

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF LETHBRIDGE COUNTY HELD AUGUST 18, 2016 IN THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE, LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA.

PRESENT:

Division No. 1	- L. Hickey, Reeve
Division No. 3	- H. Doeve, Deputy Reeve
Division No. 2	- J. Willms
Division No. 4	- K. Benson
Division No. 5	- S. Campbell
Division No. 6	- T. White
Division No. 7	- M. Zeinstra

ADMINISTRATION PRESENT:

Acting/Chief Administrative Officer	- R. Bacon
Director of Corporate Services	- D. Urkow
Director of Community Services	- L. Randle
Recording Secretary	- D. Irwin

REEVE LORNE HICKEY IN THE CHAIR

CALL TO ORDER Reeve Hickey called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Rick Bacon, Acting Chief Administrative Officer and members of Council made the following additions and deletions to the August 18, 2016 agenda.

F5. Malloy Drain Basin Sod Turning/Ribbon Cutting - Possible Dates
K1. In-Camera – Legal Item

381/16 K. BENSON MOVED that Council approve the agenda as amended.
CARRIED

CONFIRMATION B1. Confirmation of Minutes

382/16 S. CAMPBELL MOVED that the August 4, 2016 Council Minutes be approved as presented.
CARRIED

APPOINTMENTS E1. Introduction of Kurtis Kaskiw, Human Resources Coordinator - 1 Year Term

Dana Johnson, Human Resources (HR) Coordinator introduced Mr. Kurtis Kaskiw who will be filling the role of HR Coordinator for a 1 Year Term. Mr. Kaskiw provided a brief history of his professional and educational background. Council welcomed Mr. Kaskiw to Lethbridge County and wished him success on his one year term.

383/16 M. ZEINSTRAS MOVED that item E1. Introduction of Kurtis Kaskiw, HR Coordinator - 1 Year Term be received for information.
CARRIED

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

IN-CAMERA**K1. Legal Matter**

- 384/16 M. ZEINSTRA MOVED that Council go In-Camera at 10:12 a.m. CARRIED
- 385/16 M. ZEINSTRA MOVED that Council come out of In-Camera at 10:30 a.m. CARRIED
- 386/16 M. ZEINSTRA MOVED that County Council receive item K1. Legal Matter for information. CARRIED
- 387/16 S. CAMPBELL MOVED to bring item F1. 2016 Lethbridge County Road Tour back to the table. CARRIED

MUNICIPAL SERVICES**F1. 2016 Lethbridge County Road Tour**

- 388/16 T. WHITE MOVED that County Council chooses the date of Wednesday, October 12, 2016 from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. for the 2016 Lethbridge County Road Tour. CARRIED

F5. Malloy Drain Basin Sod Turning/Ribbon Cutting - Possible Dates

Rick Bacon, Acting CAO advised Council that two possible dates have been established for a Malloy Drain Basin Sod Turning / Ribbon Cutting event with Minister Shannon Phillips as well as MLA Dave Schneider and those dates are September 9, afternoon only, and September 23, 2016.

- 389/16 T. WHITE MOVED that Council chooses the date of September 23, 2016 for the Malloy Drain Basin Sod Turning/Ribbon Cutting ceremony and that invitations also be extended to the SMRID Board of Directors and the Town of Coaldale Council members. CARRIED

APPOINTMENTS**E2. Subdivision Application #2016-0-088 - Lethbridge County - SE 1/4 19-11-20-W4**

- 390/16 T. WHITE MOVED that the Agricultural subdivision of Plan PW 189; SE1/4 19-11-20-W4M (Certificate of Title No. 111 000 003 +5), to subdivide and split a 7.07 acre (2.86 ha) portion of a former CPR railway parcel (Railway Plan RW 189) into two portions, and consolidate them to two adjacent agricultural titles of 105.13 and 47.8 acres (42.55 and 19.3 ha), creating new titles of 108.31 and 52.29 acres (43.83 and 21.16 ha) respectively in size, for agricultural use; BE APPROVED subject to the following:
- CONDITIONS:**
1. That, pursuant to Section 654(1)(d) of the Municipal Government Act, all outstanding property taxes shall be paid to Lethbridge County.
 2. That the portions of former railway (Railway Plan RW 189) to be subdivided and consolidated to the two existing titles in the SE¼ 19-11-20-W4M shall be consolidated (amalgamated) by plan by a certified Alberta Land Surveyor so that the titles may not be further subdivided without approval of the Subdivision Authority.
- REASONS:**
1. The proposed subdivision is consistent with the South Saskatchewan Regional Plan and complies with both the Municipal Development Plan and Land Use Bylaw.
 2. The Subdivision Authority is satisfied that the proposed subdivision is suitable for the purpose for which the subdivision

 Reeve

 Chief Administrative Officer

is intended pursuant to Section 7 of the Subdivision and Development Regulation.

3. The subdivision is for a former railway title owned by the municipality which will be consolidated to adjacent land, and with no separate standalone titles created, it conforms to the County's subdivision criteria.

4. The proposal complies with the Land Use Bylaw as the proposed subdivision and consolidation of land results in parcel sizes that conform to the bylaw's stipulated minimum agricultural sizes. CARRIED

Reeve Hickey recessed the meeting at 10:58 a.m.

The meeting reconvened at 11:05 a.m.

391/16

T. WHITE MOVED to bring item E3. Bylaw 1456 – CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING – Prairie Cedar Building Materials (1614560 Alberta Ltd.) - Amendment to the Land Use Bylaw from Lethbridge Urban Fringe (LUF) to Direct Control (DC) for a portion of Plan 0210532, Block 2, Lot 2 (SW 14-9-22-W4) back to the table at 11:06 a.m. CARRIED

E3. Bylaw 1456 – CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING – Prairie Cedar Building Materials (1614560 Alberta Ltd.) - Amendment to the Land Use Bylaw from Lethbridge Urban Fringe (LUF) to Direct Control (DC) for a portion of Plan 0210532, Block 2, Lot 2 (SW 14-9-22-W4)

Reeve Hickey welcomed the delegation to the meeting. The delegation consisted of:

A. Chell	V. Hales	P. Zmurchyk	G. Boychuk
T. Watmough	J. Vanschothorst	J. Marti	S. Dudley
D. Ponjavic-Vornbrock	L. Boychuk		

Reeve Hickey declared that the public hearing is being held pursuant to the Municipal Government Act as amended for Bylaw #1456.

Reeve Hickey invited Mr. Larry Randle, Director of Community Services to give an overview of the application.

Mr. Larry Randle, Director of Corporate Services stated the following:

- An application has been made by 1614560 Alberta Ltd to amend Land Use Bylaw 1404.
- The purpose of the amendment is to re-designate a 24 acre portion of Plan 0210532, Block 2, Lot 2 from Lethbridge Urban Fringe (LUF) to Direct Control (DC).
- The proposed re-designation located along Highway 25 at the intersection of Township Road 9-2 and is about 0.85 miles north of the City of Lethbridge boundary.
- On March 3, 2016 the public hearing was opened and administration recommended to Council to table the public hearing to allow the City and Council Intermunicipal Development Committee the opportunity to meet to discuss the City's concerns with the application.
- The City was concerned with the creation of a mini-business park within a mile of the City's boundary and the increased traffic that the proposed development may have on Highway 25.
- County Council heard from the applicant and members of the public in attendance and subsequently tabled the meeting to April 21, 2016.

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

- The public hearing has been continued on from June 1 and the June 16 meeting in an effort to allow the applicant time to complete a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA).
- The TIA for the proposed re-designation is dependent on the completion of the TIA for the Town of Coalhurst Southeast Collector Access Road.
- With the near completion of that TIA, MPE has been able to complete the TIA for this application. A copy of the report was forwarded to both the City and Alberta Transportation when it was received.
- The TIA provides conclusions and recommendations for the proposed use of the property on Page 21 and 22 of the report.
- The recommendations include reducing the speed, installing delineation lighting (as per the Coalhurst Southeast Collector Road TIA), improvements to Township Road 9-2, additional right-of-way obtained to accommodate the road and intersection improvements.

Reeve Hickey asked if Council had any questions of Mr. Randle.

Council enquired if the road widening is the result of this Direct Control application or is it a result of the Coalhurst road going out?

Mr. Randle invited Mr. Stephen Dudley from MPE to speak to his report.

Mr. Dudley stated the intersection treatment is more the result of the Coalhurst south east access adding considerable traffic to that intersection. This development is relatively small and the amount of traffic that will be generated is negligible. The Alberta Transportation (AT) turn lane reports and the traffic points that are there, we determined that a turn lane is warranted for southbound movement and it is largely based on existing through traffic on the highway.

Council enquired regarding southbound traffic and asked would it be coming off the new road from Coalhurst mainly; would that be the numbers that would equate to making that road wider to accommodate that? Or do you mean a southbound turning lane coming into that intersection going east from the north.

Mr. Dudley responded that it would be a northbound left turn lane and a southbound left turn lane on the highway and a northbound left turn lane will need to be a little bit larger. We need a northbound left turn lane (type 4 treatment) and the 9-2 a left turn lane for that. That whole intersection would be upgraded for that project. What we found when we were looking at traffic volumes for the Prairie Cedar development was that a south bound left turn lane is also warranted based largely through traffic volumes on the highway.

Rick Bacon, Acting Chief Administrative Officer stated so this is the only upgrade associated with the commercial development, the rest are associated with the Coalhurst collector road, including the speed reduction.

Mr. Dudley stated that is correct for the highway intersection.

Council enquired about maintaining the property for this development, is there enough room in the ROW.

Mr. Dudley stated we expect additional ROW will be required at all four quadrants of intersection. That extra right of way will be required for the south east access arterial road. The upgrades for Prairie Cedar won't require any more ROW than what would be required to accommodate the Coalhurst project.

Council asked regarding that intersection when you are coming up off of Highway 3, there's a little hump there, the brake traffic is huge since there's an intersection to turn left. You're advocating a left hand turn lane into the Coalhurst access and straight through and nothing for a right hand turn?

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

Mr. Dudley stated, that is correct.

Council noted there are 24 acres here, and that is great for now, but in the future that could be subdivided into two acre parcels and that would make a huge difference between what exists and what should be done now, and you're not advocating for any lights?

Mr. Dudley replied no, not in the immediate future. Prairie Cedar would open in 2019 and based on those criteria. In the future civilization may warrant it in association with the Coalhurst project. To answer your questions about future development in this area to the east of the highway, my recommendation is more analysis is done if more development is expected but it is not expected at this time.

Council stated, so no consideration was given to future development?

Mr. Dudley stated the intersection treatment we are talking about here will accommodate a fair amount of traffic but there were no details for any additional development so that would just be speculation at this point.

Council stated the intersection you are talking about is just north of there, the Kipp Road with more motor vehicle accidents and it will get a lot more traffic.

Mr. Dudley noted going back to the executive summary of the report, what we have recommended here will accommodate the development. Regarding the Coalhurst south east access collector, ultimately the upgrades if they are going to go in they can be constructed at the same time, the actual impact on commercial development on traffic is very small.

Council enquired in your study, how many vehicles came eastbound out of Coalhurst and made a right hand turn.

Rick Bacon stated that as far as the study is concerned normally assumed values are used for trip generation based on the subdivision that is proposed at the time. So similar to Broxburn, there was a certain number of trips per acre of industrial or commercial development for that intersection and at the time, it doesn't warrant unnecessarily putting in lights or turning lanes, etc. As that development grows and gets different businesses moved in there possibly that assumed number is higher or lower than what was assumed at the time, so a Traffic Impact Assessment is then required and a further assessment is done based on actual counts, and if those actual counts warrant upgrades to that intersection at that time, then that is when that is brought into place. So 24 acres of commercial development is what would be used in that development.

Council stated what we are dealing with today is what is being asked for and nothing else and if another development happens in the future it is no different than Broxburn, then you have to deal with that as such, as it comes up, it could be lights, it could be a bigger turn out lanes or whatever, but today we can only deal with what is in front of us.

Mr. Dudley stated that is correct, we are not saying that this is all that should be built ever, just that this is what we are recommending at this time. If things do develop out then additional traffic stats will look at what would be needed there. What we have recommended will accommodate the development.

Council stated that they think the recommendation is simply based on the information we have provided to you to ask the question, and that was simply for this development because the ASP we have with the City of Lethbridge, we would be slightly limited as to what we can and can't do there.

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

Steve Harty, Senior Planner, Oldman River Regional Services Commission stated that the proposal before you today for Direct Control has changed a bit from what was originally proposed. Those other additional commercial industrial uses have been removed, so it is just for lumber yard, the building supply store, signage, extensive agriculture and accessory building/structures to an approved use; so the other original considerations are not in front of you today, the subdivision as well mentioned that it would be just for the creation of the one lot for the Direct Control district. Because it is Direct Control anything additional, extra or on top of what is being asked for today would have to come back to Council.

Council enquired, what is a Type 4 or a Type 3 intersection.

Mr. Dudley replied that a Type 3 and Type 4 intersection both have left turn lanes, but the difference is the length for deceleration or slowing to a stop. As far as assigning costs, that wasn't part of the study here, ultimately that would be a discussion with Alberta Transportation.

Council: We are looking at the same thing as was in north of Shaughnessy for Deer Run Estates; they had to have access on both sides of the road. I believe that was 100% cost to Deer Run Estates.

Mr. Dudley stated that would be a discussion with Alberta Transportation.

Council stated that would be a consideration at Development Permit stage.

Rick Bacon reported that from his understanding, the circulation would go out and Alberta Transportation would make comments and I can surmise that they might say these intersection upgrades have to be done for the southeast access collector road as well as for the development and then a further study would need to be done as they may recommend Type 4 intersection possibly for speed reduction and that would have to be done prior to the development and would be a condition on the development. A further traffic study would be done once the development is complete and we would be advised at that time if they were good with it, similar to Broxburn, whoever is responsible for the costs at that time, so in our development agreement we would make statement that there is either an offsite levy or some other type of way to collect that money from the developer.

Council enquired so there is an unknown dollar amount that we would be on the hook for because, as we all know, Broxburn didn't really go well.

Rick Bacon replied, the reason for that was because it was not stated in the development agreement and it would be a requirement of the developer which we have learned going into new development agreements where they are in an area that they would affect traffic in that region, especially commercial industrial.

Council stated it could be tens of thousands to hundreds of thousands, it's such an unknown number.

Rick Bacon stated, that is correct, the likelihood that what parameters are affected by the right turn or left turn to the development versus the southeast collector road, because there are far greater impacts from that collector road hitting the highway than the development.

Council stated that Alberta Transportation, in discussion with the collector road had come to the table with some dollars to fix the road, so whether or not but whether that's still available after all the budget cuts, I don't know, but it was in the original plan.

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

Mr. Dudley indicated the latest update I have heard is that Alberta Transportation is supportive of the project and an upgrade at the intersection. As far as how this study changes that it just means that how the intersection treatment is built up is modified slightly to include a south bound left turn lane, but it is not going to be substantially different.

Larry Randle referred Council to Page 28 of Agenda, and reviewed Schedule B of the proposed bylaw where it does address some of the issues being discussed such as a TIA will be required, well we have received that. Access to the parcels will be limited to a single access point to Township Road 9-2 and the developer is to pay for all cost associated with the TIA and all upgrades required for the intersection of TWP RD 9-2 and HWY 25 as recommended by the Engineers' TIA and required by Alberta Transportation. The developer will be required to upgrade Township Road 9-2 to the County's standards at their own expense.

Reeve Hickey asked if there were any further questions at this time. Council had no further questions.

Reeve Hickey asked if anyone in attendance wished to speak regarding Bylaw 1456.

Darlene Ponjavic-Vornbrock I am part of the acreage along the gravel road. What date did the TIA take place?

Mr. Dudley replied that it took place July 2015 for the Coalhurst southeast access project and since the counts were fairly recent we did not go out this year.

Ms. Ponjavic-Vornbrock enquired why it was not done for this year.

Mr. Dudley replied that the count was conducted in 2015 with a traffic growth rate for projected to 2019; when we did the study Township Road 92 and Range Road 22-3 were open as well as 45th Avenue in Coalhurst.

Ms. Ponjavic-Vornbrock stated that at previous meetings we expressed our concern that people at that corner did not see people out there for the full 24 hours, so that is why we wanted another TIA done. My mom lives right on the corner and has witnessed that they are not there all day.

Council asked are you talking about the road going west to Coalhurst?

Ms. Ponjavic-Vornbrock replied, yes.

Council replied that is not part of this Direct Control bylaw, this bylaw is for the east side of Highway 25 on the east side, and what impact it will have on the intersection which Coalhurst is going to be sending traffic into, so we are talking about two impact studies here, the one proposed today is for the traffic coming out of the Direct Control zone merging with the Coalhurst traffic, and that is all we are dealing with.

Rick Bacon stated that a circulation will be coming to us once the design is done for that intersection once that 92 is upgraded and traffic is sent in that direction. We will have the opportunity to comment on the design at that time and possibly it may be requested through us or through Alberta Transportation that a new TIA is done. I think what you are saying Mrs. Ponjavic-Vornbrock is that the traffic count for the assessment was not accurate; however, that traffic count on that road would be based on assumed values from 2015 and future projections that may or may not happen. Have to make assumptions as the road isn't constructed yet so we are using the impact assessment for Prairie Cedar where the commercial zone on the other side of the road not necessarily the collector road. Once it comes time for us to comment on the design for the upgrades, we may

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

say at the time you have to re-do traffic counts if they are not accurate, but not for now but this is not part of the same analysis for that part of the intersection.

Larry Boychuck stated that you never answered her question fully because on the weekends that is an Indianapolis 500 highway. Council brought up the point as to the rise in that road as that is a blind spot and you will be coming off a turning lane and there is no mention of a brake turning access to the application. You are going to have the potentialities of creating accidents there because not everyone abides by the speed limit and you're going to have issues.

Mr. Dudley replied that the traffic counts were conducted at the intersection at peak hours for 9 hours from 6:00-9:00 a.m. and 11:00 a.m.-2:00 p.m. and 3:30 to 6:00 p.m. on July 30, 2015. We took raw traffic data and submitted it to another firm, Cornerstone Solutions, who use that raw data and combine it with other data from automatic traffic recorders and they factor the data, basically giving us counts back that were representative of the average counts at that section, so the report is accurate. Regarding the blind spot, I've driven the intersection and understand your concern, but the profile of the highway, and sight distances do meet Alberta Transportation standards there.

Mr. Boychuck stated that with the proposal of Prairie Cedar, it's kind of funny that directly a westbound turning lane off of Highway 25 you're making a southbound left turning lane off of Highway 25 but there will be transport trucks periodically, there is no right turning lane north bound proposed. I'd like to see that added for a safety feature because of trucks coming off of Highway 3 over the overpass, so a reduced speed sign is warranted. Where are you going to introduce that reduction of speed?

Mr. Dudley stated that nothing has been finalized but Alberta Transportation is open to the idea of reducing the speed limit along Hwy 25 to 80 km per hour from the intersection of Township Rd 92 south to the City of Lethbridge limits. In regard to a right turn lane, we did look at the traffic volumes there and we looked at the warrant procedure that Alberta Transportation has on the right turn warrant was not warranted but part of doing the Type 3 and Type 4 intersection treatments there is that it would make the turning radiuses larger there allowing vehicles to turn safer.

Mr. Boychuck added so you are enlarging your approach onto Highway 25 on the east side of the highway, some will slow to make a right hand turn lane.

Mr. Bacon added there is a lot of data to be interpreted and the design of the intersection is going to meet our standards. The Developer or Alberta Transportation are not going to design something that will be substandard at that intersection. It will meet the sight distances and the turning radiuses that are warranted for the traffic that is generated at that intersection.

Mr. Zmurchyk addressed Council and stated that at Highway 25 to the east, I challenge anyone to get across two lanes of traffic let alone four. I've got about 250 to 300 yards and it's getting real busy there.

Mr. Bacon replied that issue is addressed through the 80km proposed speed limit which is a design standard for that traffic volume that is suggested to start north and south of the intersection.

Mr. Dudley added that it would be posted north of the intersection. If you are driving south on Highway 25 approaching the intersection you would have signs indicating speed reduction to 80 km in advance of the intersection.

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

Council stated that 80 km would probably start just south of Ponjavic's house. But 100km or 80km it doesn't matter, there is no room with the volume of traffic.

Garry Boychuk stated that two miles north, there's a big intersection that addresses our concerns, right hand to right hand turn, access to get on from west coming east, and it takes up a lot of land, it's two miles north, why can't people use that? What you're proposing is traffic going into the subdivision. We are an agricultural community so that highway is used 24-7 so when was your study done?

Mr. Dudley stated there is one clarification is that it was originally 24 acres and it is actually 13 acres.

Tyler Watmough noted I rent to the north of this proposed subdivision. My question is what is the future for this area? I just invested a quarter million on a pivot system to irrigate and maybe I should be putting money into development. Should I be farming or developing? Is this the future of our County in this area?

Council replied that this is an agricultural county. We do have a lot of old subdivisions that the CPR created and you'll find them all over the place, they are not specific to any one area and the people are now starting to realize the value of those subdivisions is greater than they'll ever recover their costs of farming from, so we are having a tremendous amount of pressure put on places like that so in this area it is kind of segmented as well. Our IDP with the City of Lethbridge has quite a few restrictions as to what will or will not be developed in the future. There won't be a mass exodus of farmland and there won't be a huge growth in industry there for more than one reason, but the biggest is we have no water and we have no wastewater facilities there so it simply isn't going to happen. It is going to be restricted to if something like this gets developed it will have a toilet and a coffee pot but the plan of the County is not to take away good quality farm land for development to make industry on.

Mr. Jake Vanschothorst of Prairie Cedar stated that we do not generate a lot of traffic, we are intentionally want to be in this location as it is in the fringe, we don't want to be in the city. What that is going to introduce in terms of new traffic is absolutely minimal influence in terms of vehicle counts being added to it. Many of the questions have to do with the safety of the road as a whole it is noted that increased traffic from Coalhurst is coming or being generated as a division in the road. It strikes me as having significant influence of the question in front of us. These are two separate issues. Assuming we develop over there, we won't be generating traffic, the traffic is pre-existing in the community. The provision is inadequate. The Coalhurst addition is going to increase that but Prairie Cedar is not going to add to the traffic.

Council added that you are correct, the traffic problem exists now and with the addition of Coalhurst it will be that much more difficult to manage, it already is a challenge at times will continue to be a certain times of the day. At some point in time, once Alberta Transportation comes up with a design you may have to look at something different from what is there but you will not be making it worse.

Reeve Hickey asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition of Bylaw 1456.

Reeve Hickey asked three times if there were any further questions in favour or opposed. No one came forward and there were no further questions

Reeve Hickey thanked the delegation for attending the meeting. The delegation retired at 11:56 a.m.

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

- 392/16 T. WHITE MOVED that the Public Hearing for Bylaw 1456 – CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING – Prairie Cedar Building Materials (1614560 Alberta Ltd.) - Amendment to the Land Use Bylaw from Lethbridge Urban Fringe (LUF) to Direct Control (DC) for a portion of Plan 0210532, Block 2, Lot 2 (SW 14-9-22-W4) close at 11:57 a.m. CARRIED
- 393/16 H. DOEVE MOVED second reading of Bylaw 1456 as amended. CARRIED
- 394/16 T. WHITE MOVED third reading of Bylaw 1456. CARRIED
- 395/16 M. ZEINSTRA MOVED the meeting recess for lunch at 12:00 p.m. CARRIED

The meeting reconvened at 1:35 p.m. with all members of Council present as previously stated.

MUNICIPAL SERVICES

F2. Picture Butte Shop - Spatial Needs Assessment and Design

- 396/16 M. ZEINSTRA MOVED that County Council receives the Final Report “Picture Butte Operations Building – Spatial Needs Assessment & Pre-Design Study” for information and that during the budget process for 2017-19 it be discussed further with Administration. CARRIED

F3. Hamlet and Group Country Residential Speed Reduction to 30 km/hr

- 397/16 T. WHITE MOVED to table item F3. Hamlet and Group Country Residential Speed Reduction to 30 km/hr to a future County Council meeting. CARRIED

F4. Broxburn Road Additional Paving

- 398/16 H. DOEVE MOVED that County Council approves the proposed paving extension of 1km on Broxburn Road to utilize the projected surplus funding of \$466,147 in MSI funding CARRIED

COMMUNITY SERVICES

G1. Bylaw 1474 Southern Excavating and Trucking Ltd. - Amendment to the Land Use Bylaw from Rural Agriculture (RA) to Rural General Industrial (RGI) for a portion of NW 7-8-20-W4 – First Reading

- 399/16 T. WHITE MOVED first reading of Bylaw 1474. CARRIED

G2. Inter-community Pathway Committee - Financial Administrative Request

- 400/16 H. DOEVE MOVED that Lethbridge County agrees to take the lead on applying for grant funding opportunities that the Inter-Community Pathway is eligible for, as they become available. CARRIED

G3. Municipal Consent Request – City of Lethbridge

- 401/16 H. DOEVE MOVED that County Council refer item G3. Municipal Consent Request – City of Lethbridge to the County / City IDP Committee and that a meeting be requested with the City. CARRIED

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

G4. Town of Coaldale – Memorandum of Understanding for Annexation and Related Matters

- 402/16 H. DOEVE MOVED that item G4 Town of Coaldale – Memorandum of Understanding for Annexation and Related Matters be tabled until such time as administration sets up a workshop with Council, inviting Steve Harty, Senior Planner at ORRSC and Spencer Croil, Director of Planning and Development, Town of Coaldale to conduct a review of the Memorandum of Understanding with the MOU to be brought back to a future Council meeting. CARRIED

CORPORATE SERVICES

H1. Tax Penalty Waiver Requests – Roll # 33080000, 34340000, 32590100 and 20100000

- 403/16 M. ZEINSTRA MOVED that County Council deny the request for cancellation of tax penalties on Roll Number 2010000. CARRIED
- 404/16 M. ZEINSTRA MOVED that County Council deny the request for cancellation of tax penalties on Roll Numbers 33080000, 34340000 and 32590100. CARRIED

INVITATIONS

J1. Alberta Health Services South Zone 2017-20 Operational Planning Sessions – Save the Date - September 29, 2016

- 405/16 T. WHITE MOVED to receive item J1. Alberta Health Services South Zone 2017-20 Operational Planning Sessions – Save the Date - September 29, 2016 for information. CARRIED

J2. Walk on the Wild Side Re: Ribbon Cutting Ceremony for New Gazebo

- 406/16 H. DOEVE MOVED that Councillors Morris Zeinstra and Tom White be authorized to attend the “Walk on the Wild Side” Ribbon Cutting for the new gazebo scheduled for Friday, August 19, 2016 at 2:00 p.m. and bring congratulations on behalf of Lethbridge County. CARRIED

J3. Rachel Harder, MP Re: Fall Federal Forum – September 6, 2016, Sandman Hotel

- 407/16 M. ZEINSTRA MOVED that any member of County Council wishing to attend the Rachel Harder, MP Fall Federal Forum scheduled for Tuesday, September 6, 2016 from 11:30 to 1:30 p.m. at the Sandman Hotel be authorized to do so. CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

- 408/16 M. ZEINSTRA MOVED the meeting adjourn at 3:52 p.m. CARRIED

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer