 1988 and, when adjusted for change in dollars and population change, found that municipal spending is consisted with 1988 levels.
- The use of population as a benchmark fails to recognize the impact of non-population related variables. The period of 2000 to early 2008 saw significant increases in commercial and industrial growth provincially, with the most intense development occurring within central Alberta. Following the brief economic downturn of late 2008 – 2010, Clearwater County has again seen significant increase in industrial activity (e.g. fracking) that has required increased road maintenance and staff to address resulting challenges. CFIB's methodology fails to account for these non-population related factors.
- Similarly, changes in provincial or federal regulations or legislation also require changes in municipal spending. The current upgrade of the Town's wastewater lagoon illustrates this dynamic extremely well, from two standpoints. First, the upgrade has been engineered to exceed current treatment limits to meet anticipated changes in treatment levels anticipated to take effect in 2016/17. Secondly, as this is a "town facility" and the Town is managing the contract, the County's payment will show as an operational expense, not a capital expense, providing a marked increase in 2013 and 2014. Again, CFIB's methodology will not recognize this change nor the benefit to the two municipalities.
- The CFIB report also fails to acknowledge the offloading of provincial responsibilities. For example, in 1960 municipalities were responsible for 30 percent of Canada's public infrastructure, today municipalities are responsible for more than 50 percent. As Council has noted on numerous occasions, the \$85 million bridge deficit is an example of a provincial downloading. The proposal that all municipalities share in provincial policing costs is another.

CFIB recommendations

Based on their analysis, the 2013 CFIB report outlined the following recommendations; I've provided a brief response.

1. *"Real municipal operating spending increases be limited by the rate of population growth. Special circumstances that require an increase in operating spending for a particular year should be funded by built-up emergency or reserve funds."*
This recommendation fails to recognize the issues of downloading, non-population driven expenses and the reality that prudent proactive municipal planning requires increasing service capacity (e.g. roads, water, sewer, etc.) prior to the population growth.
2. *"In all cases, core services must be identified and core service reviews conducted to ensure effective fiscal management."*
I suggest that the CFIB's statement is very similar to Section 3 of the MGA that states that the purpose of a municipality is to: "provide good government", "provide things that are desirable or necessary within the community" and "to maintain a safe and viable community". I suggest the identification of core services and ensuring that they are effective and efficient is "the essence of good governance" which is achieved in part through fiscal analysis but the other part, which the CFIB fails to recognize, is the

dialogue that Council has with its citizenry and businesses and on what are the services the community needs and wants.

3. *“The number of full-time municipal employees should be restricted and sustainable wage growth policies implemented. In addition, public sector compensation should be better aligned with the private sector.”*

Similar to Recommendation #1 above, this recommendation fails to recognize factors such as provincial downloading, non-population factors affecting service delivery, changes related to legislation or approval process, etc. In terms of compensation, as Council is aware, the Clearwater County’s compensation strategy involves and reflects a comparison to private sector wages.

4. *“Some public services such as garbage collection and recreation centers be investigated for the potential to be outsourced. Doing so would:*

- *Create more jobs in the private sector*
- *Give entrepreneurs the opportunity to innovate and create more efficient and cost effective ways of service delivery.*
- *Let municipalities focus on fewer core services and thus manage them more efficiently.”*

Clearwater County relies heavily on the private sector for the provision of many municipal services (e.g. road grading, road construction) but we also consider the cost effectiveness of service provision. One factor not reflected by the CFIB that we pursue is partnership with other municipal governments for specialized equipment (e.g. line flushing, salted sand), sharing expertise or facilities (e.g. regional fire, recreation, FCSS) and increasing cost efficiencies by combining .

5. *The Province creates an independent auditor general for local government. The municipal auditor general.*

This recommendation has been made in each of the CFIB reports and was reviewed by the Province and was rejected. The Province’s position was that municipal councils already engage municipal auditors and that the creation of such a position would be a duplication of costs.

Conclusion:

Each time I read a CFIB report, I need to remind myself that one of the CFIB’s principle functions is as a national lobby organization. When the recommendations are considered in this context, I believe it is important to recognize the relationships and interactions that Council and staff have with: the local Chambers of Commerce; with industry through participation on various committees (e.g. SPOG, West Frasier/Weyerhaeuser community groups); and, with local business owners. I believe these interactions provide Council and administration with continual feedback on quality of service, taxation and perspectives about the County as a whole and that the comments are generally supportive of County’s performance and taxation.



Agenda Item

Project: Rocky Arena Upgrade	
Presentation Date: October 8th, 2013	
Department: Community and Protective Services	Author: Mike Haugen
Budget Implication: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funded by Dept. <input type="checkbox"/> Reallocation	
Strategic Area: Quality of Life	Goal:
Legislative Direction: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Provincial Legislation (cite) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> County Bylaw or Policy (cite) _____	
Recommendations: 1) That Council accept the Rocky Arena Concept Plan as presented; and, 2) That Council provide the Town of Rocky Mountain House with funding in the amount of \$377,000.00 to cover half of the cost of preparing detailed drawings for upgrades to the Rocky Mountain House Arena Complex.	
Attachments List: NA	

Background:

Lee Chambers of the Town of Rocky Mountain House will be in attendance to jointly present this item.

Upgrades to the Rocky Arena Complex were scheduled to take place this past summer. Due to citizen concerns and a desire for additional input, the project was postponed so that additional public feedback could be sought.

As a result of the additional public feedback the Rocky Recreation Board, which consists of both Town and County representatives, has completed an updated concept plan for the facility and is recommending that the Town and County move forward with the project.

To move forward the preparation of detailed drawings suitable for tender is required. It is the Town's goal to tender this project in January or February of 2014 and for



construction to begin in the spring of 2014 and be completed in the fall of 2015. The cost of this step is estimated to be \$754,000.00 (based on a percentage of the overall project). The Town has already committed to fund half of this amount and is asking the County to fund the remaining half.

This funding request is in alignment with both historical practice and the Recreation Agreement between the Town and County. Funding this project would not require any adjustment or reallocation to Council's approved 2013 budget which already contains \$2.175 Million for this project.

Staff is seeking Council's endorsement of the presented concept plan as well as direction to move forward with the preparation of detailed drawings and the tender package.



Agenda Item

Project: 'Rock and Roll on Main Street' Funding Request	
Presentation Date: October 8, 2013	
Department: CPS	Author: Trevor Duley
Budget Implication: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funded by Dept. <input type="checkbox"/> Reallocation	
Strategic Area: Land and Economic Development	Goal: The County will develop an economic development plan which supports and promotes industry, business and agri-business and tourism opportunities in the County.
Legislative Direction: <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Provincial Legislation (cite) _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County Bylaw or Policy (cite) <u>Event Funding Policy</u>	
Recommendation: That Council provide Administration with direction pertaining to: 1) Whether or not to sponsor the event; 2) Staff attendance at the event; and 3) Approval to bring the <i>Event Funding Policy</i> forward for review at the next A&P Meeting.	
Attachments List: Letter from Lynette Birg; <i>Event Funding Policy</i>	

Background:

County Staff recently received a letter from the Town of Rocky Mountain House requesting funding for an event entitled 'Rock and Roll on Main Street.' The event is scheduled for Saturday, October 19th, 2013 and coincides with the 'Fright Night' event happening at the Historic Site.

There are various degrees of sponsorship available, which are presented in the attached letter for Council's review. However, the Town is requesting that the County sponsor the specific event, 'Giggle Gang Company' at the cost of \$1500.00. Should Council agree to sponsor this event, the County would be allowed to have a booth on Main Street for the afternoon, and the County logo would be displayed on all advertising. The Town is hoping to make this an annual event, depending on its success this year, and is also seeking corporate sponsors in order to provide a greater variety of games at the event, above the funding they have requested.



It should be noted that Council has historically not received many requests like this, and that the Town has begun a number of new initiatives within the last year aimed at community engagement and arts and culture, with the establishment of their Community Events Coordinator position. This particular event, as expressed within the letter, seeks to engage the community's youth through arts and recreation in an inclusive and respectful setting.

As noted within Council's *Reeve's Economic Summit* reports, more and more of today's 'creative professionals' and youth are attracted to communities that offer the social experiences, environment and quality of life they expect and demand.

Administration is firstly seeking Council's direction as to whether or not to supply funding to this event. Should Council wish to fund the event in the full \$1500.00 requested amount, funding could be provided from within the Economic Development budget.

Secondly, should Council wish to fund the event, Staff would ask for Council's direction in regards to staff participation at the event (ie. providing a booth, distributing information on the County, etc.)

Thirdly, should Council choose, Administration would seek Council's approval to bring forward an item at the next Agenda and Priorities Meeting to discuss options pertaining to the *Event Funding Policy* and Council's philosophy towards events of this nature in the future.

Letter Received Tuesday, October 1, 2013

Clearwater County,

Rocky Mountain House, Ab

Dear Trevor,

I am the Events Coordinator at the Town of Rocky Mountain House and I am planning a party for our local youth called '**Rock and Roll on Main Street**'. This event is scheduled for Saturday, October 19, 2013. (**weather permitting**) On behalf of the Town of Rocky Mountain House and our many local youth, I am hoping that the County will help support this worthwhile event. Your donations will go towards sponsoring an entertainment company that provides jousting, and face painting and hopefully big bike rides. They have quoted me around \$1,500.00 for what they have to offer for the day and the things I can rent to make this an exciting day for our youth.

Rock and Roll on Main Street is planned to appeal to the youth of our community. We will showcase some of our young local musicians, athletes and artists. We plan to close Main Street to traffic for the day, allowing our local youth to ride their BMX bikes, scooters, skateboards, go-karts and long boards down the street. We will have different venues set up with activities such as some local youth bands, food, beverages, a shared graffiti art wall, video gaming, games, prizes and much more! We will also be using this event to promote the Fright night at the Historic site also by doing zombie face painting and have invited them to set up a booth for that day. We have also invited our Community Peace Officers and RCMP to be present during that day to strengthen and encourage positive rapport and relations.

We would be more than happy to hang **the county** banner at our event to show our appreciation of your support and we will also use your logo in all the advertising that we will be putting in the paper and our posters & media.

Platinum Donors - \$1000.00 and over

Gold Donors - \$500.00 - \$999.00

Silver Donors - \$200.00 - \$499.00

Bronze Donors - \$50.00 - \$199.00

Your support will help make this a positive, memorable day for Rocky's youth! Any profits made will be put towards future youth events and if the weather doesn't make this possible it will be put in to the youth entertainment budget for another event. We appreciate any help **the county** can offer. If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact me.

Regards,

Lynette Birg
Community Events Coordinator
Town of Rocky Mountain House
403-847-5260 ext - 112

Clearwater County

EVENT FUNDING POLICY

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 2010

SECTION: Administration

POLICY STATEMENT:

This policy is intended to provide direction concerning the types of events and the conditions that must be met for Clearwater County Council to assist with the funding of community, cultural or sporting events or celebrations.

PROCEDURE:

1. Applications must be made in writing and should be submitted on the form attached hereto as Appendix "A". Applications shall include:
 - a. a description of the event, including date & time(s), and the number and age of the audience/participants that are anticipated to attend;
 - b. an explanation of the benefit of the event to the community;
 - c. the amount of funding that is being requested;
 - d. a general explanation of what activities the County's funding will be used for ;
 - e. a list of other supporting or funding agencies; and,
 - f. a projected budget highlighting anticipated revenues & expenses.
2. For an event to receive funding the following conditions must be met:
 - a. The event must be located within Clearwater County, the Town of Rocky Mountain House, or the Village of Caroline; and,
 - b. The event function(s) must have broad community appeal involving, or providing entertainment for, a variety of age groups (e.g. fireworks, community concerts, etc.).
3. Events that do not meet the above criteria and are not specifically mentioned in this policy may be reviewed and approved by Council. If provided, funding will generally be provided on a matching basis of up to \$2000.00. This does not include funding provided for dust control.
4. Events that celebrate the 25th, 50th, 75th, 100th (and so on in 25 year increments) anniversary of hamlets or community associations, and which are hosted by an incorporated community association, may receive up to \$2000.00 on a matching basis subject to the conditions contained in this policy.
5. Council hereby directs that funding in the amount of \$2500.00 be included annually in the County's budget for the Canada Day Celebrations in Rocky Mountain House.

6. Council hereby directs that funding in the amount of \$2500.00 be included annually in the County's budget for the Caroline Volunteer Recognition Event. This funding is to be provided on a matching basis.
7. Council hereby directs that funding in the amount of \$2000.00 be included annually in the County's budget for the Bighorn Stampede & Parade in Caroline.
8. Generally, the County will not provide grants or subsidies to individuals or organizations for hosting, traveling to, or participating in sporting or cultural events.
9. The County should be considered a "funder of last resort", that is, other funding sources should be approached prior to considering the use of County funds.
10. The County will not provide retroactive event funding.
11. Events that incorporate liquor and/or gambling may still be eligible for County funding, however the County will not provide funding that is intended to be used directly towards the purchase/provision or subsidization of liquor or for direct use in or subsidization of gambling activities.
12. A report shall be submitted to the County office within six (6) weeks of the conclusion of the event and should describe the highlights of the event and provide an accounting of how the funding provided was spent.
13. County funding will not be used to pay event organizers or participants.
14. Council may fund requests for dust control associated with an event provided that the following conditions are met:
 - a. The subject road is a public roadway;
 - b. The event has not already occurred; and,
 - c. The method of dust control has been approved by the Clearwater County Public Works department.
15. Generally, the applicant will be responsible for organizing dust control subject to the conditions outlined above and will submit a receipt to the County for reimbursement of up to \$2000.00.

Total Revenues:	\$1500.00
Expenses (Please indicate which expenses County funding will be used to cover):	
Item	Amount
Bands, staging, prizes, advertising, volunteer honourariums (Town)	\$1500.00
Giggle Gang Company, Jousting, Face Painting, Carnival Games, Sumo Wrestling (County)	\$1500.00
_____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____
Total Expenses:	\$3000.00
Total Deficit (Amount Requested):	\$1500.00
<small>(Please note that County funding will generally not exceed \$2000.00)</small>	
Do you have any other resources/donations dedicated to this event?	
The Town will be seeking corporate sponsors in order to provide events above the requested amount. The Legion recently made a donation towards the event.	
Agreement	
<small>(To be signed by an authorized representative of your organization)</small>	
On behalf of _____ I, _____	
agree that, should Clearwater County provide funding for this event that:	
1) The funds will be used only for the project outlined above; and,	
2) An accounting of the funding will be provided to Clearwater County within six (6) weeks following the event.	
Signature:	_____
Date:	_____

Clearwater County

Councilor and Board Member Remuneration Statement

For the Year of2013.....

Name of Councilor / Board MemberCase Karver.....

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
8	Bighorn Backcountry Tour	✓	✓				368
13	Council				✓		26
14	CPO review	✓					26
27	Council				✓		26
28	Caroline H.V.B	✓					40

{more Space on Back of Page}

Remuneration Calculation

<u>3</u>	Meetings @ \$149.00=	<u>447.00</u> ✓	<u>486</u>	Kms @ \$0.54=	<u>262.44</u> ✓
<u>1</u>	Meetings @ \$119.00=	<u>119.00</u> ✓		Lunch @ \$16.00=	
<u>2</u>	Meetings @ \$271.00=	<u>542.00</u> ✓			
	Supervision=	<u>550.00</u> ✓			
	TOTAL=	<u>1658.00</u>		TOTAL=	<u>262.44</u>

Signature {Councilor / Board Member}

Clearwater County

Councilor and Board Member Remuneration Statement

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

Name of Councilor / Board Member *C. Case K. K. K.*

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
9	Council				✓		26
23	Council				✓		26

{more Space on Back of Page}

Remuneration Calculation

Meetings @ \$149.00=	_____	52	Kms @ \$0.54=	28.08 ✓
Meetings @ \$119.00=	_____		Lunch @ \$16.00=	_____
2 Meetings @ \$271.00=	542.00 ✓			
Supervision=	550.00 ✓			
TOTAL=	1092.00		TOTAL=	28.08

Signature {Councilor / Board Member}

Clearwater County

Councilor and Board Member Remuneration Statement

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

Name of Councilor / Board MemberPat Alexander.....

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
Aug 4	Burnt Stick Lake	X					154
Aug 9	Zone Directors	X	X			X	384
Aug 13	Council				X		74
Aug 14	SLR-CPO	X					74
Aug 21	Meet Chamber	X					74
Aug 21	Airport		X			X	
Aug 22	MGA workshop	X	X	X			
Aug 27	Council				X		74

{more Space on Back of Page}

Remuneration Calculation

<u>5</u>	Meetings @ \$149.00=	<u>745.00</u>	<u>834</u>	Kms @ \$0.54=	<u>450.36</u>
<u>4</u>	Meetings @ \$119.00=	<u>476.00</u>	<u>2</u>	Lunch @ \$16.00=	<u>32.00</u>
<u>2</u>	Meetings @ \$271.00=	<u>542.00</u>			
	Supervision=	<u>850.00</u>			
	TOTAL=	<u>2613.00</u>		TOTAL=	<u>482.36</u>

Signature {Councilor / Board Member}

.....