

# **2017 Resolutions Book**

**Updated October 27, 2017**

**Alberta Urban Municipalities Association**

**2017 Convention**

**Calgary, Alberta**

**November 22-24, 2017**

**Resolution Sessions:**

**First Session – November 22, 2017**

**Second Session – November 24, 2017**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>AUMA RESOLUTIONS POLICY</b>	<b>Page 3</b>
<b>CATEGORY STRATEGIC/BUSINESS PLAN SCOPE</b>	<b>Page 11</b>
RESOLUTION 2017.A1 Collaborative Discussions Between AUMA and AAMDC on the Opportunity to Merge - AUMA Board of Directors	Page 12
<b>CATEGORY PROVINCIAL SCOPE</b>	<b>Page 14</b>
RESOLUTION 2017.B1 Alberta Capital Finance Authority Access for Housing Authorities - City of Grande Prairie/Town of Banff/Town of Canmore	Page 15
RESOLUTION 2017.B2 Repeal the Cannabis Act - Town of Taber	Page 17
RESOLUTION 2017.B3 State of Local Emergency - City of St. Albert/City of Spruce Grove	Page 18
RESOLUTION 2017.B4 Integrate Emergency Social Services and Emergency Management at Provincial Level - Town of High River	Page 19
RESOLUTION 2017.B5 Municipal Reserve - City of St. Albert	Page 21
RESOLUTION 2017.B6 Cell Phone Towers - City of Lethbridge	Page 22
RESOLUTION 2017.B7 Combative Sports - City of Red Deer	Page 24
RESOLUTION 2017.B8 Expanding Mandatory Helmet Requirements - City of Grande Prairie	Page 26
RESOLUTION 2017.B9 Commitment to Formal Municipal Consultations on the Future of Provincial Revenue Sharing - City of Leduc/City of Grande Prairie/City of St. Albert	Page 28
RESOLUTION 2017.B10 Compensation for Municipalities Participating in the Medical First Response Program - City of Wetaskiwin	Page 30
RESOLUTION 2017.B11 Support to Medical Equipment Lending Initiatives across Alberta - City of Red Deer	Page 32
RESOLUTION 2017.B12 Regional Trail Linkages between Urban Municipalities - Town of Blackfalds/Town of Sylvan Lake/Town of Penhold	Page 36
RESOLUTION 2017.B13 Provincial Funding of 211 - City of Red Deer	Page 37
<b>CATEGORY EXTRAORDINARY RESOLUTIONS</b>	<b>Page 39</b>
RESOLUTION 2017.E1 Tax Exemption for Municipal Elected Officials - Town of Penhold	Page 40
RESOLUTION 2017.E2 Provincial/Municipal Working Group on Opioids - City of Grand Prairie	Page 41
RESOLUTION 2017.E3 Need for Hospital Expansion - City of Red Deer	Page 43

**NOTE: There were no 2017 resolutions in the categories of Endorsement Requests or Targeted Scope.**

# **AUMA Resolutions Policy**

## AUMA Resolutions Policy

### General

1. Resolutions should address a topic of concern affecting municipalities on a regional or provincial level, and must be approved by the council of the sponsoring municipality.
2. Resolutions must not direct a municipality to adopt a particular course of action, but must be worded as a request for consideration of the issue seeking action by the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association (“AUMA”).
3. Each resolution must be submitted:
  - (a) electronically;
  - (b) in the appropriate format;
  - (c) along with council minutes that show proof of the sponsoring municipality’s council approval; and
  - (d) in adherence to the guidelines presented in this Policy.
4. Resolutions may be submitted for consideration at the AUMA annual Convention by:
  - (a) a regular member or group of regular members; or
  - (b) the AUMA Board of Directors.
5. Resolutions shall be in the form:

**WHEREAS ...**  
**AND ...**  
**IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT** the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association (take some action) ...
6. Each resolution shall be written in the following format:
  - (a) A title that is concise yet specific to the issue in the resolution;
  - (b) The Preamble of the resolution (beginning with “WHEREAS”...);
    - i) must describe the issue or opportunity that the resolution is bringing forward;
    - ii) should outline the applicable legislation and, where possible, the specific section of the Act or Regulation; and
    - iii) should ideally not exceed five clauses.
  - (c) The operative clause of the resolution (i.e. beginning with “IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT”...) must:
    - i) clearly set out what the resolution is meant to achieve;
    - ii) state a specific proposal for action;
    - iii) specify who should be taking the action (e.g. the federal or provincial government, AUMA, or another party) and the role for AUMA that is being requested or proposed; and
    - iv) be straightforward and brief so that the intent of the resolution is clear. Generalization should be avoided. Resolutions that are too general or fail to meet this format may be returned to the sponsoring municipality.
7. Each resolution should be accompanied by background information outlining the issue as it relates to the sponsoring municipality, when and how often the resolution has been submitted in the past, and how the resolution is related to AUMA policy. This material will assist the AUMA Municipal Governance Committee, and later the Resolutions Session, in understanding the issues.
8. Resolutions must be submitted to the AUMA Chief Executive Officer no later than May 31 each year, provided that, the Chief Executive Officer may grant an extension of the deadline:

- (a) if the Convention is scheduled later than Thanksgiving Day in any year; or,
- (b) if requested by a member, when the Chief Executive Officer is satisfied that valid conditions have made it impossible for the member to submit the resolution by the deadline date.

9. The annual call for resolutions may include information on key issues identified in the AUMA strategic or business plan on which the AUMA Board of Directors wishes to focus and/or information regarding any other matters on which AUMA seeks assistance in the coming year. As well, the annual call for resolutions will remind members that alternatives to Convention resolutions available during the year include bringing Requests for Decisions to the appropriate Mayors' Caucus and bringing a matter directly to the attention of the AUMA Board of Directors.

### **Extraordinary Resolutions**

10. A resolution arising from the proceedings of the Convention or related to a matter of an urgent nature arising after the resolution deadline may be considered an extraordinary resolution on a case-by-case basis.

11. A regular member wishing to propose an extraordinary resolution shall provide notice to the AUMA Chief Executive Officer as soon as possible with a deadline of the first day of Convention. The extraordinary resolution must also include:

- (a) a rationale of why the resolution is extraordinary;
- (b) an electronic copy of the resolution via email that adheres to resolution formatting guidelines presented in Sections 5 and 6;
- (c) proof of the council's approval for the sponsoring municipality; and
- (d) 1,000 printed copies of the resolution, which requirement may be waived if AUMA determines in advance that there is sufficient time to publish the extraordinary resolution in the Convention handbook, website, or ability to distribute the resolution appropriately in another manner.

12. The determination whether the proposed resolution meets the criteria of an extraordinary resolution will be made by

- (a) in the case of a proposed extraordinary resolution submitted after the resolution deadline but before the final AUMA Board of Directors meeting prior to the Convention, by the Board on the recommendation of the Municipal Governance Committee; or
- (b) in the case of a proposed extraordinary resolution submitted after the final AUMA Board of Directors meeting prior to the Convention, by the Executive Committee of the AUMA Board of Directors, in consultation with the either Resolutions Session Chair or Municipal Governance Committee Chair.

13. The criteria of an extraordinary resolution is that it must:

- (a) deal with an emergent issue of concern to the general membership that has arisen after the resolution deadline or just prior to the resolution deadline such that they could not come forward as a resolution in time; and
- (b) have a critical aspect that needs to be or will be addressed before the next Convention; and
- (c) comply with the guidelines for resolutions set out elsewhere in this policy.

14. Prior to the merits of any proposed extraordinary resolution being debated, a 2/3 majority vote is required to determine whether it meets the criteria in Section 13 and therefore will be considered at the Resolutions Session.

15. Extraordinary resolutions accepted for consideration by the Resolutions Session shall be presented following debate of the Targeted Scope resolutions.

### **Administrative Review**

16. The AUMA Chief Executive Officer may return any submitted resolution to the sponsoring municipality to have deficiencies corrected or to clarify details of the resolution.
17. Deficiencies may include but are not limited to:
- (a) absence of any indication of the resolution being endorsed by the Council of the sponsoring municipality;
  - (b) the Preamble includes statements contradictory to the operative clause or lacks necessary details;
  - (c) lack of a clear supporting narrative where the rationale of the resolution is unclear;
  - (d) unclear background and Preamble; and
  - (e) incorrect or misleading statements within the resolution or within the supporting background information and/or documentation.
18. Each resolution and accompanying background information may undergo fact-checking to ensure details relating to the resolution are accurate.
19. The AUMA Chief Executive Officer may request and accept from AUMA staff an opportunity to provide further background material on a resolution.
20. The return by the AUMA Chief Executive Officer of any proposed resolution for the correction of any deficiencies will not affect its categorization nor will it disqualify a resolution submitted on time.

### **Committee Review**

21. The Municipal Governance Committee shall serve as the AUMA Resolutions Committee and review each proposed resolution for format and content and may recommend that the AUMA Board of Directors refuse to submit to the Resolutions Session any resolution deemed inappropriate for consideration by the AUMA.
22. The Municipal Governance Committee will notify the appropriate Standing Committee of any proposed resolution(s) related to its policy or policies.
23. The Municipal Governance Committee may:
- (a) amend the grammar or format of the resolution;
  - (b) consolidate resolutions of similar intent or subject matter;
  - (c) provide comments on each resolution regarding its background;
  - (d) inform the sponsoring municipality where the resolution will materially change or contradict current AUMA policy;
  - (e) recommend to the AUMA Board of Directors that resolutions already adopted and/or forming AUMA policy not be considered at the Convention, and be returned to the sponsor(s) of the resolution(s) with an explanation of the reason for return;
  - (f) refer resolutions back to the sponsor municipalities for deficiencies including but not limited to those outlined in Section 17; and
  - (g) provide comments on each resolution with respect to updates on the policy topic as appropriate and alignment with other AUMA policies.

24. When the Municipal Governance Committee determines that a proposed resolution is appropriate for submission to the Resolutions Session, it shall categorize the resolution as one fitting into the category of either:
- (a) AUMA Strategic/Business Plan Priorities, including matters related to the implementation of the AUMA strategic and/or business plans;
  - (b) Provincial Scope, including resolutions that address matters of significance to all or most municipalities in the province;
  - (c) Targeted Scope, including resolutions that address matters of significance to all or most municipalities located in one area of the Province, region, or municipal members of a similar size;
  - (d) Endorsement Requests, including requests of regular Members to endorse positions they are taking without any advocacy action by AUMA; or
  - (e) Non-Municipal Matters, including matters outside of municipal jurisdiction and therefore not appropriate for presentation to the Resolutions Session shall also be categorized by the Municipal Governance Committee.
25. The Municipal Governance Committee will prepare a Resolutions Report, which will include all proposed resolutions determined appropriate for submission to the Resolutions Session, including the following information on each resolution:
- (a) Number and Title of Resolution;
  - (b) Name of Sponsoring Member(s);
  - (c) Proposed Resolution;
  - (d) Resolutions Category; and
  - (e) Municipal Governance Committee comment (if any).
26. Resolutions will appear in the Resolutions Report and the Resolutions Session Agenda in the following order:
- (a) AUMA Strategic/Business Plan Priorities;
  - (b) Provincial Scope;
  - (c) Targeted Scope; and
  - (d) Endorsement Requests.
27. The Resolutions Report will be forwarded to the AUMA Board of Directors, and upon the AUMA Board of Directors having approved the Resolutions Report, proposed resolutions assigned to the Non-Municipal Matters category will be returned to the sponsoring member(s) with an explanation of why the resolution(s) will not appear in the Policy and Resolutions Book at the Resolutions Session.
28. The AUMA will electronically publish and distribute a Policy and Resolutions Book to members at least eight (8) weeks prior to Convention that includes the Resolutions Report and other information on appropriate bylaws, policies and procedures.

<b>Resolutions Session Agenda</b>
-----------------------------------

29. The AUMA Board of Directors, after consulting with the Municipal Governance Committee Chair, will appoint a Resolutions Session Chair.
30. As provided in the Bylaws, quorum for all proceedings at a Resolutions Session will be comprised of representatives of twenty-five percent [25%] of the Regular Members.

31. Prior to the beginning of the Resolutions Session, the Resolutions Session Chair will ask for a motion from the floor to adopt the Resolutions Session Agenda as presented in the Policy and Resolutions Book.
32. Amendments from the floor to the Resolutions Session Agenda will be accepted when duly moved and seconded.
33. A 2/3rds majority of the delegates present will be required to change the Resolutions Session Agenda.
34. If there are no amendments to the Resolutions Session Agenda, resolutions will be debated in the order they are presented in the Policy and Resolutions Book. No further amendments to the resolution agenda will be accepted.

<b>Considering Resolutions</b>
--------------------------------

35. The Resolutions Session Chair will introduce each proposed resolution by indicating its number, title, the name of the sponsoring municipality, and the action being voted on.
36. The Resolutions Session Chair will then call on the sponsoring municipality to move the resolution.
37. The Resolutions Session Chair will then call for a supporting municipality to second the resolution. If no municipality seconds the resolution, the resolution dies. Immediately after the resolution is seconded, the spokesperson from the sponsor municipality that moved the resolution will have up to two minutes to speak to the resolution. The spokesperson that seconded the resolution will also have up to two minutes to speak to the resolution.
38. Resolutions must be moved by an elected official from the sponsoring municipality. However, in the event that the elected official moving the resolution is unable to speak on behalf of the resolution, the sponsoring municipality's Chief Administrative Officer may speak on behalf of the resolution at the discretion of the mover.
39. Following a resolution being seconded, Resolution Report comments developed by the Municipal Governance Committee may be presented to the Resolutions Session. These comments must be approved in advance by the AUMA Board of Directors. The spokesperson shall be the Chair of the Municipal Governance Committee, or the Vice-Chair if the Chair of the Municipal Governance Committee is acting as the Resolutions Session Chair, or a designate as determined by the Chair of the Municipal Governance Committee. Following these comments, the resolution is open for debate.
40. As provided in the AUMA Bylaws, the persons entitled to speak in favour and opposed to a resolution during the Resolutions Session are:
  - (a) those elected representatives in attendance whose municipalities are Regular Members of the Association in good standing;
  - (b) in the event a Regular Member is unable to be represented at the Resolutions Session by an elected representative, an official appointed by motion of the Council to represent it, provided that notice of such appointment is submitted in writing to the AUMA Chief Executive Officer at least three (3) days prior to the date of the Resolutions Session; and
  - (c) upon a motion from the floor or at the discretion of the Resolution Session Chair, a representative of an Associate Member.



41. No debate on accompanying background material and information for resolutions will occur.
42. In the case of a proposed new Policy Position Paper, the Resolutions Session Chair will allow a spokesperson or designate a maximum of five (5) minutes to introduce the new Policy Position Paper and place the resolution on the proposed new policy before the Convention and to name the seconder.
43. Following the initial speaker, the Resolutions Session Chair will then call alternately for persons opposing and supporting the resolution. These speakers will have a two (2) minute time limit and shall not speak more than once on any one question. When no alternate position speaker is available, the Resolutions Session Chair will declare the end of the debate and the spokesperson will be allowed one (1) minute for the closing of debate.
44. If no one rises to speak in opposition to a proposed resolution, the question will be immediately called.
45. A sponsoring municipality may withdraw a proposed resolution when the resolution is introduced but before the motion is seconded and accepted by the Resolutions Session Chair. In this event, the Resolutions Session Chair shall declare the resolution withdrawn and no further debate or comments will be allowed.
46. Amendments, including “minor amendments” from the floor will be accepted when duly moved and seconded. Amendments, including “minor amendments” are encouraged to be submitted in writing to the Resolutions Session Chair prior to the amendment being introduced but verbal amendments will also be accepted from the floor.
47. The Resolutions Session Chair will rule whether or not an amendment complies with the intent of the original resolution.
48. Debate procedures for an amendment shall be the same as for a resolution as set out in Sections 38 to 45.
49. The conflict of interest guidelines for council votes, as outlined in the *Municipal Government Act*, shall also apply to Convention resolution votes for all delegates. It is incumbent upon each delegate to ensure adherence to this rule.
50. Voting may, at the discretion of the Resolutions Session Chair, be by:
  - (a) a show of hands of eligible voters;
  - (b) electronic means; or
  - (c) paper ballot.
51. The number of votes necessary for any resolution to pass is a simple majority of votes cast for that resolution (50 per cent plus one vote).
52. As long as there is a quorum present (Section 30), the Resolutions Session shall not be closed until all resolutions listed in the agenda are debated and voted upon, or the allotted time for the Resolutions Session has expired, unless the majority of delegates present vote to extend the allotted time.
53. Resolutions which are not debated at a Convention Resolutions Session because of insufficient time or lack of quorum will be considered by the Municipal Governance Committee, with its recommendations, to a meeting of the AUMA Board of Directors following the Convention.

## Carried Resolutions

54. Resolutions carried by the membership:
- (a) shall not be amended or modified by the Municipal Governance Committee or the AUMA Board of Directors except as provided for in this Section.
  - (b) will be referred to the relevant AUMA Standing Committee which will
    - (i) develop policy statements and make a recommendation to the AUMA Board of Directors; or
    - (ii) in the event that the AUMA Standing Committee determines that the background information or Preamble are materially incorrect or misleading, may recommend to the Board amendments to background information or Preamble.
55. The policy statements developed by the relevant AUMA Standing Committee(s) shall be reviewed and approved by the AUMA Board of Directors, following which each statement will be sent to the relevant Minister(s).
56. The AUMA Chief Executive Officer will collect all advocacy responses and prepare a status of resolutions inventory on the AUMA website. The status of resolutions inventory will include the responses and an indication of what (if any) follow up action AUMA will take with regards to any resolution for which the advocacy was not successful.
57. Resolutions brought forward by regular members have an active life of up to three (3) years if not successfully completed before then, following which they are deemed inactive. AUMA Board-sponsored Policy Position Papers are considered “active” until the AUMA Board of Directors deems them to be completed or inactive.

## **2017 Resolutions**

### **CATEGORY STRATEGIC/BUSINESS PLAN SCOPE**

#### **AUMA Resolutions Policy:**

The **Strategic/Business Plan Scope** category contains matters related to implementing the AUMA strategic and/or business plans.

1 resolution is recommended under this category

**WHEREAS** the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association (AUMA) and the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties (AAMDC) each have over 100 years of experience in supporting Alberta’s municipalities;

**WHEREAS** AUMA and AAMDC share a common goal to enable strong, vibrant and sustainable communities;

**WHEREAS** the member municipalities of each association need to work more collaboratively together to deliver municipal infrastructure and services within and outside of their individual boundaries;

**WHEREAS** given the common goals of rural and urban municipalities, the associations themselves have recognized their own need for greater collaboration and have been able to reach consensus on many policy, advocacy and program matters;

**WHEREAS** the experiences of other provinces like Manitoba and Ontario illustrate that having one association to represent all municipalities with a unified policy and advocacy position has a more robust impact with federal and provincial governments;

**WHEREAS** combining our respective policy and advocacy resources would expand our impact, lower costs, and increase our sustainability; and

**WHEREAS** there is an opportunity for the associations to unite their efforts in providing property and casualty insurance, retirement and employee benefits, and utilities so that instead of competing with each other we can improve services to our members, reduce costs and provide the best possible pricing for our members, while combatting competition from the private sector so that our modest proceeds can be used to fund other services to help municipalities.

**IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT** the AUMA invite AAMDC to engage in exploratory discussions to merge our associations into one new municipal association.

**BACKGROUND:**

AUMA and AAMDC have been operating as separate municipal organizations since the early 1900s. Both associations provide member-based advocacy and business services to municipalities. AUMA represents 269 of Alberta’s urban municipalities and AAMDC represents 69 counties and municipal districts. Some municipalities are full voting members of both associations, while others are associate members for the purpose of acquiring business services.

AUMA and AAMDC jointly own the Elected Official Education Program and Municipal Climate Change Action Centre. In addition, our associations are accustomed to working collaboratively to provide resources and tools to build municipal capacity and advocate on municipal issues and opportunities through our participation on committees and correspondence and meetings with other governments and stakeholders.

As AUMA and AAMDC each provide business services such as insurance, benefits, water and utilities, we compete with each other to serve the needs of urban and rural municipalities. While each association has a combination of urban and rural municipal clients, our respective market shares are at risk given the emergence of private sector competitors who would like to attract our respective clients. Instead of

competing with each other, AUMA and AAMDC need to join forces to combat this competition so we can continue to provide quality service at low cost to our members.

## **2017 Resolutions**

### **CATEGORY PROVINCIAL SCOPE**

#### **AUMA Resolutions Policy:**

The **Provincial Scope** category contains resolutions that address matters of significance to all or most municipalities in the province.

13 resolutions are recommended under this Category.

**WHEREAS** Section 21 of the *Alberta Capital Finance Authority Act* provides that: 'The business of the corporation (the Alberta Capital Finance Authority, stated hereafter as the corporation) is to provide local authorities that are its shareholders with financing for capital projects';

**WHEREAS** Section 32(1) of the *Alberta Capital Finance Authority Act* provides that a local authority may borrow money from the Corporation in any form or manner and on any terms that are acceptable to the Corporation;

**WHEREAS** Section I(g) of the *Alberta Capital Finance Authority Act* defines local authority as: 'a city, an educational authority, a health authority, a municipal authority, regional authority or a town' and does not include housing foundations and other non-profit housing organizations;

**WHEREAS** Section 271 (c) of the *Municipal Government Act* states that the Minister of Municipal Affairs may make regulations respecting how debt limits for a municipality are determined;

**WHEREAS** the Minister of Municipal Affairs has established Alberta Regulation No. 255/2000 for the purpose of calculating the debt limit of a municipality;

**WHEREAS** the stated mission of the Alberta Capital Finance Authority is: 'To provide local authorities within the Province with flexible funding for capital projects at the lowest possible cost';

**WHEREAS** housing foundations and non-profit housing organizations are created for the public benefit to deliver affordable housing options and deliver a public good;

**WHEREAS** a portion of the debt associated with all of these foundations and non-profit organizations currently resides within various municipalities' debt;

**WHEREAS** municipalities incur debt to both address significant deferred maintenance and infrastructure deficits and invest in the infrastructure required to ensure the sustainability and viability of these foundations and non-profit organizations; and

**WHEREAS** Alberta's Provincial Affordable Housing Strategy focuses on a sustainable systems so housing providers can better support Albertans if the housing system is financially sustainable.

**IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT** that the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association request that the Government of Alberta make the appropriate regulatory and legislative amendments to allow non-profit housing organizations, foundations, authorities, and other similar entities to borrow directly from the Alberta Capital Finance Authority.

**BACKGROUND:**

As housing foundations and similar non-profits seek to address affordable housing pressures for seniors and other vulnerable groups, their efforts are being limited through provincial regulatory and/or legislative barriers for debt financing. While they are providing a much-needed public service and are capital intensive, they are excluded from applying directly to the Alberta Capital Finance Authority for debt financing.

Without access to such debt financing, these organizations may seek funding indirectly through agreements with local authorities such as municipalities. As these arrangements impact municipalities' provincially established debt limits, housing foundations and similar non-profit affordable housing organizations face municipally imposed limits on their borrowing capacities, which impacts the ability of foundations to fulfil their mandates.

This proposed resolution seeks to remove these regulatory and legislative barriers and support the appropriate and efficient development and maintenance of affordable housing options throughout the Province of Alberta.

**AUMA Comments:**

- AUMA does not have a current policy position on this specific issue.



**WHEREAS** the Government of Canada has tabled Bill C-45, known as the Cannabis Act, to legalize the use and possession of recreational marijuana;

**WHEREAS** Bill C-45 (the Cannabis Act) does not adequately outline the individual powers Provincial and Municipal Governments will have in enforcing the consumption and possession of marijuana in their own boundaries;

**WHEREAS** Bill C-45 does not provide sufficient preventive measures from young persons (defined as 12-18 years of age) buying, possessing or consuming cannabis;

**WHEREAS** healthy residents, families and neighborhoods are fundamental to the effective operation and success of municipalities;

**WHEREAS** there is not adequately-proven technology to test for cannabis impairment in safety-sensitive positions;

**WHEREAS** the impairment of municipal workers and citizens constitutes a high risk liability towards the safety for all municipalities;

**WHEREAS** the short timeline for municipalities to create regulations may not be sufficient to create policies and regulatory strategies by July 1, 2018, creating the situation where business enterprises would have the opportunity to develop in the municipality contrary to the policy desires of Councils; and

**WHEREAS** the impact of Bill C-45 will result in increased operating expenditures for municipalities to enforce a new suite of regulations.

**IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT** the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association (AUMA) lobby the Government of Canada to repeal the Cannabis Act (Bill C-45), and request that the Government of Alberta work with AUMA to advocate for the repeal of that Act.

**BACKGROUND:**

The introduction and first reading of Bill C-45 by the Government of Canada has instigated a process by which a significant extra burden and responsibility could be placed on communities to govern and direct a legal framework associated with the legalization and regulation of cannabis, thereby decreasing the capacity of the municipality to deal with other situations should they arise.

**AUMA Comments:**

- AUMA's current policy position includes requesting regulations well in advance of implementation to provide sufficient time for municipalities to prepare required bylaws relating to restrictions on production, distribution, and consumption activities, and applicable enforcement. As well, AUMA requested that community peace officers be considered as a component of the enforcement activities (and will need funding for training and equipment), and that national building code standards will need to be reviewed to ensure appropriate provisions are in place for home grows. See AUMA's [Marijuana Municipal Resources webpage](#).

**WHEREAS** Section 21 of the Disaster Services Act (now Emergency Management Act) was amended in 2011 eliminating the ability of a municipality to delegate authority to declare a state of local emergency to an individual or committee;

**WHEREAS** in effect, the amendment requires either a council vote or vote of a regional commission or joint body of two or more local authorities to declare a state of local emergency; and

**WHEREAS** this change makes it nearly impossible to declare a state of local emergency in a timely manner, which could delay support and assistance to residents in a time of emergency.

**IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT** the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association request that the Provincial Government amend the Emergency Services Act to enable a designated officer of municipality to declare a state of emergency, without resolution.

**BACKGROUND:**

Section 21 of the *Disaster Services Act*, the predecessor (prior to 2011) to the current *Emergency Services Act*, indicated:

“(4) A local authority may delegate any of its powers and duties under this Act to a committee composed of a member or members of the local authority.”

This wording would have allowed Council to delegate declaratory authority to a small Committee or an individual Council member. By way of example, the City of Calgary delegated authority to their Local Emergency Committee, which is composed of two individuals – the Mayor and one other member of Council as designated by the Mayor. The City of Edmonton similarly delegated authority to a committee, comprised of all members of council, but in an emergency, the City Manager can call a meeting with one hour’s notice and those in attendance constitute a quorum. However, in 2011, the Provincial Government changed Section 21 to read:

“Declaration of state of local emergency

21(1) A local authority may, at any time when it is satisfied that an emergency exists or may exist in its municipality, by resolution or, in the case of the Minister responsible for the Municipal Government Act, the Minister responsible for the Special Areas Act or a park superintendent of a national park, by order, make a declaration of a state of local emergency relating to all or any part of the municipality.”

Notwithstanding Council’s wide powers of delegation under the *Municipal Government Act*, the legislation’s silence regarding potential delegates appears to prohibit the municipality’s ability to delegate authority to an individual designated officer (Mayor) or a committee. Under the new wording of the Act, declaration and termination of a state of local emergency must be done by resolution of the local authority (defined in that Act as Council). It may delegate this declaratory responsibility to a regional commission or a joint body of two or more local authorities. Both of these options are logistically cumbersome and make it near impossible for a municipality to declare a state of local emergency in a timely manner, which could delay support and assistance to residents in an emergency.

**AUMA Comments:**

- AUMA does not have a current policy position on this specific issue.

**WHEREAS** the Minister of Municipal Affairs is designated as the Minister responsible for the Emergency Management Act;

**WHEREAS** a Director of Emergency Management is appointed by the local authority to prepare and coordinate emergency plans, act as the director of emergency operations on behalf of the emergency management agency, and coordinate all emergency services and other resources used in an emergency including emergency social services plans and resources;

**WHEREAS** the Emergency Social Services is housed in the Ministry of Community and Social Services, where the structure of support to local authorities that is currently available through the Alberta Emergency Management Agency is being recreated, duplicating efforts and creating confusion for local authorities in how best to communicate with the province on planning, training, and responding to emergencies in a holistic sense;

**WHEREAS** the Alberta Emergency Response Plan defines the Provincial Operations Centre as the entity responsible for the coordination of provincial supports to the local authority during an emergency to ensure a common understanding and prioritization of all requests for assistance, as well as to provide a single coordination point for local authorities to access all provincial ministries; and

**WHEREAS** during the 2011 Slave Lake Wildfire, the 2013 Southern Alberta Floods, and the 2016 Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo Wildfire, the disconnection of emergency social services into a separate provincial ministry (in the case of the 2016 wildfire this was formalized into a separate coordination centre, known as the Provincial Emergency Social Services Emergency Coordination Centre) created communication challenges, confusion around roles and responsibilities, duplication of effort, and disjointed policies and supports provided to evacuees.

**IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT** the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association urge the Province of Alberta to consolidate Emergency Social Services and Emergency Management into a single, all-hazards, public safety oriented government ministry to eliminate duplication and enhance coordination of provincial support to local authorities.

**BACKGROUND:**

Alberta has had a number of large-scale disasters recently, which present and opportunity for learning and improvement. Through the Slave Lake Wildfire, Southern Alberta Floods, and the Wood Buffalo Wildfire, one common recommendation is for better integration of emergency social services and emergency management. Many municipalities have adopted this approach and are incorporating emergency social services into municipal plans, training, exercises, and responses. Provincially, however, these two inter-connected pieces are currently managed through two separate ministries, which has led to communication and coordination challenges.

The Government of Alberta adopted the ICS and mandated that all provincial organizations and ministries shall use ICS as their incident management systems. One of the foundational principles of ICS, which is United of Command, is designed to address this inherent challenge of a multi-agency response. The separation of emergency social service and emergency management into two different provincial ministries undermines this

foundational principle by introducing a dual reporting structure and creating an unnatural division in what should be a coordinated response. Unlike other provincial ministries with clear jurisdictional authority over specific elements of a response (such as Environment, Forestry, or Health), the mandate for emergency social services at the local level falls under the Director of Emergency Management.

Emergency Social Services cannot be effectively separated from the response without a significant, detrimental impact on the people affected by the disaster. Creating this separation results in loss of coordination, communication breakdowns, and conflicting messages to evacuees who need certainty in order to make decisions about their homes and businesses.

Each of the past three large-scale disasters in Alberta has resulted in the recommendation of closer integration of emergency social services into the overall response. In the Lesser Slave Lake Regional Urban Interface Wildfire – Lessons Learned Final Report (KPMG, 2012), one of the primary recommendations was to “fully implement the Incident Command System so that emergency response roles and mandates are firmly established within a single, clear chain of command”, especially regarding “Disaster Social Services, Consequence Management Officers, the NGO Council, First Nations, the Red Cross, and the Fire Commissioner” (pg. 165). This highlights the need for a fully-integrated response with a clear chain of command, making no distinction between traditional response resources (e.g. Fire Commissioner) and emergency social services (Disaster Social Services, the NGO Council, and the Red Cross). The Review and Analysis of the Government of Alberta’s Response to and Recovery from 2013 Floods (MNP, 2015) report stressed the urgent need for a provincial emergency social services framework that created a unified approach to delivering ESS services, acknowledging that “the lack of a unified approach to these elements is linked to the overarching ESS challenge at the provincial level” (pg. 43). The May 2016 Wood Buffalo Wildfire Post-Incident Assessment Report (KPMG, 2017) recommends the integration of provincial emergency social services into Provincial Operations Centre to streamline communication, coordination, and support to local authorities (pg. 96).

It is acknowledged that The Review and Analysis of the Government of Alberta’s Response to and Recovery from 2013 Floods (MNP, 2015) explicitly suggests the Ministry of Human Services is best positioned to lead the ESS framework and program (pg. 84). Part of the justification for this rationale is that “social service expertise” resides in Human Services at the provincial level. However, in emergencies, the direct delivery of social services is done by the local authority, supported by non-governmental organizations and provincial ministries, and not the other way around. Likewise, recovery “is a local authority’s responsibility” (May 2016 Wood Buffalo Wildfire Post-Incident Assessment Report, KPMG, 2017, pg. 109), where provincial financial and programming support is needed for success, but must be community-led to be most effective. It is essential to prioritize the human impact of disasters and ensure this does not become lost in the overall response, but this issue can be better addressed through more integrated training for local authorities on their responsibilities under the Emergency Management Act, which includes emergency social services. Local authorities would be best served by a well-coordinated, integrated provincial approach to emergency management and emergency social services.

It is clear the frequency and impact of large-scale disasters is increasing as a result of climate change. Municipalities in Alberta are working towards closer integration and coordination between emergency social services and emergency management under the authority of the Director of Emergency Management. This progressive approach should be reflected at the provincial level to align training, planning, and responding to emergencies in a clear, unified manner.

**AUMA Comments:**

- AUMA does not have a current policy position on this specific issue.

**WHEREAS** Section 668 of the *Municipal Government Act* allows municipalities to take an additional 5% of municipal and school reserve land in addition to that required under Section 666 of the *Municipal Government Act*; and

**WHEREAS** Section 668 of the *Municipal Government Act* is worded in such a way that makes it impractical for municipalities to make use of the provision.

**IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT** the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association request that the Provincial Government amend Section 668 of the *Municipal Government Act* to enable it to be utilized by municipalities.

**BACKGROUND:**

Currently, municipalities are allowed to take 10% of the parcel of land (less the land required to be provided as an environmental reserve and the land made subject to an environmental reserve easement) as municipal reserve, school reserve, or municipal and school reserve (MGA S.666 (2), 2000). The planning for this is done at the Area Structure Plan (ASP) stage, but the land is taken at the time of subdivision.

Additionally, Section 668 of the MGA allows municipalities to take an additional 5% of municipal and school reserve at densities of 30 or more units per hectare based on a proposed subdivision. Planning for the 5% at the subdivision level has proven too impractical for municipalities to be able to implement for the following reasons:

- Section 668 provides for the acquisition of additional land, but not money in place (cash in lieu);
- Taking the additional land at the subdivision level does not result in usable additional municipal reserve to serve the purposes of a neighbourhood; and
- Taking the additional land at the subdivision level has the potential to require an Area Structure Plan amendment if the municipal reserve taken varies from the ASP.

This is the first time this resolution has been submitted by the City of St. Albert. There was an AUMA resolution passed in 2013 with respect to “School Sites for our Communities Future” which outlined the need for an increase in the initial allowable percentage of municipal reserve land that can be taken from 10% to 15%. This proposed increase did not include the additional 5% that is available to municipalities in higher-density areas. This proposed resolution differs from the former in that it is not seeking to increase the percentage of municipal or school reserve, it is seeking to amend a section of the *MGA* to enable municipalities to practically implement it.

The City of St. Albert raised this issue in the course of the *MGA* Consultations conducted by Municipal Affairs. The Ministry acknowledged that municipalities are not using the additional 5% made available to them in Section 668 and asked why. The City of St. Albert hosted a session in January 2016 with the Cities of Edmonton, Leduc, Spruce Grove, Red Deer, and Airdrie and invited representatives from the Provincial Government. The issue of why municipalities are not using Section 668 was subsequently more thoroughly examined, and it was determined that because of the wording specifying the 5% be taken based on densities at the subdivision level, it is impractical for municipalities to implement.

**AUMA Comments:**

- AUMA does not have a current policy position on this specific issue.

**WHEREAS** telecommunication is vital to the national economy and security and is the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and through this Federal jurisdiction telecommunication towers locations are approved by Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED for short, formerly Industry Canada) based on guidelines for telecommunication towers for site selection and public consultation;

**WHEREAS** municipalities encourage telecommunication providers to participate in planning of new communities, establishing appropriate locations and promoting co-location to minimize the total number of telecommunication tower sites encouraging efficient land utilization;

**WHEREAS** municipalities strongly encourage locations on existing structures or buildings in established communities and the use of design features, colour and landscaping to screen telecommunication facilities; and

**WHEREAS** municipalities encourage the location of cell phone towers be identified early in the planning and development process and in a manner which minimizes the effects on residents, lessens visual impact, and respects natural and human heritage features and sensitive land uses to the greatest extent possible.

**IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT** the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association urge the Federal Government to require telecommunication companies work in partnership with municipalities early in the planning process to select, not just identify, the location of future telecommunication facilities.

**BACKGROUND:**

As per Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada's website, "the demand for wireless services is growing, and is expected to continue as more and more Canadians use smartphones and other mobile devices. To accommodate this demand, more towers will be needed."

Wireless companies have been working with municipalities in the site selection process and are required to clearly notify and consult with the public. During this process municipalities often hear concerns from residents regarding cell tower locations. Common concerns include health considerations, aesthetics and negative effects to property values. Balancing these concerns can be challenging when residents also expect good wireless service.

Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED) has set out in their guidelines very explicate expectations related to health and safety standards, public consultation, settling disputes and siting decisions. Municipalities strongly supports ISED's push for wireless providers to co-locate therefore reducing the number of sites. Municipalities also endorses the "Antenna System Siting Protocol Template" that the Canadian Wireless Telecommunications Association and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities launched in February 2013.

There are areas for improvement in the planning process of new neighbourhoods. One area includes wireless providers participating in the planning process to identify sites before development occurs. Identifying land uses and utilities in the planning approval process would minimize the 'not in my backyard' (NIMBY) effect in the site selection process as all planning processes include public consultation. It is also important for wireless companies to be more aware of the aesthetics that can be linked to negative effects to property values.

Wireless companies have demonstrated very unique and creative ways to blend towers into the areas surrounds. It is time that they are more aggressive about aesthetic features of their towers especially in residential areas.

**AUMA Comments:**

- AUMA does not have a policy position on this specific issue.

**WHEREAS** there is public interest in the operation of, attendance at and participation in combative sports events in Alberta;

**WHEREAS** section 535.1 of the *Municipal Government Act* (MGA) contemplates the establishment of a commission by bylaw for the sanctioning of combative sports;

**WHEREAS** several communities in Alberta have established commissions;

**WHEREAS** there appears to be little coordination or consistency amongst the existing commissions throughout Alberta;

**WHEREAS** there are inherent risks to the operation and regulation of combative sports events that warrant a more detailed and coordinated approach;

**WHEREAS** there is a responsibility to provide oversight to combative sporting events that sets ethical and safety standards;

**WHEREAS** the regulation and sanctioning of combative sports is not a core local government function or service; and

**WHEREAS** other provinces in Canada have created commissions at the provincial level.

**IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT** the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association urge the provincial government to create a provincial commission to sanction combative sports events throughout the Province of Alberta.

**BACKGROUND:**

This resolution was originally introduced by the Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo in 2013. While the AUMA adopted the resolution, in 2014 Tourism, Parks and Recreation provided the following response:

It is more appropriate for municipalities to make this determination at a local level through knowing the community and available resources. The response also indicated that these combative sports events should be guided by rules and standards for each particular sport that are developed and monitored by various provincial, national and international oversight bodies.

The AUMA rejected this response, however, this resolution has now expired.

Similar to the Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo, The City of Red Deer over the past two decades has received requests and statements of interest from the public, expressing desire to hold and attend combative sports events, such as mixed martial arts events.

Alberta is the only province in the country without a combative sport commission. This has been a matter of ongoing advocacy by many municipalities including the City of Edmonton, the Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo and The City of Red Deer.



Alberta's Municipal Government Act (MGA), specifically section 535.1, makes some provision for the establishment of a municipal combative sports commission through bylaw. At the present time, there are combative sports commissions in Edmonton, Calgary, Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Grande Prairie, Cold Lake and Penhold. The bylaws in place vary significantly from one municipality to another, which means that there is no coordination or consistency in the regulation of events throughout the province.

**AUMA Comments:**

- This resolution is consistent with AUMA's past advocacy on this issue via a 2013 resolution, which has expired. The province did not change its position and continued to indicate that this is a matter appropriate for local decision making.

**WHEREAS** head injuries are the number one cause of serious injury and death to youth participating in wheeled activities such as skateboarding, in-line skating, using a scooter and cycling;<sup>1</sup>

**WHEREAS** on average the human skull is less than one centimeter thick and can be shattered by an impact of only 7 to 10 km/h;<sup>2</sup>

**WHEREAS** wearing a helmet while participating in wheeled activities can reduce the participant's risk of head injury by at least 45 percent;<sup>3</sup> and

**WHEREAS** Section 112 of the Vehicle Equipment Regulation (VER) only requires approved helmets be worn by children/youth riding bicycles.

**IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT** the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association requests the Government of Alberta (GOA) amend the Vehicle Equipment Regulation to include mandatory helmet requirements for riders younger than 18 years of age while skateboarding, in-line skating and using a scooter.

**BACKGROUND:**

The Government of Alberta enacted mandatory helmet legislation for bicycle riders under the age of 18 on May 1, 2002. Only four years later, helmet use in Alberta increased from 75% to 92% among children younger than 13 years of age and from 30% to 63% among youth aged 13 to 17.<sup>4</sup>

The existing helmet legislation remains effective but additional wheeled activities such as skateboarding, in-line skating and riding a scooter have grown in popularity among youth and are often used interchangeably. These activities represent a similar degree of risk as bicycles, yet they remain omitted in the current helmet legislation.

Wheeled activities are a great way to enjoy the outdoors. Establishing mandatory helmet rules for all wheeled activities consistently across municipalities and leveraging Provincial resources towards education campaigns is recommended to both increase helmet use and reduce the risk of head injuries for children and youth.

References:

<sup>1</sup>(n.d.). Johns Hopkins Medicine, based in Baltimore, Maryland. For Parents: Bicycle, In-Line Skating, Skateboard, and Scooter Safety | Johns Hopkins Medicine Health Library. Retrieved August 1, 2017, from [http://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/healthlibrary/conditions/non-traumatic\\_emergencies/for\\_parents\\_bicycle\\_in-line\\_skating\\_skateboard\\_safety\\_85,P00818/](http://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/healthlibrary/conditions/non-traumatic_emergencies/for_parents_bicycle_in-line_skating_skateboard_safety_85,P00818/)

<sup>2</sup>(2012, June 20). Montreal Children's Hospital. Calling for a law making bicycle helmets mandatory for children under the age of 18 | Montreal Children's Hospital. Retrieved August 1, 2017, from <http://www.thechildren.com/news-and-events/latest-news/calling-law-making-bicycle-helmets-mandatory-children-under-age-18>

<sup>3</sup>(2016, March). Safe Kids Worldwide. Bicycle, Skate and Skateboard Safety Fact Sheet (PDF) | Safe Kids Worldwide. Retrieved August 1, 2017, from <http://www.safekids.org/fact-sheet/bicycle-skate-and-skateboard-safety-fact-sheet-2016-pdf>

<sup>4</sup> Karkhaneh M, Rowe BH, Saunders LD, Voaklander DC, Hagel BE. Bicycle helmet use four years after the introduction of helmet legislation in Alberta, Canada. *Accident Analysis and Prevention* 2011;43(3):788-96

**AUMA Comments:**

- AUMA has a policy supporting mandatory helmet requirements for riders who use ATVs, snowmobiles, dirt bikes and other off-highway vehicles on public land, but it does not currently cover the ridership targeted in this resolution.

**WHEREAS** municipalities, their residents and the economy benefit from long-term, stable financial commitments from other orders of government;

**WHEREAS** municipalities receive approximately eight (8) cents of every tax dollar generated by all three levels of government;

**WHEREAS** municipalities are limited in their ability to raise needed revenue other than through property taxes;

**WHEREAS** municipalities are responsible for over half of the public infrastructure;

**WHEREAS** the population of Alberta is expected to grow by nearly one million over the coming decade, putting increased pressure on infrastructure and municipal assets;

**WHEREAS** the Government of Alberta has a history of revenue sharing with municipal governments through programs like the current Municipal Sustainability Initiative (MSI);

**WHEREAS** the Government of Alberta has announced a two-year continuation of the Municipal Sustainability Initiative while they review the program to reaffirm outcomes; and

**WHEREAS** the Government of Alberta has not made changes to the provision of statutory grants or provincial revenue sharing through any of their proposed amendments to the Municipal Government Act.

**IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT** that the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association (AUMA) seek a commitment from the Minister of Municipal Affairs to timely, inclusive and comprehensive consultations with municipalities on the future of provincial revenue sharing to occur within the first six month of 2018 to ensure adequate time for feedback to be incorporated prior to expiry of the Municipal Sustainability Initiative (MSI) and that the details of those consultations are shared with municipalities sufficiently in advance.

**BACKGROUND:**

Most municipalities rely on provincial and federal revenue transfers to address the infrastructure deficit. The federal New Building Canada Fund and provincial MSI programs are just two examples. MSI was a welcomed program that was refined with time to allow municipalities to address their local infrastructure priorities and the two-year extension is greatly appreciated.

As complex organizations delivering meaningful services to citizens, all municipalities in Alberta rely on stable and predictable provincial revenue sharing. Funding of this nature has been leveraged in the past to successfully build and rehabilitate critical community infrastructure, support Albertans and plan for the future. The projects enabled by MSI over the past decade have had significant, positive community impacts. Without long-term predictable funding from the Province, the future of important community-building, collaborative, and climate-action initiatives and projects will be jeopardized. Certainty allows municipalities to continue work on projects that will keep Albertans working and stimulate the economy while getting the best value for those investments.

It is critical that municipalities are acknowledged as a valued partner in making the lives of everyday Albertans better. In order to hold the Government of Alberta accountable in this regard, municipalities must be persistent in seeking an open and formal consultation process where the future of provincial revenue sharing can occur.

**AUMA Comments:**

- A similar resolution was approved as a Request for Decision at AUMA's 2017 June Mayors' Caucuses on each of the three days of the caucus.
- AUMA has been working with the province to provide input on a funding model, but has not received an indication of when consultations on MSI will begin.

**WHEREAS** the Province of Alberta is responsible for providing ambulance service in Alberta;

**WHEREAS** the Province of Alberta, through Alberta Health Services, offers the “Alberta Medical First Response Program” which is a voluntary program which Alberta municipalities can participate in to provide medical first response service;

**WHEREAS** no compensation is provided to municipalities participating in the program, other than for a very limited amount of equipment and training; and

**WHEREAS** the service provided by the municipalities participating in this program is very valuable and saves lives.

**IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT** the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association requests the Government of Alberta to provide direct financial compensation on a full cost-recovery basis to all Alberta Medical First Response agencies for every call responded to.

**BACKGROUND:**

The Province of Alberta, through Alberta Health Services, is responsible for providing ambulance service in Alberta. Previously, ambulance service was community based. Fire services remain a municipal responsibility. This separation between emergency services can pose a challenge to communities wanting to provide an integrated service in the times of greatest need.

The “Alberta Medical First Response Program” is a voluntary program which works towards closing this separation. Under this program, municipalities may voluntarily commit to providing emergency medical first response. There are five levels of service that can be provided by the participating municipalities which run the range from providing Standard First Aid up to and including Advance Life Support.

For participating in this program, municipalities are provided with access to equipment, training and other support through Alberta Health Services. Under the terms and conditions of the program any such support isn’t guaranteed. Currently, the monetary value of the support provided is \$3,000 per Medical First Response agency per year. This provides things such as training and equipment. **There is currently no direct monetary compensation provided by the Province to these volunteer agencies.**

The program requires dedication from the participating municipalities in the form of reports and data submission and they must follow a number of protocols and procedures established by Alberta Health Services.

While many municipalities participate in the program as to do so can save lives and provide for a better level of care to patients than ambulance service alone (which can, at times be delayed due to call load or other reasons), providing this service places a burden on municipal resources both through responding to medical emergency calls as well as for filing the requisite documentation.

The City of Wetaskiwin has noted an inequity that exists in this program in that there is no monetary compensation provided to municipalities for providing this service. This is counterintuitive, we feel, as it discourages participation in the program, especially for the smaller municipalities of which there are many.

We believe that there should be monetary compensation provided by the Province for delivering this service and that the compensation should be **full** cost-recovery based. Not only will this put the service more in reach of municipalities of meager means but providing this compensation is simply fair and equitable as municipalities participating in this program are providing a service that is truly part of the Province's mandate.

**AUMA Comments:**

- AUMA does not have a current policy position on this specific issue.

**WHEREAS** Alberta Health Services has established policy and practice whereby post-operative and other patients who may need medical equipment are being released from hospital relatively quickly;

**WHEREAS** Alberta Health Services has established a policy in which Home Care providers will no longer lend out medical equipment;

**WHEREAS** in rural communities, seniors, those with chronic illness and disease, and those experiencing injury, may not have access to affordable medical equipment, even on a rental basis, and there may be restrictions on time allowances;

**WHEREAS** the Lending Cupboard Society of Alberta lends out about 4,300 pieces of equipment, at no cost, to central Albertans;

**WHEREAS** this type of no-charge medical equipment lending initiative saves Alberta Health Services substantial amounts of money each year; and

**WHEREAS** both urban and rural communities across the province have expressed a strong need for a local initiative similar to The Lending Cupboard, which will:

- Allow seniors to age in place;
- Improve health outcomes and quality of life for seniors, those with chronic illness and disease, and those experiencing injury; and
- Contribute to the vibrancy and wellness of communities across the province;

**IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT** the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association advocate to the provincial government to encourage:

- That Alberta Health Services increase its funding support to all organizations, such as the Lending Cupboard Society of Alberta, and include annual incremental increases;
- That Alberta Seniors and Housing and Persons with Developmental Disabilities (PDD) also support all organizations, such as the Lending Cupboard Society of Alberta; and
- That these government ministries support municipalities and communities across Alberta to develop local medical equipment lending initiatives.

**BACKGROUND:**

Community Needs Assessment: <http://lendingcupboard.ca/news-events/>

The Lending Cupboard was established in Red Deer to fill a need for individuals who may not necessarily be able to afford equipment post operation or injury; they provide equipment indefinitely for some patients regardless of income. The Lending Cupboard is based in Red Deer providing equipment to patients predominantly in Central Alberta, however with the growing need they have also been loaning equipment to patients throughout the province. Following for reference is a listing by community of equipment disbursement. Note that 54 municipalities are listed as benefitting from this centralized service.

Additionally there are other organizations that are looking to follow the model of the Lending Cupboard in order to provide for the local need to patients: Medicine Hat, Wetaskiwin, and Rocky Mountain House have or



are trying to establish a medical equipment lending facilities. The Lending Cupboard is working with these local organizations to help provide assistance and expertise. The Red Cross also has a program to loan equipment to patients, but they have more stringent timelines to how long a piece of equipment can be loaned.

Alberta Health Services does provide the Lending Cupboard funding however it is for specific patients of Total Joint Arthroplasty. For all other patients, these organizations are trying to fill a gap in the system without any overall support; and doctors and nurses are constantly referring patients to the Lending Cupboard for equipment. The listing below demonstrates the distribution of over 9,500 pieces of equipment of which only 350 are for Total Joint Arthroplasty (TJA).

**The Lending Cupboard Society of Alberta  
Client Transaction Count**

Transactions between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2017

<b>City</b>	<b>All Count</b>	<b>TJA Count</b>
Airdrie	15	
Alder Flats	2	
Alhambra	8	2
Alix	46	5
Bashaw	15	
Benalto	40	1
Bentley	119	13
Big Valley	4	
Birchcliff Summer Village	5	
Blackfalds	234	3
Bluffton	16	
Bowden	79	1
Breton	6	
Buck Lake	4	
Byemoor	1	
Calgary	29	
Camrose	1	
Carbon	4	
Caroline	21	1
Carstairs	18	3
Clive	56	
Condor	14	1
Consort	2	
Coronation	2	
Craigmyle	2	
Cremona	2	1
Crossfield	4	
Daysland	3	
Delburne	49	3
Delia	3	
Dickson	2	

<b>City</b>	<b>All Count</b>	<b>TJA Count</b>
Didsbury	72	6
Donalda	1	
Drayton Valley	9	1
Drumheller	11	3
Duchess	1	
Eckville	102	4
Edberg	3	2
Edmonton	12	
Elnora	11	
Erskine	5	
Falun	1	
Ferintosh	3	
Fort Saskatchewan	1	
Gull Lake	5	
Gwynne	1	
Hanna	3	1
Huxley	5	
Innisfail	451	20
James River Bridge	1	
Jarvis Bay	3	
Killam	4	
Lacombe	612	33
Leslieville	16	2
Linden	6	
Lougheed Hwy	1	
Lousana	2	
Maskwacis	4	
Medicine Hat	3	
Mirror	4	
New Norway	5	
Norglenwold	4	
Okotoks	1	
Olds	164	14
Penhold	102	3
Pine Lake	8	
Ponoka	110	4
Provost	2	
Red Deer	5820	166
Red Deer County	368	19
Rimbey	75	5
Rochon Sands	2	
Rocky Mountain House	137	5
Rosedale Valley	1	
Sherwood Park	2	
Springbrook	40	2
Spruce Grove	1	
Spruceview	15	

City	All Count	TJA Count
St. Albert	1	
Stauffer	3	
Stettler	44	4
Strathmore	4	
Sundre	67	6
Sylvan Lake	384	12
Tees	13	
Three Hills	15	1
Torrington	17	
Trochu	8	
Wainwright	1	
Warburg	2	
Westrose	6	
Wetaskiwin	10	1
Wimborne	5	
Winfield	3	
Total:	9599	348

**AUMA Comments:**

- AUMA does not have a current policy position on this specific issue.

**WHEREAS** there are opportunities for regional trail development which fall outside trail routes designated as Trans Canada Trail;

**WHEREAS** there is a need to connect trail systems already built in neighboring communities, thereby offering safe, economical alternative means of travel;

**WHEREAS** alternative modes of transportation such as walking and biking offer health benefits as well as benefit the environment; and

**WHEREAS** the growing number of bikers and walkers on highways and roadways designed strictly for vehicles increases the likelihood of catastrophic conflict with automobile traffic.

**IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT** the Albertan Urban Municipalities urge the Government of Alberta to provide support and funding to complete non-motorized trail linkages between Urban Municipalities.

**BACKGROUND:**

“Active Transportation” is any human powered transportation and people who use active transportation are most likely to achieve daily physical activity goals. The 2017 Alberta Survey on Physical Activity found that 43% of Albertans are not getting enough physical activity and active transportation provides numerous benefits including:

1. Reduction in the risk of developing chronic health problems including heart disease, cancers, diabetes and mental health issues.
2. Providing economic benefits through reduced personal costs, reduced infrastructure needs, and reduced healthcare spending and boosts to the local economy.
3. Benefits to the Environment through reduced ecological footprint and lower energy consumption.
4. Increased safety by reducing pedestrian and cyclists conflicts with motor vehicles.

Encouraging “Active Transportation” starts by providing safe active transportation infrastructure such as exclusive lanes and interconnected paths. Non-motorized trail linkages between urban municipalities will provide many long term benefits to the citizens and the communities in which they live in.

**AUMA Comments:**

- This resolution is consistent with a 2011 resolution on regional trail linkages outside of the Trans Canada Trail Network, which has expired.

**WHEREAS** 211 is an easy to remember three-digit telephone number that provides reliable information and referrals to community, social, health and government related human services;

**WHEREAS** 211 is available in 175 languages and 18 per cent of Alberta’s population is currently made up of immigrants;

**WHEREAS** 211 is currently available to approximately 70 per cent of the residents of Alberta;

**WHEREAS** 211 is an information service available to many Albertans and a provincial strategy exists to extend the service to all Albertans;

**WHEREAS** the strategy to extend services to all Albertans has been built on the engagement of communities and local volunteer centres;

**WHEREAS** the United Way has been instrumental in bringing 211 to cities in Alberta, and it is now playing a leading role, along with many community partners, to initiate and implement a province-wide service so more people can benefit from the 24 hour support;

**WHEREAS** funding has primarily been from the United Way, Region 6 CFSA and FCSS in Edmonton, Calgary and Bow Valley, and municipalities;

**WHEREAS** the 211 program has long term successful funding in Edmonton and Calgary, funding is needed to extend the service to the balance of the province; and

**WHEREAS** the additional funding needed for a provincial 211 service is expected to cost \$650,000 to start-up with ongoing costs of \$750,000 annually.

**IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT** the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association urge the Province of Alberta to provide a provincial funding source that would provide for 211 services to all Albertans.

**BACKGROUND:**

This resolution was initially introduced to and endorsed by the AUMA in 2010. In June 2011 Alberta Municipal Affairs provided the following response to the resolution:

“211 Alberta currently covers approximately 70 per cent of the citizens of Alberta and supports recommendation 17 of Alberta’s Crime Reduction and Safe Communities Task Force report: Establish a Family Source within the provincial government to provide a central source for information, resources and community connections.

While there are merits to expanding 211 Alberta to the rest of the province, there are significant costs as well. As a result, the Government of Alberta is looking further into this issue with a review to identifying opportunities to:

- Increase efficiencies and reduce duplication of effort;
- Eliminate unnecessary wait times;

- Manage the escalation of issues to crisis by providing the right supports at the right time;
- Increase collaboration and cost-sharing; and
- Slow cost increases and reduce costs.”

Since 2011, 211 has continued to grow but without the commitment of ongoing provincial funding. The AUMA notes that while this resolution was adopted it has now expired.

211 was launched in Edmonton in 2004 and in Calgary in 2005. 211 works to identify a person’s needs and concerns, performs a triage role to identify the most immediate needs and then takes steps to connect the person with appropriate human service organizations;

The 211 service is an enhancement, not a replacement, of local Information & Referral services currently operating across the province. In addition to helping people find the information they need, 211 analyzes data from calls to identify emerging needs, gaps in services and areas of high demand. 211 shares this data with various stakeholders, including local municipalities.

In 2016, daily online chat was added to increase the ways that Albertans can access our service.

A province-wide 211 service will ensure that all people, regardless of where they live, will have equal access to information. For example, this would allow a resident in Lethbridge to easily identify home support options for their elderly parents living in Grande Prairie, or assist an immigrant in finding services once they move to Calgary.

Both costs and benefits are optimized with a province-wide approach. Furthermore, the overall goal is to eventually have 211 services across Canada. By having a province-wide service, it is much easier to plug into a national network, providing rapid and effective service for all Canadians.

Comprehensive research on the costs and benefits of 211 has been conducted in both Canada and the United States. United Way organizations in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, British Columbia and Ontario have worked with a number of organizations, including Deloitte, to develop specific business cases and identify the potential of a 211 service. These studies confirmed the strength of the 211 business cases and the inherent value of the service.

Each of the studies concluded that the measurable benefits of a national system outweigh the costs by a significant margin. Everyone—public, governments and service providers—stand to realize substantial benefits from the time and cost savings that 211 provides.

There are a number of N11 phone numbers utilized by the public for a variety of services. 211 connects you to a full range of non-emergency social, health and government related human services in your community. In Alberta, 311 provides access to the City of Edmonton and the City of Calgary’s municipal information, programs and services. 411 provides access to general telephone directory listings, 511 provides information on Alberta road conditions and 811 provides nurse advice and general health information. Lastly, 911 is an emergency number for medical, fire and police emergencies only.

Alberta 211: <http://ab.211.ca/homepage>

**AUMA Comments:**

- This policy position is consistent with the 2014 resolution on funding 211, which will be expiring this year.

## **2017 Resolutions**

### **CATEGORY EXTRAORDINARY RESOLUTIONS**

#### **AUMA Resolutions Policy:**

A resolution arising from the proceedings of the convention or related to a matter of an urgent nature arising after the resolution deadline may be considered an **Extraordinary Resolution**.

An Extraordinary Resolution deals with an emergent issue of concern to the general membership that has arisen after the June 30 resolution deadline, where a critical aspect of the issue needs to be or will be addressed before the next Convention.

Prior to the merits of any proposed extraordinary resolution being debated, a 2/3 majority vote is required to determine whether it meets the criteria in Section 13 and therefore will be considered at the Resolutions Session.

Extraordinary resolutions accepted for consideration by the Resolutions Session shall be presented following debate of the Provincial Scope resolutions.

**WHEREAS** the 2017 Federal Budget removed the tax exemption for one third of non-accountable expense allowances paid to members of provincial and territorial legislative assemblies and certain municipal office holders effective January 1st 2019;

**WHEREAS** the federal government did not hold consultations on this matter prior to the budget;

**WHEREAS** the appreciation shown for serving the public from the federal government to elected officials has been removed;

**WHEREAS** the removal of this exemption will create less take home pay for elected officials; and

**WHEREAS** each community will need to increase the respective Councillor pay and make up the shortfall from the community tax base.

**IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT** the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association advocate for the Federal Government to provide a minimum tax exemption for elected officials as an acknowledgement and appreciation for the public service being provided.

**BACKGROUND:**

Currently municipal elected officials receive a tax exemption for one third of their non-accountable expense allowances related to the community work they perform under their role. This exemption was originally given by the federal government as an acknowledgement to individuals who contribute to building communities. This is/was appreciated.

Without prior consultation, the federal 2017 Budget removed this exemption/gratitude effective the 2019 taxation year.

This appreciation needs to remain intact. As an example, this could be similar to the federal emergency personnel exemption, removes income tax on the first \$1,000 of income earned by volunteer ambulance technicians, fire fighters, search and rescue, or other types of emergency volunteers.

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities recently adopted a similar resolution.

**AUMA Comments:**

- AUMA does not have a policy on this specific issue.



**WHEREAS** Alberta had 368 deaths associated with fentanyl overdose in 365 days in 2016<sup>1</sup> (1.01 per day);

**WHEREAS** from January 1 to June 30, 2017, the rate of fentanyl overdose related deaths has increased by 29% to 1.3 per day across the province<sup>1</sup>;

**WHEREAS** in Alberta, over the past five years, the number of emergency department visits increased almost ten-fold for heroin poisonings and more than ten-fold for synthetic opioid poisonings (including those related to fentanyl)<sup>2</sup>;

**WHEREAS** the Municipal Government Act in part describes the purpose of a municipality to be to “develop and maintain safe and viable communities”;

**WHEREAS** municipal resources including first responders, Family and Community Support Services (FCSS) departments, enforcement agencies, housing bodies and public education programs are already impacted by, or working directly with, individuals and groups facing the opioid crisis;

**WHEREAS** municipalities maintain close connections to localized non-government organizations working in areas such as harm reduction, housing, health, public education and serving vulnerable populations;

**WHEREAS** notwithstanding ongoing provincial efforts to address the opioid crisis such as the establishment of the Opioid Emergency Response Commission, to date no specific steps have been taken to directly engage municipalities as partners in addressing the crisis; and

**WHEREAS** municipalities have resources and knowledge that could be called upon to develop and execute interventions that are more comprehensive, direct and appropriate to local context.

**IT IS THEREFORE BE RESOLVED THAT** the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association request the Government of Alberta to establish a Provincial/Municipal Working Group on Opioids to directly engage municipalities in addressing the opioid crisis.

**BACKGROUND:**

Alberta had 368 deaths in 2016 associated with fentanyl overdoses. Across Canada, the opioid overdose crisis has been driven by the emergence of fentanyl and other powerful illicit drugs, as well as by inappropriate prescribing practices and poor education about the risks associated with opioids.

In May 2017, the provincial government established a Minister’s Opioid Emergency Response Commission<sup>1</sup>, under the Opioid Emergency Response Regulation in the Public Health Act. The commission will oversee and implement urgent coordinated actions on the opioid crisis, focused on six strategic areas:

- Harm-reduction initiatives
- Treatment
- Prevention
- Enforcement and supply control
- Collaboration
- Surveillance and analytics

The members of the Minister’s Commission are:

- Dr. Karen Grimsrud, Chief Medical Officer of Health for Alberta (co-chair)
- Elaine Hyshka, assistant professor at the University of Alberta’s School of Public Health (co-chair)
- Karen Turner, president of Alberta Addicts Who Educate and Advocate Responsibly (AAWEAR)
- Marliss Taylor, program manager of Streetworks, Edmonton’s needle-distribution program
- Dr. Esther Tailfeathers, physician on Kainai First Nation (Blood Tribe)
- Petra Schulz, parent advocate with Moms Stop the Harm
- Atiya Ashna, Diversity and Community Collaboration specialist
- Staff Sgt. Jason Walker, Calgary Police Service
- Dr. Nicholas Etches, Calgary clinician with expertise in opioid addiction and treatment
- Dr. Karen Mazurek, deputy registrar, College of Physicians and Surgeons
- Kathy Ness, Assistant Deputy Minister, Health Services Delivery Division, Alberta Health
- Bill Sweeney, Senior Assistant Deputy Minister, Public Security Division, Alberta Justice and Solicitor General
- Kathryn Todd, Vice President, Research, Innovation and Analytics, as well as Executive Lead for Seniors, Addiction and Mental Health with Alberta Health Services
- Dr. Gerry Predy, Senior Medical Officer of Health, Alberta Health Services

While not exclusively contained to larger urban municipalities, as the following table<sup>3</sup> shows, a number of cities are being significantly impacted by fentanyl related overdoses and deaths.

Rate (per 100,000 person years) and number of deaths due to an apparent drug overdose related to **fentanyl**, by place of death and city. Jan. 1, 2016 to Jun. 30, 2017:

	2016		2017 YTD*	
	Count	Rate	Count	Rate
<b>Lethbridge</b>	10	10.3	8	16.9
<b>Medicine Hat</b>	4	5.8	0	0.0
<b>Calgary</b>	155	11.7	98	14.9
<b>Red Deer</b>	23	21.0	9	16.3
<b>Edmonton</b>	103	10.6	65	13.3
<b>Fort McMurray</b>	9	11.0	8	19.9
<b>Grande Prairie</b>	10	13.4	9	23.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>14.5</b>

\*YTD = Jan. 1, 2017 to Jun. 30, 2017

**SOURCES:**

1. Alberta's opioid crisis response. (n.d.). Retrieved September 14, 2017, from <https://www.alberta.ca/albertas-opioid-crisis-response.aspx>
2. Canadian Institute for Health Information. *Opioid-Related Harms in Canada*. Ottawa, ON: CIHI; 2017.
3. Government of Alberta, Alberta Health. (2017, August 16). *Opioids and Substances of Misuse Alberta Report, 2017 Q2*. Retrieved September 14, 2017, from <https://open.alberta.ca/dataset/1cfed7da-2690-42e7-97e9-da175d36f3d5/resource/5b2cbe3f-ea27-4688-bdded630ee770ba0/download/Opioids-Substances-Misuse-Report-2017-Q2.pdf>

**AUMA Comments:**

- AUMA does not have a policy on this specific issue

**WHEREAS** the Municipal Government Act charges municipalities to provide and sustain a good quality of life for all citizens;

**WHEREAS** health care is an essential quality of life marker for citizens;

**WHEREAS** the Red Deer Regional Hospital plays an essential role within Alberta Health Services and the Central Alberta zone as a primary health service provider for our citizens and regional population;

**WHEREAS** Red Deer Regional Hospital is the fourth busiest hospital in ALL of Alberta and the busiest referral hospital in All of Alberta;

**WHEREAS** Red Deer has immediate access to over 81 per cent of Alberta's 4 million population within a two hour drive and is a commercial and industrial hub with an immediate trade area of 271,000 people and thus the hospital services much more than a regional population;

**WHEREAS** in a December 2015 Needs Assessment<sup>1</sup> of the Red Deer Regional Hospital, Alberta Health Services stated that:

“Programs which are operating either at or beyond capacity within the Central Zone have been targeted, analyzed and described in this Needs Assessment. These programs are as follows:

- \* Interventional and Procedural Services
- \* Ambulatory Care Services
- \* Emergency Services
- \* Addiction and Mental Health Services
- \* Cardiac Science Services
- \* Clinical Support Services
- \* Maternal Child Services
- \* Non-clinical Support Services” and

**WHEREAS** Red Deer Regional Hospital was previously identified in Government of Alberta infrastructure priorities as the 4th in a list of 17 priorities<sup>2</sup>;

**WHEREAS** in the 2016 Alberta Health Services Multi-Year Facility Infrastructure Capital Submission<sup>3</sup>, the Red Deer Regional Hospital is no longer identified in the list of priorities and was excluded from capital funding;

**WHEREAS** strong community, physician and Red Deer Regional Hospital Foundation support for capital hospital expansion in the Central Zone has been identified;

**WHEREAS** 56% of the Hospital’s patients consistently ARE NOT FROM RED DEER;

**WHEREAS** there is a 50-60% higher mortality rate in the Central Zone due to transportation and rehabilitation issues; and

**WHEREAS** a fully functional Red Deer Regional Hospital benefits all Albertans.

---

<sup>1</sup> Alberta Health Services Needs Assessment: Red Deer Regional Hospital Centre Service & Program Expansion, December 2015

<sup>2</sup> Alberta Health Services 2015 Multi-Year Facility Infrastructure Capital Submission, July 13, 2015

<sup>3</sup> 2016 Multi-Year Facility Infrastructure Capital Submission, December 2016

**IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT** the AUMA urge Government of Alberta to consider reinstating the Red Deer Regional Hospital to the capital priorities list as identified in the 2015 Capital Submission for the purpose of ensuring timely and accessible health service equity for the citizens of the Central Zone.

**AUMA Comments:**

- AUMA does not have a policy on this specific issue