1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The Council General Meeting for the County of Wetaskiwin No. 10 was called to order by Reeve T. Van de Kraats in the Council Chambers, of the County of Wetaskiwin Administration Office, commencing at 10:50 a.m. on Thursday, September 26, 2019.

2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

   Resolution CG20190926.001
   
   MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop
   
   to approve the following addition to the agenda pursuant to Procedural Bylaw 2018/04, Section 8:
   
   8. **New Business**
   
   8.7 Gwynne Community Church 70th Anniversary October 5, 2019

   and that the agenda be approved as amended.

   **Carried Unanimously**

3. **MINUTES APPROVAL**

3.1 **Council General Minutes September 10, 2019**

   Resolution CG20190926.002
   
   MOVED: by Councillor D. Woitt
   
   to approve the minutes for the Council General meeting held September 10, 2019 as presented or amended.

   **Carried Unanimously**

4. **DELEGATION - 10:30 A.M. - Rene Boutin, Director of Assessment Services**

   In his absence, Mr. R. Hawken, CAO, presented Mr. R. Boutin's reports to Council.

4.1 **2019 Shallow Gas Tax Relief Initiative (File#3355-00-00)-Report**

   The Provincial Government has recently announced property tax relief initiative for shallow gas producers as many are in a difficult financial situation. Municipal Affairs is conducting a review on regulated assessment models that includes the assessment of...
wells and pipelines; however, this review will not come into effect until the 2020 taxation year. The Provincial Government has stated that the reduction in property taxes cannot wait until then and has decided that they will implement a tax reduction of 35% on shallow gas well and pipeline accounts for the 2019 property tax year.

To ensure municipalities are not impacted by lost revenue, the Province will reduce the amount of the 2019 education property tax requisition to cover the cost.

Municipal Affairs sent a list of 28 companies who qualify for the reduction, along with the tax amounts to be adjusted. The total current taxes for these 28 companies is $485,687,06; after adjusting this by 35% the total taxes are $315,696.47, consequently administration is requesting that Council cancel the difference of $169,990.59 in tax relief.

Council may cancel or reduce tax arrears as per the Municipal Government Act, Section 347(1) that states: If a council considers it equitable to do so, it may, generally or with respect to a taxable property do one or more of the following, with or without conditions:

• cancel or reduce tax arrears;
• cancel or refund all or part of a tax;
• defer the collection of tax.

Administration recommended that Council approve the cancellation of 35% of the 2019 taxes relating to shallow gas wells and pipelines in the amount of $169,900.59 in accordance with section 347(1) of the Municipal Government Act.

Resolution CG20190926.003
MOVED: by Councillor K. Adair
that Council approve the cancellation of 35% of the 2019 taxes relating to shallow gas wells and pipelines in the amount of $169,900.59 in accordance with section 347(1) of the Municipal Government Act.

Carried Unanimously

4.2 Penalty Cancellation Request – Joel Bishop - (File# 125410)-Report

On September 18, 2019 the County of Wetaskiwin received a phone call from Joel Bishop requesting Council to forgive the September 1st penalty on his property legally described as SE 10-47-24-W4M – Plan 1521475; Block 2; Lot 7 in the amount of $159.63. Joel stated that he brought a postdated cheque into the County office in June 2019. Neither County administration nor Joel Bishop have proof that the payment was received.

The process when receiving postdated cheques has been to put them in a file folder at the front counter and enter them into the system at a later date, once entering the payment the receipts are held until the payments have been processed and sent to the bank on the 31st of August.

A change in the process of dealing with postdated cheques has been developed and implemented as a result of this issue. This process will now see the post dated payment entered into the system upon delivery and a post dated receipt will be provided immediately.

Council may cancel or reduce tax arrears as per the Municipal Government Act, Section 347(1) that states: If a council considers it equitable to do so, it may, generally or with respect to a taxable property do one or more of the following, with or without conditions:

  o cancel or reduce tax arrears;
  o cancel or refund all or part of a tax;
  o defer the collection of tax.
Administration recommended that Council deny the request for the cancellation of the September 1st penalty on the property legally described as SE 10-47-24-W4M – Plan 1521475; Block 2 Lot 7 as Mr. Bishop cannot prove that the payment was received.

Resolution CG20190926.004
MOVED: by Councillor K. Rooyakkers

that Council approve the request for the cancellation of the September 1st penalty on the property legally described as Lot 7, Block 2, Plan 1521475 (SE 10-47-24-W4M) in the amount of $159.63.

Carried Unanimously

5. **DELEGATION - 10:45 A.M. - Geoff Lynch, Director of Leisure & Community Services**

A delegation consisting of Geoff Lynch, Director of Leisure & Community Services, entered the meeting at 10:59 a.m.

5.1 **2019 Zone 5 Recreation Funding Request (Millet Area) – 092619 - Report**

On September 10th, 2019 the Zone 5 Recreation Committee reviewed the submitted grant applications for 2019. The Committee meets approximately twice a year, determined by the number of requests received.

Currently the 2019 Zone 5 allocation for grants to organizations is $9,554.00; as Council approved allocating $2,000.00 from the $11,554.00 budget to the Millet and District Historical Society at the April 23, 2019 Council General meeting. (Ref. Resolution #CG20190423.008)

There is currently $72,020.17 in Zone 5 Operating Reserves and $54,000.00 in Zone 5 Capital Reserves.

Facility Operations

As per Recreation Facility Operational Grant Policy #72.0.3 states: "the financial assistance available will be in the form of an annual grant as follows:

- A Maximum 50% of eligible Recreation Facility operating costs with GST being excluded from the amounts awarded (annual maximum is contingent on Council’s final approval) for:
  - Sewer servicing (e.g. septic tank servicing, outdoor toilets)
  - Electricity
  - Natural Gas, Propane, Oil
  - Custodial Costs
  - Parking lot maintenance (e.g. snow removal, grading, gravel, etc.)
  - Landscaping maintenance (e.g. grass cutting, tree removal, etc.)
  - Out-Door Arena Maintenance (snow removal, ice maintenance, etc.)
  - Curling Arena Maintenance (e.g. ice installation, maintenance, etc.)
  - Insurance Costs”.

The following grant application was received and is in compliance with the Facility Operations per policy:

**Millet and District Historical Society:**

- Project: Safe Electrical Project – Tamper Resistant Receptacles/Panel Circuit Verification
- Total Requested: $2,471.24
- Recommended Amount: $824.00
If approved, the remaining amount of $8,730.00 in the 2019 Budget allocation would be transferred to operating reserves.

Options for Council’s consideration:

1. deny the recommendations from the Zone 5 Recreation Committee in allocating $824.00 to the Millet & District Historical Society for the Safe Electrical Project; or

2. approve the recommendation from the Zone 5 Recreation Committee for in allocating $824.00 to the Millet & District Historical Society for the Safe Electrical Project.

Administration recommended that Council approve the recommendation from the Zone 5 Recreation Committee for in allocating $824.00 to the Millet & District Historical Society for the Safe Electrical Project.

Resolution CG20190926.005

MOVED: by Councillor L. Seely

that Council approve the recommendation from the Zone 5 Recreation Committee for in allocating $824.00 to the Millet & District Historical Society for the Safe Electrical Project.

Carried Unanimously

Mr. Jeff Chipley, Assistant CAO, entered the meeting at 11:05 a.m.

5.2 Recreation Facility Nodes-Report

On September 1st, 2015 Council approved the Recreational Needs Assessment and Master Plan as amended. (CG20150901.1017)

In the resolution Council denied recommendation 5.14: The Department should confirm a future facility model to eliminate duplication of facilities and to ensure that all areas have access to appropriate space for social and recreational activities. The plan developed in conjunction with the volunteer organizations responsible for the management of recreation facilities, community centers and halls will designate specific facilities as those best able to meet the community’s long-term needs. Designated facilities should be given priority for future municipal funding and the Department should work closely with the volunteer groups responsible for their operation to ensure their continued viability.

At the December 4, 2018 Council meeting, Council resolved to host two Citizen Engagement Sessions in February 2019, one at Winfield February 27 and one at Millet February 28 to discuss recreation. (CG20181204.1021)

Upon further discussion between Council and Administration, it was agreed that the Citizen Engagement Sessions focus on the sustainability of recreation facilities and community halls, subsequent to the 2014 Recreation Needs Assessment and Master Plan, and Council Strategy.

Council directed Administration and Council collaborate to investigate the creation of facility nodes and funding models for recreation facilities and community halls. (CG20190409.009)

At the September 10th, 2019 Council General meeting, Council denied the proposal to create one recreation tax rate for the County and remain status quo. (CG20190910.019)

According to the Recreational Needs Assessment and Master Plan:

“a pro-active approach is preferable to waiting until the conditions of existing facilities deteriorate to the point, they are no longer useable, or volunteers are no longer available to operate them”.

Administration outlined three steps to help guide Council’s decision on creating facility nodes.
**Step 1: Identifying potential growth in the County of Wetaskiwin**

As stated in the Recreational Needs Assessment and Master plan:

“the County of Wetaskiwin Municipal Development Plan identifies areas of potential growth in the County. These growth areas include the Hamlets of Alder Flats, Winfield, Falun and Gwynne: the areas around the major lakes including Buck Lake, Pigeon Lake, Wizard Lake and Coal Lake; and the area between the Town of Millet and the City of Wetaskiwin”.

The map of Potential Growth was provided for Council review.

Administration would like to identify that many of the areas for growth are along the Hwy 13 corridor.

**Step 2: Data Collected from the Community Engagement Sessions.**

The Citizen Engagement Sessions were held on February 27 & 28, from 7-9 pm, at the Winfield Agriplex Hall and the Millet Agriplex Hall. Approximately 45 stakeholders attended Winfield and 45 residents attended Millet, along with 7 County Councilors, the Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Director of Leisure and Community Services, Director of Public Works, Director of Finance, Communications Officer, and Municipal Intern.

The top five selections for the three categories are:

**Halls**
1. Lakedell Community Hall *
2. Winfield Agriplex*
3. Falun Community Hall
4. Buck Lake Community Hall*
5. Alder Flats* / Buck Lake Seniors Hall
*represents facilities operated by Agricultural Societies.

**Curling Rinks**
1. Lakedell Curling Rink*
2. Alder Flats Curling Rink*
3. Usona Curling Rink*
4. Wetaskiwin Curling Rink
5. Millet Curling Rink

**Rodeo Grounds**
1. Lakedell Indoor/Outdoor Rodeo Grounds*
2. Buck Lake Rodeo Grounds
3. Winfield Rodeo Grounds *
4. Wetaskiwin Rodeo Grounds *
5. Alder Flats Rodeo Grounds *

**Step 3: 20 minute drive times**

As driving to experience a recreational event is not uncommon in rural Alberta, most studies identify that a 20 minute drive catchment is usually common for residents who reside in a rural community.

A map showing 20 minute drive times was provided for Council review.
Step 4: Facility assessment

Administration recommended that the County should undertake an assessment of the potential facilities to confirm a new facility model. Preferred facilities should be identified based on their location, physical condition, programming potential and community support. The following categories for the potential assessment are below:

1. **Structural Condition**: the estimated cost of repairing current deficiencies and maintaining the facility for community use over the next ten years. A Facility Condition Index (FCI) would be the recommended assessment strategy, an FCI is a standard facility management benchmark that is used to objectively assess the current and projected condition of a building asset.

2. **Appropriateness for Public Use**: the existence of, or cost to provide full accessibility or conform to other characteristics traditionally associated with public buildings (e.g. adequate parking; signage/visibility; security and safety of users, etc.) Size: the capacity of the areas available for public use.

3. **Programming Potential**: the range of community uses and programming that can be accommodated based on such considerations as ceiling height; design and coverings of floors and walls; amenities such as storage, change areas, food service, etc.

4. **Accessibility**: both geographically to the proposed service area and for community use during day, evenings and weekends.

5. **Volunteer Management**: the existence, capabilities and willingness of a volunteer management group to operate the facility and potentially to take on greater use.

6. **Agricultural Societies**: Locations and capacity of already funded organizations and how they fit in each potential node location.

The goal of this exercise is to ensure the best facility for programming is identified and that all County residents have reasonable accessibility to facilities.

**Other key considerations when selecting a facility node**

1. Willingness and ability of volunteers to continue to operate these facilities.
2. Location of schools and other potential gym spaces to accommodate the node.
3. Available tax funds through the County.

After reviewing the current supply of facilities, potential growth of the County, data from the citizen engagement and other key considerations, administration has selected the potential nodes below as an “example” to initiate the discussion on selecting facility nodes within the County of Wetaskiwin.

**An example of potential community hall nodes:**

1. Alder Flats Community Hall
2. Winfield Agriplex Community Hall
3. Lakedell Community Hall
4. Angus Ridge Community Hall (Angus Ridge was selected as the Town of Millet and the City of Wetaskiwin currently provide facilities for residents in the surrounding area)

**Explanation:**

- The Community Halls are in an identified location for potential growth according to the Recreation Master plan and the County of Wetaskiwin Municipal Development Plan.
The locations are within the 20 minute drive time catchment of their specific area.

Results from the citizen engagement sessions have identified the three potential nodes as all three were the top five responses from the community.

The facilities are currently operated by Agricultural Societies.

The County of Wetaskiwin has invested significant dollars in each of the three facilities over the past six years.

A more in-depth facility audit is required to estimate the current FCI (Facility Condition Index) structure and identify potential capital costs over the next 10 years.

A combined map of the areas for growth map and the 20 minute drive time to assist with the identifying potential facility node locations was provided to Council.

Administration requested Council to select a date to further discuss facility node locations within the County of Wetaskiwin.

Options:
1. Remain status quo with the current recreation funding model.
2. Council accept the "Recreation Facility Nodes" report as information and have Administration present at the 2019 strategic planning session for the 2020 annual budget.
3. Create a "Recreation Facility Nodes" committee made up by Council and residents to develop terms of reference and options for Council to review.

Administration recommended that a "Recreation Facility Nodes" Committee with representatives from Council and County Residents be created to develop terms of reference and options for Council to review.

Discussion included sustainability, existing recreation facilities and grant funding.

**Resolution CG20190926.006**

MOVED: by Councillor L. Seely

that a "Recreation Facility Nodes" Committee with representatives from Council and County residents be created and further that Administration develop terms of reference and options for Council to review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recorded</th>
<th>In Favour:</th>
<th>Opposed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reeve T. Van de Kraats</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor J. Bishop</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor B. Krahn</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor D. Woitt</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor K. Adair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor K. Rooyakkers</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor L. Seely</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results**

| Carried (5 to 2) |

Mr. Lynch left the meeting at 11:32 a.m.
6. **DELEGATION - 11:30 A.M. - Jeff Chipley, Assistant CAO**

6.1 **Transfer to Tax Roll – Unsightly Premise Clean-Up Fees – Lot 14, Block 1, Plan 8221631, NE 12-48-28-W4M, Roll #278414 – Report**

On August 23, 2018, Protective Services received a complaint regarding vehicles parked on a County Roadway and the unsightly condition of the property legal described as Lot 14, Block 1, Plan 8221631, NE 12-48-28-W4M in the Wizard Ridge Estates Subdivision. On this date, Protective Services confirmed that the property was indeed in an unsightly condition and vehicles were parked on a County Roadway. The property owner, who resides on the property, was warned both verbally and in written form and advised to remove the vehicles from the County Roadway by 3:00 p.m. on August 26, 2018 and have the property cleaned up to a satisfactory condition by September 20, 2018.

On August 28, 2018 the vehicles were confirmed to be off the County Roadway.

On September 24, 2018, a follow-up was conducted and no remedial action to the unsightly condition of the property was made, nor was there any prior communication by the property owner between August 23, 2018 and this date. Therefore, a Stop Order was sent by registered mail to the property owner listed on title on September 25, 2018, ordering clean-up of the property by October 16, 2018. The Stop Order was confirmed received on September 26, 2018.

On October 18, 2018, a follow-up regarding the Stop Order was conducted and no remedial action to the unsightly condition of the property was made, nor was there any communication from the property owner asking for an extension. Therefore, a Violation Ticket was issued under Section 3.6 of the Nuisance and Unsightly Premise Bylaw 2018/52, Fail to Comply with an Order.

After the Violation Ticket was Convicted in Absence on December 12, 2018, a second Stop Order was sent by registered mail on December 19, 2018. The Stop Order was refused upon delivery and returned to the County on December 21, 2019. Therefore, the Stop Order was hand delivered to the property owner at the aforementioned property on December 28, 2018, ordering clean-up by May 31, 2019.

On May 31, 2019, a follow-up regarding the Stop Order was conducted and no remedial action to the unsightly condition of the property was made, nor was there any communication from the property owner asking for an extension. Therefore, the property owner was served with a Notice of Entry for the clean-up of the property on June 6, 2019.

On June 6 & 7, 2019, clean-up of the property was completed by Sunrise Estate Services. Pictures of the property both before and after clean-up have been provided for review by Council. Due to the extensiveness of the clean-up, the total cost was $8,403.90.

On June 24, 2019, an invoice was sent to the property owner listed on title for payment of the clean-up fees of the unsightly condition of the property for $8,403.90. On September 5, 2019, penalties of $126.06 were added to the outstanding amount for the property. To date, no acknowledgement of the invoice has been received and Administration is of the opinion that there is no willingness for the property owner to pay the invoice.

Therefore, Administration is bringing forward this unpaid invoice for unsightly premise clean-up to be added to the tax roll.

In accordance with the *Municipal Government Act*, Section 553(1)(c) states that Council may add unpaid and expenses and costs associated with the bringing of a property into compliance with an enacted bylaw as long as the contravention occurred on all or part of the parcel.

Administration recommended that Council transfer $8,403.90 in unsightly premise clean-up costs to Tax Roll #278414 for the property legally described as Lot 14, Block 1, Plan 8221631, NE 12-48-28-W4M pursuant to Section 553 of the *Municipal Government Act*.

Mr. Chipley clarified that, due to a recent penalty run, the new amount owing is $8,529.96; and that the clean up was completed by a private contractor.
Resolution CG20190926.007
MOVED: by Councillor L. Seely
that Council transfer $8,529.96 in unsightly premise clean-up costs to Tax Roll #278414 for the property legally described as Lot 14, Block 1, Plan 8221631, NE 12-48-28-W4M pursuant to Section 553 of the Municipal Government Act.
Carried Unanimously

6.2 Transitional Solutions Inc.-Strategic Planning for the 2020 Budget-Report
At the meeting of September 10, 2019, Council directed Administration to negotiate the scope of work with Transitional Solutions Inc. (TSI) in order to provide facilitation of the Strategic Planning for the 2020 budget for the County of Wetaskiwin.
(Ref. Resolution CG20190910.008)
Council may consider the following options:
1. Approve the proposal from Transitional Solutions Inc. (TSI) to provide facilitation of the Strategic Planning for the 2020 budget for the County of Wetaskiwin at a cost of $16,840.00 plus expenses; or
2. Complete the Strategic Planning for the 2020 Budget for the County of Wetaskiwin in-house.
Administration recommended Council approve the proposal from Transitional Solutions Inc. (TSI) to provide facilitation of the Strategic Planning for the 2020 budget for the County of Wetaskiwin at a cost of $16,840.00 plus expenses.

Resolution CG20190926.008
MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop
that Council approve the proposal from Transitional Solutions Inc. (TSI) to provide facilitation of the Strategic Planning for the 2020 budget for the County of Wetaskiwin at a cost of $16,840.00 plus expenses.
Carried Unanimously

6.3 Weed Enforcement Process – Follow-up –092619 CG-Report
At the August 7, 2019 meeting, the Agricultural Service Board was provided with the Weed Enforcement Process. At that time, the Board did not feel any changes needed to be made to the process and the ratepayers should be taking ownership of their weed infestations. The Board resolved to accept the Weed Enforcement Process as presented and that it be forwarded to Council for approval. (Ref. Resolution #AG20190807.008)
At the August 13, 2019 Council General meeting Council was presented with the Weed Enforcement Process as Administration had been made aware of potential instances where landowners were suggesting changes be made to the current Weed Enforcement Process undertaken by the County. At the time, Council resolved to table the Weed Enforcement Process for clarification of process. (Ref. Resolution #CG20190813.018)
On August 15, 2019 CAO Rod Hawken sent an email to the Director of Agricultural Services requesting additional information on the Weed Enforcement Process in the form of questions. The questions and answers are provided for Council’s review.

1. Did the landowners receive any information (weed notice, warning, etc.) that advised what type of chemical was going to be applied and what the residual results of using that chemical might have on their operations?
   - The landowners were not given any information regarding what herbicide was being used as each individual case is unique. The herbicide selected for control
of noxious weeds (N) and eradication of prohibited noxious (PN) weeds is based on the weed species present on the property. One of the Contract Companies (Custom Sprayer) sprayed Restore 2 for almost all of the properties that enforcement was completed. There were a couple of properties that had Common Tansy on them and Reclaim 2 was used on them as it controls Common Tansy. The other Contractor used the herbicide called Navius for the properties they enforced. This product also eradicates prohibited noxious and controls noxious weeds.

- In 2020, product information through a copy of the respective herbicide label will be provided to each landowner.

2. Did the County complete any enforcement on properties with only noxious weeds (those that require maintenance vs eradication)?

- The County did not enforce on properties that only had noxious weeds. Every weed notice enforced in 2019 had either Orange Hawkweed or Meadow Hawkweed on them which are both Prohibited Noxious weeds.

3. What was the process to decide whether to spray or mow on properties that had both Prohibited Noxious and Noxious weeds?

- Legislation requires eradication of Prohibited Noxious weeds and control of Noxious weeds. Herbicides that control or eradicate PN weeds were selected for enforcement by Professionals who hold Pesticide Applicators Licenses and through consultation with Corteva Agriscience and Advantage Vegetation Management. In discussions with Doug Macaulay of Alberta Agriculture & Forestry, mowing is not considered a form of eradication and could not be used as a management tool for PN Weeds. Administration did discuss spot spraying where the PN weeds were and possibly mowing the rest of the area where N weeds were but the past Hawkweed Program showed that spot spraying is not very effective in eradication of Hawkweed as it appears in patches adjacent to where the previous spot spraying occurred.

4. What type of chemical was used and why was it chosen? What is the residual for this chemical?

- Several herbicides were discussed when trying to decide which herbicide was best to use. The following criteria was used to select the most appropriate herbicide for the weeds that needed to be controlled or eradicated:
  a) Environmental profile
  b) Cost efficiency
  c) Herbicide registered for range and pasture applications
  d) Respective weeds listed as controlled on the herbicide label

Three different products were chosen to control N and eradicate PN weeds on the enforcement properties. These products were chosen as the respective weeds on the property were listed on the products as weeds that are controlled. All three products do provide residual carryover of more than one year as identified on their product label. The number of years of carryover varies depending on a number of factors including but not limited to soil type, soil moisture, rainfall, pH, organic matter, soil microorganisms, herbicide rate etc. When producers purchase or have these products custom applied they agree by contract to leaving the hayfield or pasture land for three years after the application as there are cropping restrictions on the products.

- In 2020, the product label will be given to the producer and the restrictions will be highlighted.
5. Does this chemical have any restrictions for use around animals such as cows, dogs, bees or other animals?
   - product labels available upon request, as there are a number of pages.

6. Are there any chemicals that control Prohibited Noxious or Noxious weeds that only have a one year residual?
   - There are several hundred herbicides available to perform weed control. Not all herbicides are created equally. The products that control or eradicate weeds for a longer period of time cost more money to purchase and have residual carryover.
   - There are several products that could be applied annually to control Noxious weeds. However, the Agricultural Fieldman is not aware of any annually applied herbicides that eradicate Prohibited Noxious weeds or have the PN weeds listed on their label. A product such as MCPA or 2,4-D (even though Hawkweed is not listed as a weed controlled on its’ label) could be applied annually to prevent the PN Weed from going to seed (this is not eradication). Administration has conducted a cost comparison between some products as follows:
     - MCPA is $10.50 per litre
       - Application cost is $19.75 per acre.
       - Total cost is $30.25 per acre per application with some years possibly requiring two applications.
       - This done over three years is a minimum cost of $90.75.
     - Restore II is $45.00 per acre
       - Application cost is $19.75 per acre.
       - Total cost is $64.75 per acre per application with a three residual.
       - This done for the three year cost is $64.75.
   - Environmental Benefits cannot be calculated but applying once every three years versus once or twice a year uses less fuel, less herbicide, less equipment, compaction, less risk of improper rates being applied, less risk of non target species being affected and time.

7. Did the County tender for the services of weed control contractors?
   - According to the Purchasing Tendering Policy #1907, tenders are not required as each property falls within the Greater than $1,000 but less than $20,000 under Section 2. Through contacting the companies, Administration found that Contractors were reluctant to provide tenders as the total number acres and properties could not be determined until the due dates on the weed notices came. Administration contacted several contractors to see their availability, ensure they had the proper equipment to perform the spraying and their rates. Three contractors (Flowline, GT Custom Spraying and Performance Ag Group) were not available as they took on new contracts and already had established clientele that they were working for. Hytek, Gunslinger and West Country provided pricing for their various pieces of equipment. Administration tried to use all three contractors but with the wet weather and some equipment issues were only able to use Gunslinger and West Country. Both Contractors were selected to perform enforcement on properties that were relatively close to each other with due dates close. Administration did not want to have the Contractors passing each other while doing enforcement.
8. What was the cost of the chemical application by the contractors you chose?
   o The cost is still being determined but ranges from $55 to $120 per acre. The variation is due to the equipment costs, crew size and time for herbicide application on each parcel of land. Administration has not received all of the invoices from West Country to finalize the exact cost for each property that was enforced.

9. Were residents advised that if they wanted more information than just the invoice (ie, what chemical, how much time, where sprayed) they would have to pay an additional cost? Can you explain why this might cause the County to incur additional costs?
   o Residents were not informed of any additional costs as Administration is unaware of any additional costs. If a landowner (resident) is requesting the spray records and data from the Contractor, it may cost extra for them to provide these records and details to the County to forward to the landowner. In the Council Agenda Item, Administration suggested that it would/could be an extra cost to the resident to have this information provided. To date, Administration has only had one request for this additional information.
   o In 2020, the County will request this information for all herbicide applications.

10. What type of guarantee did the contractors provide for the work? If the chemical did not work would they come back? If the equipment wasn't working (one boom plugged), is the invoice cheaper or would they come back?
    o There were no guarantees provided by any of the Contractors. If the herbicide does not work, the County/Contractor will work with the herbicide manufacturer to ensure control or eradication is accomplished. The herbicide manufacturers are responsible to ensure their products are performing appropriate control levels are achieved.
    o Each piece of equipment used for enforcement has global positioning system (gps) on it. This system would notify the Applicator if there was an issue with the equipment such as a plugged nozzle.
    o A contractor would not reduce the invoice or come back to do additional work without compensation.

11. Can a list be provided of the properties that were sent weed notices, which ones made contact to do their own work, which ones made contact and didn’t do the work and which ones the County received no contact and sprayed?
    o A spreadsheet is provided with a list of properties and the individual weed reports are available upon request.

12. Did Mr. von Arx pay any penalties on the work that was arranged by the County (prior to 2019)? For example, if the County sent him an invoice for work, did penalties get added to any unpaid amounts?
    o Mr. von Arx paid penalties on invoices when the penalties were applied. He paid $162.64 on one invoice and $278.43 on another invoice which the County added to the tax roll and was paid.

Options for Council:
1. To accept the Weed Enforcement Process Follow-up as information.
2. To provide the Agricultural Service Board feedback on how to move forward with the Weed Enforcement Process in future years.
Administration recommended that Council accept the Weed Enforcement Process Follow-up as information.

It was the general consensus that Council continue their discussion after reconvening the meeting.

7. **RECESS**

Resolution CG20190926.009
MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop
that the meeting be reconvened at 1:00 p.m.

Carried Unanimously

The meeting recessed at 12:08 p.m.

8. **RECONVENE**

The meeting reconvened at 1:00 p.m.

Mr. Jeff Chipley, Assistant CAO, entered the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

9. **Weed Enforcement Process-Continuance of Discussion**

Council resumed their discussion on the Weed Enforcement Process Follow Up.

Resolution CG20190926.010
MOVED: by Councillor K. Rooyakkers
to defer discussion regarding Weed Enforcement Process Follow Up to a later time in the meeting.

Carried Unanimously

Mr. Chipley left the meeting at 1:04 p.m.

11. **NEW BUSINESS**

11.1 Amendment to Bereavement Policy 12.2.5-Report

Bereavement Leave Policy #12.2.5 was reviewed by the Directors and amended to make the Policy current in content, formatting and to follow past practice with respect to work days. This Policy was created October 2004, with the most current amended in 2012. There are a few changes (shown in either strikeout or underline) made to this policy, as follows:

Section 1.1:

Up to a maximum of five (5) regularly scheduled consecutive work days, based on the number of hours outlined in the employee letter of offer, without loss of pay at their regular rate of pay for the purpose of making arrangements for, or attending, a funeral when death occurs in an employee's immediate family, that is, current spouse, common law spouse, child, or step-child.
Section 1.2:
Up to a maximum of three (3) regular scheduled consecutive work days, based on the number of hours outlined in the employee letter of offer, without loss of pay at the regular rate of pay for the purpose of making arrangements for, or attending, a funeral when death occurs in an employee's immediate family, that is, parent, mother-in-law, father-in-law, grandparent, grandparent-in-law, grandchild, brother, sister, brother-in-law, sister-in-law and any relative who has been residing in the employee's household.

Section 1.3:
One (1) regularly scheduled workday, based on the number of hours outlined in the employee letter of offer, for step-mother, step-father, step-brother or step-sister.

The Policy amendments were approved by the Directors (Ref. Resolution #DM20190626.003) and are being presented to Council for approval.

Administration recommended that Council review the Leave for Non Union Employees Policy #12.1.8 and approve as presented or amended.

Council has the following options for consideration:
1. Approve Bereavement Leave Policy 12.2.5 as presented.
2. Approve Bereavement Leave Policy 12.2.5 with amendments.
3. Do not approve amendments to Bereavement Leave Policy 12.2.5.

Administration recommended that Council review Bereavement Leave Policy #12.2.5 and approve as presented.

Resolution CG20190926.011
MOVED: by Councillor K. Adair

that Council approve Bereavement Leave Policy #12.2.5 with amendments as presented.

Carried Unanimously

11.2 Road Allowance Lease Renewals to September 30, 2019-Report

Road allowances may be closed and leased to adjoining landowners in accordance with the Municipal Government Act, and County of Wetaskiwin Road Allowance Closure for Lease or Sale Policy 12.0.4. The term of each lease is for a three-year period. Several Road Allowance Leases are due for renewal, as follows:

File 5630-43-3 Gerald Jackson E/NE 18-46-5-W5M (excepting the most southerly 150m)
- Division 7; road closed by Bylaw 95/13
- 3.25 acres - $65.00/year

File 5630-34-3 4-H Foundation of Alberta W/NW 12-46-2-W5M
- Division 6; road closed by Bylaw 79/28
- 2.12 acres - $42.40/year

As the policy has recently changed, specifically regarding lease fees, a letter was sent to the affected lease holders to advise of the changes; and administration requested confirmation that they were still interested in leasing the road allowance prior to presenting to Council.

A copy of maps showing each road allowance lease is provided.

Administration recommended that Council approve the road allowance lease renewals for a further three (3) year term, in accordance with Road Allowance Closure for Lease or Sale Policy 12.0.4, as follows:
File 5630-43-3 Gerald Jackson E/NE 18-46-5-W5M (excepting the most southerly 150m)
- Division 7; road closed by Bylaw 95/13
- 3.25 acres - $65.00/year

File 5630-34-3 4-H Foundation of Alberta W/NW 12-46-2-W5M
- Division 6; road closed by Bylaw 79/28
- 2.12 acres - $42.40/year

**Resolution CG20190926.012**

MOVED: by Councillor K. Rooyakkers

that Council approve the road allowance lease renewals for a further three (3) year term, in accordance with Road Allowance Closure for Lease or Sale Policy 12.0.4, as follows:

File 5630-43-3 Gerald Jackson E/NE 18-46-5-W5M (excepting the most southerly 150m)
- Division 7; road closed by Bylaw 95/13
- 3.25 acres - $65.00/year

File 5630-34-3 4-H Foundation of Alberta W/NW 12-46-2-W5M
- Division 6; road closed by Bylaw 79/28
- 2.12 acres - $42.40/year

Carried Unanimously

11.3 **Rural Municipalities of Alberta (RMA) Fall Convention Registration Opening November 12-15, 2019-Report**

A Member Bulletin from Rural Municipalities of Alberta (RMA) was received advising the convention registration is now open. The main conference content starts Wednesday, November 13, 2019 at 7:00 a.m.

The Rural Municipalities of Alberta (RMA) 2019 Fall Convention will take place November 12-15, 2019.

On November 12, 2019 the Elected Officials Education Program (EOEP) kicks off the 2019 convention with two courses offered being:
- Council’s Role in Service Delivery; or
- Council’s Role in Strategic Planning

The Courses are $340.00 and run on November 12 from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

The Reeves/Mayors' meeting is also scheduled for November 12 at the Edmonton Convention Centre. A Member Bulletin from RMA was received advising the convention registration opened September 17th, 2019. The main conference content starts Tuesday, November 20th, 2019 at 7:00 a.m.

Accommodations have been made at the Courtyard by Mariott Edmonton Downtown with a check-in date of November 12, 2019 and a check-out date of November 15, 2019 to accommodate those wishing to participate in the Elected Officials Education Program (EOEP). If the EOEP courses are not attended, the Courtyard by Mariott Edmonton Downtown check-in date of November 12 will require cancellation.

The RMA Banquet is sponsored by Brownlee LLP and is scheduled for Thursday, November 14. The 2019 banquet cost is included in the registration cost of attendees; however, additional tickets for spouses/partners can be purchased for $25.00 per person.
A copy of the Partner Program was provided to Council for review. In accordance with Subsistence and Travel Policy 12.2.7, the County will pay spouse's banquet ticket but will not pay for any partner programs unless approved by Council.

As well, Administration will be submitting In Memoriam for previous Councillor Gordon Sherwood, who served on County Council from 1986-1992.

In accordance with the Business Plan for Business Unit 1100 Legislative Services action 1.7.2.1 states: "Implement Alberta Association of Municipal District and Counties training for Council".

Options for Council's consideration:

1. Advise who is attending the Rural Municipalities of Alberta (RMA):
   - 2019 Conference.
   - Advise who is attending the Elected Officials Education Program courses.
   - Advise which Partner Program Councillor's spouse/partner is able to attend.
   - Advise the number of additional banquet tickets Council wishes to order for spouse/partner to attend the RMA 2018 Fall Convention Banquet.

2. Accept the RMA 2019 Fall Convention as information.

Administration recommended that Council respond to Option 1 above.

**Resolution CG20190926.013**

MOVED: by Councillor K. Adair

That Council be registered to attend the Rural Municipalities of Alberta (RMA) Fall Convention from November 12 to 15, 2019 as follows:

1. All Council members, with exception of Councillor K. Rooyakkers who is registered by RMA;
2. Administration staff R. Hawken, J. Chipley, N. Finseth and N. Powell;
3. Councillors B. Krahn and K. Adair to attend the Strategic Planning Elected Officials Education Program Course;
4. Councillors D. Woitt and J. Bishop to attend the Service Delivery Elected Officials Education Program Course;
5. That Council advise Administration as soon as possible if there are spouses to attend a Partner Program(s) offered.
6. That Council advise Administration as soon as possible to register one additional banquet ticket for spouses/partners.

Carried Unanimously

**11.4 Rural Municipalities of Alberta-Board of Directors Zone 3-Report**

Councillor K. Rooyakkers is currently the Zone 3 Representative on the Board of Directors for the Rural Municipalities of Alberta (RMA).

Councillor Rooyakkers is seeking re-appointment and requesting Council support in her bid to stay as Zone 3 Representative.

Council has the following options to consider:

1. Support Councillor Rooyakkers request to run for Zone 3 Representative on the Board of Directors for the Rural Municipalities of Alberta (RMA); or
2. Do not support Councillor Rooyakkers request to run for Zone 3 Representative on the Board of Directors for the Rural Municipalities of Alberta (RMA).

Administration recommended that Council support Councillor Rooyakkers request to run for Zone 3 Representative on the Board of Directors for the Rural Municipalities of Alberta (RMA).
**Resolution CG20190926.014**

MOVED: by Councillor K. Adair

that Council support Councillor Rooyakkers request to run for Zone 3 Representative on the Board of Directors for the Rural Municipalities of Alberta (RMA)

**Carried Unanimously**

**11.5 North Saskatchewan Watershed Alliance-Request for 2020 Municipal Contribution-Report**

Correspondence was received from Mr. Ken Crutchfield, President of the North Saskatchewan Watershed Alliance (NSWA) Society. Attached to the letter was a copy of the NSWA 2018-19 Annual Report; and a request to Council for a $0.50 per capita contribution to NSWA for 2020.

In addition to financial contributions from individual municipalities, their non-profit alliance depends on an annual operating grant from the Government of Alberta and contributions from EPCOR.

NWlsa successfully applied for over $2 million worth of provincial and federal grants to support municipalities and local stewardship groups. NSWA is helping to address many local watershed management issues including:

- Riparian and wetland habitat conservation and restoration;
- River and creek hydrology studies;
- Natural areas and groundwater recharge areas protection;
- Fisheries habitat and aquatic health assessments, including invasive species issues;
- Long term impacts of land use changes on watershed health
- Best management practices and planning policies related to riparian, wetland and natural protection, stormwater management and flood protection and water conservation.

Attached to the information package was an invoice for the per capita funding request in the amount of $5,590.50.

At the meeting of October 4, 2018, Council denied the request received from the North Saskatchewan Watershed Alliance to fund their 2019 program based on results of the 2010 Strategic and Business Planning sessions that the County of Wetaskiwin would not provide funding to the various watershed alliances and further that funding was not considered in the 2019 Municipal Capital and Operating Budget.

(Ref. Resolution CG20181004.1028)

Options for Council's consideration include:

1. approve to become a member of the North Saskatchewan Watershed Alliance and pay the invoice amount of $5,590.50 based on $.50 per capita at a 2017 population census figure of 11,181.
2. deny the request received from the North Saskatchewan Watershed Alliance to fund their 2020 program based on results of the 2010 Strategic and Business Planning sessions that the County of Wetaskiwin would not provide funding to the various watershed alliances and further that funding was not considered in the 2019 Municipal Capital and Operating Budget.
3. discuss funding the watershed alliances at the 2019 Strategic and Business Planning Sessions for 2020 budget consideration.

Administration recommended that Council deny the request received from the North Saskatchewan Watershed Alliance to fund their 2020 program based on results of the 2010 Strategic and Business Planning sessions that the County of Wetaskiwin would not provide funding to the various watershed alliances and further that funding was not considered in the 2019 Municipal Capital and Operating Budget.
Resolution CG20190926.015
MOVED: by Councillor L. Seely

that Council deny the request received from the North Saskatchewan Watershed Alliance to fund their 2020 program based on results of the 2010 Strategic and Business Planning sessions that the County of Wetaskiwin would not provide funding to the various watershed alliances and further that funding was not considered in the 2019 Municipal Capital and Operating Budget.

Carried Unanimously

11.6 Wetaskiwin and District Association for Community Services (WDACS) Pumpkin Ball October 26, 2019—Report

An invitation was received from Wetaskiwin and District Association for Community Services (WDACS) to their 45th Annual Pumpkin Ball being held Saturday, October 26, 2019 at the Wetaskiwin Memorial Arts Centre commencing at 5:00 p.m. Events include Dinner, Pumpkin Auction, Children’s Activities, and a dance to follow. Ticket cost is $50.00 per adult.

The Pumpkin Ball began in 1974 and evolved into a signature fundraising event in Wetaskiwin. WDACS is a leader in the provision of community-based services and in the promotion of inclusion of persons with disabilities into all faces of the community. The Association provides individualized services in the community to more than 80 children and adults.

This year, proceeds from the Pumpkin Ball will be used to purchase a new accessible van.

At the Council General meeting held October 4, 2018, Council approved the registration of one Councillor and spouse to attend the Wetaskiwin and District Association for Community Services (WDACS) 44th Annual Pumpkin Ball on Saturday, October 20, 2018.

(Ref. Resolution CG20181004.1023)

Options for Council's consideration are:

- accept the Wetaskiwin and District Association for Community Services (WDACS) notice of their 45th Annual Pumpkin Ball as information.
- approve the ticket cost of $50.00 per Council member(s) and their partner(s) who are able to attend the Wetaskiwin and District Association for Community Services (WDACS) 45th Annual Pumpkin Ball on Saturday, October 26, 2019 at the Wetaskiwin Memorial Arts Centre commencing at 5:00 p.m.

Administration recommended that Council approve the ticket cost of $50.00 per Council member(s) and their partner(s) who are able to attend the Wetaskiwin and District Association for Community Services (WDACS) 45th Annual Pumpkin Ball on Saturday, October 26, 2019.

Resolution CG20190926.016
MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop

that Council approve the ticket cost of $50.00 for Reeve T. Van de Kraats and guest to able to attend the Wetaskiwin and District Association for Community Services (WDACS) 45th Annual Pumpkin Ball on Saturday, October 26, 2019.

Carried Unanimously
12. **ADDITION TO AGENDA**

**Resolution CG20190926.017**

MOVED: by Councillor K. Adair

that the addition to the agenda "Gwynne Community Church 70th Anniversary" be deemed of a time sensitive nature, unable to wait until the next meeting, pursuant to Procedural Bylaw 2018/04, Section 8.5.

*Carried Unanimously*

12.1 **Gwynne Community Church 70th Anniversary**

Reeve T. Van de Kraats advised that an invitation had been received from the Gwynne Community Church for their 70th Anniversary Celebration on October 5, 2019.

**Resolution CG20190926.0018**

MOVED: by Councillor B. Krahn

that Councillors B. Krahn and J. Bishop attend the Gwynne Community Church 70th Anniversary Celebration on October 5, 2019 on behalf of the County of Wetaskiwin.

*Carried Unanimously*

13. **INFORMATION ITEMS**

13.1 **Information Items to September 26, 2019-Report**

The following information items were presented for Council’s review:

1. **FCM Communiques:**
   a. Share our Housing Affordability Plan—September 5
   b. Housing: We’re Making a Real Splash—September 9
   c. Building Better Lives—September 12 & 13
   d. Voice September 16
   e. President’s Corner September 19

2. **RMA Bulletins:**
   a. Member Bulletin—September 6
   b. Member Bulletin—September 13

3. **RMA-Member Meeting Summary – Shallow Gas Taxation**

Administration recommended that Council accept the documents provided as information.

**Resolution CG20190926.019**

MOVED: by Councillor L. Seely

that Council approve the documents provided as information.

*Carried Unanimously*

Mr. Jeff Chipley, Assistant CAO, entered the meeting at 1:29 p.m.

14. **CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC**

Council will be discussing personnel, therefore the meeting should be closed to the public, pursuant to Section 197 of the Municipal Government Act, 2000, Chapter M-26 and amendments thereto, and the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, Part 1, Division 2 Exceptions to Disclosure Section 27 Privileged information.
Resolution CG20190926.020
MOVED: by Councillor K. Rooyakkers
that the meeting be closed to the public, at 1:31 p.m., pursuant to Section 197 of the Municipal Government Act, 2000, Chapter M-26 and amendments thereto, and the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, Part 1, Division 2 Exceptions to Disclosure, Section 27 Privileged Information to discuss personnel.
Carried Unanimously

Resolution CG20190926.021
MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop
that the meeting be opened to the public at 1:55 p.m.
Carried Unanimously

15. Weed Enforcement-Continuance of Discussion
Resolution CG20190926.022
MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop
that Council accept the Weed Enforcement Process Follow Up as information.
Carried Unanimously

16. ADJOURN
Resolution CG20190926.023
MOVED: by Councillor D. Woitt
that the Council General meeting adjourn at 1:56 p.m.
Carried Unanimously

_________________________
REEVE

_________________________
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

MINUTES APPROVED:

Ref. Resolution #