MUNICIPAL EXCELLENCE NETWORK
PRACTICE COLLECTION FORM

General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>July 15, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Name of Practice | The Inter-Municipal Development Plan Template  
                  | The Memorandum of Agreement Template |
| Name of Municipality  | Mountain View County Municipal District |
| Your Name and Title  | Doug Plamping, Chief Administrative Officer  
                        | Mountain View County |
| Phone Number       | 403.335.3311 or Toll Free: 1.877.264.9754 |
| Fax Number         | 403.335.9207 |
| E-mail for Practice Contact(s) | doug.plamping@mountainviewcounty.com |
| Mailing Address    | PO Bag 100, Didsbury, Alberta, T0M 0W0 |

INTRODUCTION

When completing this form, use your own words and share your practice in a story format. Please do not include any derogatory comments. Use paragraphs and bullet points to organize your practice. This is not a business case but instead is intended to be informative for your peers, showing them the processes and outcomes of your practice. Be sure to focus on what you learned so that it is helpful to the reader. Click on the grey boxes to type in your answers. The boxes will expand as you type.

THE ISSUE

Question | Answer
---|---
Abstract: What is the practice you developed or are developing (brief abstract)? | We are the Municipal Area Partnership (MAP); a regional advisory board which is composed of the Municipal District of Mountain View County; the Towns of: Carstairs, Didsbury, Olds, Sundre and the Village of Cremona.

Please briefly describe the final practice developed. (e.g. if you developed a new Council agenda, list the agenda items, or if a new communications plan was created, provide a summary of the plan’s goals, objectives and highlights.)

Collaboratively, we have developed and are implementing two innovative templates:

- The Inter-Municipal Development Plan Template
- The Memorandum of Agreement Template (between the County and each of the five Urban Municipalities)

More...
Both templates are designed to support sustainable, diversified growth and development under a regional umbrella, with streamlined equitable parameters for:

- Annexation
- Cost sharing for utilities, infrastructure, community services
- Public consultation
- Continuous improvement
- Dispute resolution
- Regional solidarity

We define the practice as a deliberate and guided process of research, collaboration, communication and strategic planning. Over a six month period, the Chief Administrative Officers of all six municipal partners (The County and the five Urban Municipalities) met for a minimum of ½ day per week under the facilitation of a Consultant to draft the parameters of the two templates. The deliverables which represent the substance of our submission, are the two templates:

1. **The Inter-Municipal Development Plan Template (IDP)**—a formal agreement between the County and each Urban Municipality (which is adopted as a Bylaw by each Municipality) stipulating clear and consistent parameters for:

   - Streamlined annexation
   - Development standards in urban and rural areas that mitigate Inter-Municipal competition
   - Defined areas (fringe and referral areas) that can be reviewed to identify and mitigate possible negative impacts on each municipality
   - Administration and maintenance of water and wastewater services in County developments within the Urban Partner’s fringe area
   - Coordination of transportation systems and utility corridors
   - Cooperation on economic development parameters

More…
- Establishment of an Inter-Municipal Planning Commission structure for approval of developments in the fringe area and an Inter-Municipal Subdivision and Development Appeal Board for appeals on development rulings
- Dispute resolution process
- Review and analysis

2. **The Memorandum of Agreement**—a template that forms the basis of an agreement between each Urban Municipality and The County to cover the majority of services provided by each Urban Municipality for adjacent County residents; and to provide revenue sharing for developments in The County that are connected to each Urban Municipality’s water and/or wastewater services. Key elements of the MOA include:

- Detailed subdivision guidelines
- Measures to direct different types of development to the most appropriate venue (County or Urban Municipality)
- Access to Urban Municipal services by County ratepayers (cemeteries, fire, library, recreation, parks and culture, water and wastewater, Family and Community Support Services)
- Cooperation on agricultural pest and weed control
- Funding agreements on recreation and library services, increasing County tax sharing from $408,916 in 2006 to $1,106,202 in 2011
- Indemnification of each party to the MOA
- Dispute resolution process
- Regular formal review

### Need:
Please describe (just a couple of sentences or bullet points) why you needed to create this practice (policy or process).

What issue made it necessary? (e.g. “We needed a comprehensive plan to deal with…”, or “We needed an annual forecasting tool because…”)

### Why we needed to create the process:
As a region, we needed a clearly articulated strategy to build our future and resource the infrastructure to ensure its viability.

More…
**What issues made it necessary?**

With a tax base heavily supported by oil and gas (over 70%) and predictions that energy revenues would significantly decrease over the next 20 years, economic diversification was imperative.

As interest in our region intensified along with the pressing requirement to diversify the tax base, all six administrations were attempting to address development inquiries concurrently. This was creating strong pressure on the County’s limited planning resources resulting in annexation approval delays, inconsistencies and the potential for missed opportunity.

It became very apparent our six municipalities needed:

- A cohesive growth and development vision for our region as a whole including development beyond non renewable resources
- A collaborative, not a competitive dynamic between our six administrations
- A framework to support growth and development with streamlined, equitable parameters for land use, development, annexation, revenue and cost sharing for utilities, infrastructure and community services
- An ongoing process for communication on issues and opportunities for all stakeholders
- To fast track annexation and undertake the process concurrently for all five Urban Municipalities

**CREATING YOUR PRACTICE**

**Research:**
How did you obtain information to help design your practice (including consultation with stakeholders, formal and informal research)?

Please include any research documentation you can share, or give us a source reference (e.g. Web site, literature, “We reviewed the bylaws from other municipalities in the area…”).

**Our research phase involved:**

- Comparative analysis of existing land use/planning/annexation models and Bylaws in Canadian municipalities with a particular focus on regions that embraced both rural and urban communities
- One to one consultation with target municipalities who had walked through the process of creating collaborative policies on key issues with diverse stakeholders
- Review of published research and best practices
**Process:**
How did you go about designing your practice? For instance, did you create a team, hire a consultant, borrow something ready-made from another jurisdiction?

Describe briefly who did the design work and what process they followed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The process of developing the templates was driven by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Approval by all six councils to commit the time and resources of each respective Chief Administrative Officer for ½ day per week for 26 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participation by the CAOs and The Municipal Area Partnership Committee in a step by step development process facilitated in part by an outside consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The weekly meetings and a number of intensive workshops resulted in draft templates which were then reviewed by all Councils and their Administrative Teams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public consultation on key issues contributing to template decisions was generated through:

| • Representation by elected members on all six Councils |
| • Information supplied through The Municipal Area Partnership (Source: Fall 2007 MAP Report) |
| • Information bulletins, reports and surveys posted on-line at [www.mountainviewcounty.com](http://www.mountainviewcounty.com) |
| • Input provided in public consultation for the Municipal Development Plans of the County and selected Urban Municipalities. This feedback was factored into IDP and MOA template planning |
| • One to one and group meetings with key stakeholders in all six communities |

**GETTING APPROVAL FOR YOUR PRACTICE**

**Authority:**
Whose/what approval did you need to create and implement the practice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As a formal process, the IDP required public consultation and a public hearing on a Bylaw for each Urban Municipality and the County. Each Bylaw included a map of the areas surrounding each Urban Municipality identifying fringe and referral areas. Appropriate amendments were made to each Urban Municipality’s Municipal Development Plans and relevant Land Use Bylaws.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A static document that is not expected to change for many years, the IDP template was approved in principle by all six Councils shortly after completion of the final draft (January 2007). The IDP provides for each annexation to: Include land for a further 20 years of growth; identify a fringe area containing an additional 20 years of growth; and a referral area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for the following 20 years of growth.

The IDP has already been used for annexation negotiations between Mountain View County and the Towns of Carstairs, Olds, Sundre and the Village of Cremona.

The MOA is intended:

- To form the basis of an agreement between each Urban Municipality and the County to cover the majority of services provided by the Urban Municipal for adjacent County residents
- To provide for revenue sharing for developments in The County that are connected to the Urban Municipality’s water and/or waste water services
- Not to replace any existing agreements (e.g. The Fire Protection Agreement)

The initial term of each MOA between The County and each individual Urban Municipality is ten years. This was designed to:

- Provide a sufficient term for all participating municipalities to gain comfort with the process
- Mitigate the potential of one party opting out of the MOA on short notice
- Create an opportunity to address issues with the provision for amendment should both parties agree

Three formal review opportunities exist during the term of the MOA to review and analyze terms and conditions. The three review periods have been scheduled one year after each Municipal election to allow Councils one year in office before revisiting the MOA. The first formal review is currently underway.

The success of each MOA is contingent on trust and communication between The County and each Urban Municipality. The Inter-Municipal Committee has been formed to facilitate such communication.

As the size, scope and resources of each the five Urban Municipalities vary considerably, the MOAs have been reviewed and signed on an individual basis.
**Reporting:**
How did you inform the decision-maker(s) about the practice and your need for their approval?

Please note the name of any documents provided to the decision-makers that you would be willing to share.

The process of developing the IDP and MOA templates has been collaborative incorporating input, expertise and resources from:

- The six Councils
- The six Chief Administrative Officers (and appropriate planning resources within each administration)
- The Municipal Area Partnership

All participants have had full access to all documents and proceedings.
Public consultation has been facilitated by providing web site access to public documents through The County’s site and the websites of the Urban Municipalities.

As a means of communicating our experience with other municipalities, The MAP is currently developing a series of public documents detailing how the process was created and implemented. Once completed, these will be posted on the Municipal Partners respective websites and made available to the Alberta Ministry of Municipal Affairs and the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties.

---

**Consultation:**
Did you consult with stakeholders as part of your approval process?

If so, how? If possible, attach a copy of templates, surveys or other documents you used as part of your consultation.

Yes. Both templates required the approvals of all six Councils in meetings which were open to the public. MAP representatives participated in presentations to all six Councils and today operate as the communication link with each respective Council.

Public input from MDP stakeholder consultations was incorporated into the final drafts of both templates in Municipalities where MDPs were under review.

---

**IMPLEMENTING YOUR PRACTICE**

**Plan:**
Describe the process you went through to implement the practice. If you used an implementation plan, please note it here.

Implementing both templates required detailed review with the Councils of The County and each of its five Urban Municipal Partners. The templates provide a consistent frame of reference for discussion, implementation and review. Both templates are designed to work together, but require separate approval and adoption processes:

More...
The IDP is a fairly static document that is not intended to change significantly over time. It addresses big picture issues including: annexation, land use policies and transportation/utility corridor infrastructure.

The MOAs are extensive agreements that drill down to very specific parameters regarding the provision and payment/revenue sharing for services to County residents accessing Urban services.

**IDP Template**

In accordance with the Municipal Government Act, governing Councils of the parties to each IDP had to complete public consultation and adopt the appropriate Bylaws for implementation. In addition each of the five Urban Partners and The County had to ensure relevant amendments were made to their respective Municipal Development Plans and Land Use Bylaws.

Each of the Urban Partners’ adopting Bylaw specified that although they had adopted the policies and objectives of the IDP, they (the Urban Partner) had no legal jurisdiction for lands in the IDP area outside of their boundary. Similarly, The County’s adopting Bylaw specifics that The County has no legal jurisdiction outside of the boundaries of The County.

In the hierarchy of statutory plans, the IDP takes precedence over other municipal statutory plans and documents.

Amendments to the IDP can be proposed by either the Urban Municipality or The County. An amendment proposed by a landowner must be made to the Municipality in which the landowner resides. Amendments have no effect unless adopted by both signing parties, by Bylaw in accordance with the Municipal Government Act.

More...
As part of adopting an IDP between The County and each Urban Municipality, parties had to identify and achieve consensus on the following as they pertained specifically to each Municipality.

- The urban fringe (the area surrounding the Urban Municipality to be protected for future Town growth)
- The referral area (the corresponding area in The County to be protected for long term growth of the Town)
- Areas for development of Industrial Parks within the fringe and referral areas
- Development standards for Industrial Parks
- Area Structure Plan principles for Industrial Parks
- Development of land use policies in support of economic development for future growth and development of the region economically and socially
- Development of a plan for the provision of utility corridors to provide for future growth and to ensure oil and gas pipelines cannot inhibit or restrict future development of the region
- Effective coordination of transportation systems and protection of required land for future road and trail network development
- Land use policies to ensure protection of future sites for schools and recreation facilities
- Protection of physical features and environmentally sensitive areas
- Effective referral and dispute resolution mechanisms
- IDP implementation and administration
- Annexation policies to ensure land would be available for orderly future Urban growth

Memorandum of Agreement

The MOA forms the basis of an agreement between each Urban Partner and The County to:

- Cover the majority of services provided by the Urban Partner for neighboring County residents
- Provide for revenue sharing for developments in The County that are connected to the Urban Partners
The MOA does not replace any existing agreements. Services are defined in the MOA as those that both parties are desirous of joint cost sharing including:

- Cemetery
- Family and Community Support Services
- Fire
- Library
- Recreation and Culture
- Water and Wastewater

Other parameters included in the MOA

- Subdivision development standards
- Industrial and commercial development standards
- Capital projects including recreation, cultural, library, water and wastewater infrastructure and major roadways

Because the MOAs are complex and detailed, signing of each one required discussion and negotiation between the parties. The MOA template provides a specific and consistent framework from which to conduct these discussions.

The MOA outlines:

- The terms of the agreement which include a ten year initial term with an automatic renewal unless one party provides a one year notice of termination or desire to renegotiate
- A schedule of payments on a quarterly basis
- A process for ongoing communication and dialogue throughout the MOA lifespan. The Inter-Municipal Committee has been formed to meet and develop recommendations to the Councils of the Urban Partner and The County on all matters of strategic direction and cooperation affecting County and Urban Municipal residents; except on matters where other structure and mechanisms are operating successfully
**Policy:**
What changes to bylaws, regulations or procedures were needed to implement this practice and how did you deal with them?

Please attach a copy of the change in bylaw, policy or procedure.

| As above. Relevant Bylaws are attached with our submission. |

| **When:**
When did your municipality begin to use the practice?
Was it implemented all at once or in stages? |
| --- |
| The IDP template was approved in principal by The County and all five Urban Partners at one time, within six months of the final draft. At this time, all six parties have adopted Bylaws.

Changes to individual Municipal Development Plans and Land Use Bylaws are underway and have either been formally adopted or are pending.

MOAs have been signed between The County and the five Urban Partners. |

| **Who:**
Who was responsible for implementing the practice?
If someone else is responsible for ongoing management, who is it? |
| --- |
| IDP Template

- The Urban Partner is responsible for the administration and decisions on all statutory plans, Land Use Bylaw amendments thereto and subdivisions applications falling with the IDP area within the boundaries of the Urban Partner.
- The County is responsible for the administration and decisions on all statutory plans, Land Use Bylaws and amendments thereto, except for those powers delegated to the Inter-Municipal Planning Commission (IMPC) which was created, by Bylaw as part of the IDP.
- The IMPC is responsible for all developments within the fringe area that would normally require the approval of the County Municipal Planning Commission including: subdivision approval and discretionary uses. All Area Structure Plans and Land Use Bylaw amendments are referred to the IMPC for review and comment; however The County retains responsibility for any Bylaw matters.
- The IDP is formally reviewed by the Inter-Municipal Planning Commission every three years to identify issues that need to be addressed and/or to make recommendations to the Councils of both parties. Any amendments to the IDP must be adopted by Bylaw.

In the event of dispute, The CAOs of both |
administrations will meet to attempt resolution. If this is not successful, the Inter-Municipal Review Committee will convene. Failing resolution, the matter will proceed to mediation and if ultimately required, to the Municipal Government Board.

**RESOURCES REQUIRED**

**Budget:**
How much did it cost you to design and implement your practice (i.e. We saved/spent $XX per year)?

What are your ongoing operational and capital costs, if any?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget:</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The cost associated with development and implementation of the templates was two fold:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To create the templates, the Municipal Area Partnership agreed to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Invest the time of the Chief Administrative Officers of the six administrations for one ½ day per week for 26 weeks to build the template frameworks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This investment acknowledged that the CAOs were diverting their time from other pending issues and responsibilities during the commitment period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Invest administrative time to build a comparable analysis of other like IDP/MOA models in similar municipalities across Canada and review best practices in this regard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engage the services of a consultant to facilitate and drive the template creation process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bulk of development costs were covered by a grant (<em>Exploration Grant for Regional Exploration</em>) provided by Alberta Municipal Affairs; $20,000 of the grant was allocated to facilitation and expenses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing the templates involved:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An investment of time to prepare and administrate new Bylaws and drive changes to Municipal Development Plans and existing Land Use Bylaws</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What human resources did you need to design, implement and manage your practice? (e.g. “It took X staff member(s) X months on this” or “This is part of normal staff duties.”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ½ day per week for 26 weeks by the CAO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support services as required by Planning, Legislative Services and Administrative Staff from all six municipalities—all of which would have been included in the normal course of duties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Infrastructure:** | 
| --- | --- |
| What “capital costs” (such as information technology, other equipment or building assets) did you need to design, implement, manage, and/or evaluate your practice? | 
| There is no capital cost associated with the design of the practice. | 
| There will be future capital costs incurred by The County associated with implementation including: | 
| • Infrastructure and over sizing required to connect County developments into Urban Municipal Water and Waste Water systems and; | 
| • Possible participation in other capital projects including recreation, cultural, library and major roadways | 
| As well, The County, along with its five Urban Partners, will be asked to commit funding for development of a Recreation Master Plan on a per capita basis. It is anticipated that 2/3 of the cost of this initiative will be covered by an Implementation Grant under the Regional Partnership Program. |
### Evaluating Your Practice

**Formal:**
If you did a formal evaluation (e.g., user satisfaction survey, analysis of annual expenditures or number of rate payers served) for your practice, please describe the evaluation tool and the process used.

Tell us who was involved.

---

All responses for this section are addressed in this single answer

Both the IDP and MOA templates have formal review processes.

**The IDP Template**

The IDP is formally reviewed by the Inter-Municipal Planning Commission once every three years beginning in 2009 in order to confirm and/or amend policies contained in the IDP.

The review process mandates the Inter-Municipal Planning Commission to:

- Formally review the IDP
- Identify issues that need to be addressed
- Make specific recommendations to Municipal Councils

Any IDP amendments resulting from the review process must be adopted by Bylaw by the participating Councils after conducting public consultation in accordance with the Municipal Government Act.

The first formal review of the IDP has just been initiated and is in progress at this time.

**The MOA Template**

The six MOAs which are signed for an initial ten year term include three formal opportunities during this period to review terms and conditions.

The formal review periods are timed such that they incur one year after each Council has been in office. This addresses the reality of at least two municipal elections during the course of a ten year agreement term. The ten year terms are automatically renewed unless either party provides a one year notice of termination or desire to renegotiate the agreement.

The reviews will be conducted no later than April 2009, 2012, and 2015. It is premature at this point to comment on results of ongoing reviews.

---

More...
The success of each MOA is contingent on trust and communication between signing parties. The Inter-Municipal Committee, consisting of four members (Reeve and the local County Councilor, the Mayor and one Urban Councilor) provides the forum for transparent communication on all matters of strategic direction and cooperation affecting Urban and County residents.

Issues for review by The Inter-Municipal Committee include:

- Long term strategic growth plans (MDPs, ASPs, and Inter-Municipal Development Plans etc.)
- Inter-Municipal and Regional transportation issues including: utility corridors, truck routes, transitional access in and out of Urban centers.
- The provision of Urban services into The County

The Committee is the conduit for proposals and documents impacting either, or both signing parties. The CAOs of both parties are positioned as the Advisory Staff to The Committee and are responsible for developing and forwarding agendas and recommendations to their respective Councils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal:</th>
<th>Performance measures:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you did an informal evaluation, describe what you did (such as discussing the practice with people in the office or on the street, or letters/comments received).</td>
<td>Please list the performance measures for this practice (i.e. reduced number of complaints, money saved, or change in equipment life expectancy.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Above</td>
<td>As Above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance measures:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please list the performance measures for this practice (i.e. reduced number of complaints, money saved, or change in equipment life expectancy.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please list the process you used for measuring performance, (i.e. We do annual surveys on…) examples include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- collecting data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- establishing a baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- applying the measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- follow up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes:
(a) Based on the evaluation (formal or informal), describe any changes you have made, or would like to make, to your practice as a result. (e.g. “After implementing this practice, we decided that it would be better if…”)

-or-

(b) Has your practice met your expectations and if so, how?

It is premature to be commenting on changes to the evaluation process as none have been completed to date.

LESSONS LEARNED / BENEFITS RECEIVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the benefits of this practice to your municipality? (eg. Preparation of Council agenda packages now requires less time, etc.)</td>
<td>While these are early days, relative to the 20 year window in which the IDP and MOAs are being implemented, the following operational benefits are becoming readily apparent:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Significant time efficiencies (resulting in cost savings) on annexation review and approvals
- Improved Inter-Municipal communication which has removed much of the need to diffuse competitive issues
- Enhanced usage of skills and expertise in Municipal planning departments
- Consistency in terms of planning development areas across the region
- A clearly embraced regional identity and vision for the Mountain View region

These benefits are best articulated in the following comments from our Municipalities:

Mayor Lance Colby, Town of Carstairs

*We have learned more about each other and have a better understanding of each other’s issues and visions for future growth and development. We are now better able to discuss issues and try to develop a sustainable economic strategy for the entire region that will benefit both the Towns and The County.*

Mayor Larry Steeves, Village of Cremona

*The IDP and MOA templates have created a framework to facilitate meaningful discussion and strategic, regional growth. The process of building them gave us all the opportunity to learn about each other, put differences aside and focus on a building a sustainable future we can all be proud of.*
Mayor Bryan Wittal, Town of Didsbury and Chair of The Municipal Area Partnership

The best aspect of the process has been bringing together all of the expertise that is available in the region to problem solve, seek innovative solutions and develop new initiatives that are in the best interests of the region. We now have a strong group of Council members and Administrators who bring a wealth of experience, knowledge and skills to the table working for the good of all, in an atmosphere of trust and understanding towards a shared vision. As an "urban" member, we have a much better understanding of the "rural" challenges and at the same time the "rural" members are much more empathetic to the plight of the "urban" members.

Reeve Al Kemmere, Mountain View County

The entire process has given our diverse communities a shared vision of growth and development for our region as a whole for the next 20 years and beyond. The process of working together has shown us the efficiencies to be gained through collaboration versus expending wasteful energy on confrontation. We've learned to build relationships, create understanding about each others’ issues and opportunities; and gain insight on the tremendous resources in our communities—all of which contribute to a higher standard of development.

Mayor Judy Dahl, Town of Olds

“The key benefit is opportunity; a longer term land supply for our tax base including a plan to annex significant lands for commercial and industrial pursuits to facilitate a climate for responsible growth. The process of networking jointly built trust amongst each other and created a ‘oneness’ of open door communication that benefits all parties and the people we serve.

Mayor Roy Cummings, Town of Sundre

The IDP and the Inter-Municipal Planning Commission provided a framework for addressing issues like urban sprawl and commercial growth in fringe areas. This better understanding of each other’s needs and desires has provided us with a common vision that in turn, has provided a solid base from which all communities are able to move forward. When growth like this occurs it is beneficial to the entire region; which in my opinion is a pretty spectacular achievement.
Key Lessons:
What key lessons have you/your municipality learned through the process of:
- designing;
- obtaining approval;
- implementing; and
- evaluating your practice?

Include any problems, surprises, and unanticipated benefits. (e.g. “We realized that we needed to spend more time…”)

Lessons Learned

Likely the greatest lesson in this process has been the realization that effective collaboration is:

- Realistic and feasible
- Transferable to other municipalities and business applications
- A growing experience for all parties
- Critical in terms of long term growth for areas that embrace diverse cultures and communities
- The way of the future

Here’s what our partners had to say about the lessons learned and the challenges met:

**Mayor Lance Colby, Town of Carstairs**

The greatest challenge, we faced as a group, was setting aside past and present differences in order to try and identify what was best for the residents of both the Towns and The County. Once the needs and objectives were identified the challenge became how to accomplish these goals in a fair and equitable manner.

**Mayor Larry Steeves, Village of Cremona**

It is challenging for diverse communities with varying agendas to find common ground. However, in the context of a growing region, we discovered it was counter productive to divert time and resources by competing with each other. By creating a shared vision for our region, we achieved continuity and efficiencies. Most important, we created a strong regional identity which celebrates the diversity that makes Mountain View such a unique part of Alberta.

**Mayor Bryan Wittal, Town of Didsbury and Chair of The Municipal Area Partnership**

The most challenging aspect of the process was changing mindsets. Council members had to let go a history of working in isolation, seeing the other municipalities as competitors and even distrust. At the same time, we had to begin thinking globally and understanding that if we are a stronger region, we will be an even stronger municipality. At times, that meant promoting regional initiatives that often had limited or no benefit to our communities.

More…
Al Kemmere, Reeve Mountain View County

Clearly one the most challenging aspect of this process was looking at initiatives through a regional lens while keeping focus on individual municipal priorities. Also, as a group, we committed our CAOs for a full half day each week for six months. In fact, they spent considerably more time than that. In the environment of municipal politics and administration, their commitment represented a significant investment; both in terms of time and resources diverted from other issues. However, we firmly believe the dividends are significant and ongoing.

Mayor Judy Dahl, Town of Olds

We find it difficult to share any challenges experienced within the process of dealing with Mountain View County. All parties involved, including elected officials, recognized the increasing development pressures facing the Town of Olds and costs involved in proposing a one time annexation to accommodate our growth for the next 20 years. To the point, hosting meetings with affected landowners, neighbors and the public was most challenging; however, these sessions were fundamental and proved to be fruitful.

Mayor Roy Cummings, Town of Sundre

The most challenging aspect of the Inter-Municipal Development Plan and the MOA templates is very closely aligned with their best attributes. Considering the diversity of the communities and residents within Mountain View County; we were challenged to understand each party’s position and negotiate terms that allowed each of us to grow and prosper without hindering the others. As a team we were committed to ensure sustainability always remained at the forefront of our decisions.

Advice to Municipal Peers:

What advice would you give to another municipality that is considering adopting your practice? Is there anything you might have done differently?

- Learn from the experience of others
- Focus on the big picture
- Defer to regional priorities over partisan issues
- Be transparent, communicative and willing to consider all options on the table
- Incorporate formal review and amendment processes
- Create an independent body to spearhead ongoing communication
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PRACTICE UPDATES</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Information:</strong></td>
<td>There may be some new information to add since this practice was first posted. This is especially true if:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- a new process has been implemented in your municipality;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- there are new practice evaluation results; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- there has been a change affecting organizational direction. For example, explain how new economic conditions or a new vision/strategy affect the practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please indicate those changes here. Don't forget to list any new documents that may be useful to your peers. Then go to &quot;Other Information&quot; to attach the new documents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OTHER INFORMATION</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggestions:</strong></td>
<td>Please list relevant information sources that others might use or you would be willing to share (courses, Web sites, literature, experts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We are currently compiling a series of documents detailing our process; key learnings and recommendations for others who are considering this approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once completed, these will be posted on <a href="http://www.mountainviewcounty.com">www.mountainviewcounty.com</a> and made available to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We would be pleased to share all documents with other municipalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documents &amp; Attachments:</strong></td>
<td>Please list any documents you would be willing to share with others interested in your practice (e.g. a bylaw, a policy, approval documents, templates).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We have attached the following to our submission:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Copies of approved IDP By Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Copies of the IDP and MOA templates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- News release and backgrounder regarding the IDP and MOA initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2007 MAP Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Note: Most documents can be electronically attached to your practice in the MEnet database. If only a paper version of your document is available, please send it with your completed Practice Collection Form. We will scan it and attach it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nominations:</strong></td>
<td>Do you have any suggestions of other individuals or municipalities with municipal practices that we should add to the Municipal Excellence network? Please list their practice, municipality, and contact information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Or, e-mail <a href="mailto:menet@gov.ab.ca">menet@gov.ab.ca</a> and let us know about a municipal colleague that has a really good way of doing things.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**COMMENTS**

| Have we missed something; anything you’d like to add to the areas we have touched on, or an area we have not mentioned? | We appreciate the opportunity to submit our practice.  
We welcome any questions you may have.  
This network provides an ideal venue for continuous improvement for Alberta Municipalities. We have learned from previous submissions and look forward to reading those of 2009. |

---

*Thank you for your contribution to the Municipal Excellence network.*

Please e-mail your completed submission by noon on **July 15, 2009** to menet@gov.ab.ca in order to be eligible for the 2009 Minister’s Award for Municipal Excellence.