



# Technical Analysis Report

Lac Ste Anne Summer Village  
Regionalization Study (SVRS)

January 2022

**FINAL**



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>PURPOSE.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>SERVICE DELIVERY INVENTORY AND ASSESSMENT.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	LEGISLATIVE SERVICES AND ADMINISTRATION .....	7
2.2	OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE .....	9
2.3	CAPITAL PROJECTS .....	14
2.4	PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT .....	14
2.5	EMERGENCY SERVICES .....	15
2.6	BYLAW AND COMMUNITY PEACE OFFICER SERVICES.....	16
2.7	COMMUNITY SERVICES .....	17
2.8	OVERARCHING OPPORTUNITIES FOR REGIONALIZATION .....	18
1.1	INCLUDING ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL FUNCTIONS.....	18
<b>3</b>	<b>ASSET AND INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>MUNICIPAL FINANCE.....</b>	<b>20</b>
4.1	COMPARATIVE FINANCIAL POSITIONS .....	20
4.2	IMPLICATIONS OF CURRENT MUNICIPAL FINANCE POSITION.....	25
<b>5</b>	<b>GOVERNANCE.....</b>	<b>27</b>
5.1	LOCAL POLICY AND REGULATIONS .....	27
5.2	JOINT PLANNING AND INITIATIVES.....	28
5.3	GOVERNANCE.....	33
5.4	OVERARCHING POLICY OPPORTUNITIES FOR REGIONALIZATION .....	34
<b>6</b>	<b>NEXT STEPS .....</b>	<b>35</b>

## 1 Purpose

The Summer Villages of Lac Ste Anne are assessing potential regionalization options by exploring ways to improve partnerships, cost sharing, and other efficiencies between their communities. In the development of recommendations on regionalization, it is essential to understand current servicing, partnerships, governance, and finances for the individual project municipalities.

The purpose of this document is to provide a detailed technical analysis of current standing for all project municipalities which include the Summer Villages of:

- Castle Island
- Ross Haven
- Sunset Point
- Val Quentin
- West Cove
- Yellowstone

For each of the above communities, an inventory of existing services levels and analysis of associated costs was prepared through comparisons by summer village on costs per-lot and per-capita. Analysis and process are detailed in Section 2.

Section 3 outlines a summary of asset and infrastructure management, while Section 4 provides a detailed view of comparative financial positions for all the summer villages. Finally, Section 5 provides an overview of existing governance including local policy, an inventory of current joint planning and initiatives, and basic governance structure.

Findings from this analysis are used to develop and support recommendations on regionalization that are explored in detail in the [Governance Recommendations Report](#).

## 2 Service Delivery Inventory and Assessment

One of the first aspects of the technical analysis was to understand current service delivery and assess potential regionalization opportunities that would result in greater efficiency, reduced costs and/or improve service levels. Data was gathered from each of the six project municipalities, and through feedback gathered during initial public engagement. Based on this data, cost of service delivery was analyzed by type of service for each of the summer villages.

A comparison of the service delivery costs by overall costs, per-capita costs, and per-lot costs for each of the summer villages is provided in the tables below. Anomalies or differences in the reporting are noted. The potential for each of the services to be shared was also reviewed, as were gaps in service and areas of overlap between services provided by the project municipalities.

For the purposes of studying regionalization, services that would be most impactful for regionalization were identified and analyzed during the initial scoping. There may be other services covered in the municipal budgets that were not included, as they would have little impact on the analysis as it relates to regionalization.

Figure 1 summarizes data on the number of lots and population in each summer village. Figures 2 and 3 summarize the comparisons of contracted costs and the budgeted costs of each service for the project municipalities. Because the populations and numbers of lots vary significantly for each summer village, the total 2021 budgets for the services were reviewed, and it was necessary to convert these budgets to a per-capita or per-lot value in order to get a consistent and fair

comparison for each municipality. For example, water costs for Castle Island appear very low; however, when compared on a per-lot basis or as a percentage of the total budget for analyzed services, they are very comparable to the other summer villages.

It should be noted that throughout data collection there were some differences in reporting of budgeting for services among each of the municipalities. For example, one municipality might include assessment services as a separate budget item, while another municipality might include it under administration. Wherever possible, these differences were accounted for and were either reallocated so that all accounting was the same, or differences were noted and accounted for when comparing budgets.

Additionally, some discrepancies were observed in information reported from the project municipalities. The summer village 2021 budgets and reported contracted costs did not always align. These discrepancies are likely a result of differences in reporting style and ambiguity in budget items that created some challenges when reconciling. Care was taken to understand and right discrepancies wherever possible, and differences were noted when comparing budgets.

**Note:** Some elements of the following analysis are based on number of occupied lots. In discussion, the Steering Committee has determined that moving forward, future analysis will be based on number of total lots. This adjustment has a nominal effect on the current analysis, and no changes were made to this Technical Analysis

Fig. 1: Lots and Population of Project Municipalities

Summer Village	Castle Island	Ross Haven	Sunset Point	Val Quentin	West Cove	Yellowstone
Number of lots	19	227	191	187	285	165
Number of non-vacant lots	18	191	185	178	239	146
Number of vacant lots	1	36	6	9	46	19
Population	10	160	169	235	149	137

Fig. 2: Total Budgeted Costs of Service by Project Municipality

Budgeted Services (2021)	Castle Island	Ross Haven	Sunset Point	Val Quentin	West Cove	Yellowstone
Legislative Service and Admin	\$16,540	\$182,250	\$94,550	\$103,600	\$123,250	\$95,350
Operations and Maintenance	\$19,070	\$63,566	\$347,188	\$307,580	\$165,055	\$182,400
Water	\$165	\$7,230	\$8,743	\$6,550	\$4,475	\$2,000
Wastewater	\$3,494	\$5,100	\$216,414	\$123,525	\$4,000	\$33,000
Public Works and Parks	\$11,936	\$27,082	\$88,031	\$130,075	\$117,380	\$122,200
Solid Waste	\$3,475	\$24,144	\$34,000	\$34,150	\$39,200	\$25,200
Emergency Services	\$2,082	\$23,506	\$38,558	\$7,900	\$15,500	\$29,800
Fire	\$2,082	\$23,506	\$32,558	-	\$11,500	\$17,300
Emergency Management	-	-	\$6,000	\$7,900	\$4,000	\$12,500
Community Peace Officer	-	\$4,419	\$23,000	-	\$8,500	\$8,000
Planning and Development	-	\$8,700	-	\$6,050	\$10,500	\$11,400
Community Services	\$1,339	\$6,932	\$12,613	\$13,280	\$8,735	\$10,482
<b>TOTAL OF ANALYZED BUDGETED ITEMS</b>	<b>\$39,648</b>	<b>\$289,373</b>	<b>\$515,909</b>	<b>\$425,130</b>	<b>\$331,540</b>	<b>\$337,432</b>

Fig. 3: Total Contracted Costs of Service by Project Municipality

Contracted Costs (2021)	Castle Island	Ross Haven	Sunset Point	Val Quentin	West Cove	Yellowstone
Legislative Service and Admin	\$2,800	-	-	\$9,080	\$80,200	\$58,452
Operations and Maintenance	\$26,565	\$102,633	\$327,134	\$189,416	\$113,175	\$106,467
Water	\$165	\$7,230	\$8,743	\$6,293	\$4,475	\$1,903
Wastewater	\$3,400	\$5,100	\$216,414	\$123,692	\$4,000	\$31,064
Public Works and Parks	\$18,500	\$73,159	\$67,977	\$32,895	\$65,500	\$49,000
Solid Waste	\$4,500	\$17,144	\$34,000	\$26,536	\$39,200	\$24,500
Emergency Services	\$2,800	\$23,506	\$38,058	\$21,563	\$21,500	\$29,800
Fire	\$2,800	\$23,506	\$32,558	\$21,563	\$11,500	\$17,300
Emergency Management	-	-	\$5,500	-	\$10,000	\$12,500
Community Peace Officer	-	-	\$25,000	\$11,400	\$8,500	\$8,000
Planning and Development	-	\$5,260	-	\$5,400	\$7,500	\$5,400
Community Services	\$1,344	\$6,132	\$12,613	\$8,670	\$8,735	\$9,191
<b>TOTAL OF CONTRACTED ITEMS</b>	<b>\$33,509</b>	<b>\$137,531</b>	<b>\$402,805</b>	<b>\$234,129</b>	<b>\$239,610</b>	<b>\$217,310</b>

Contracted Costs as a % of Associated Budget(2021)	Castle Island	Ross Haven	Sunset Point	Val Quentin	West Cove	Yellowstone
<b>CONTRACTED % SHARE OF TOTAL</b>	85%	51%	78%	50%	72%	64%

## OBSERVATIONS

It is notable that all the summer villages report very high percentages (all six over 50%) of their total service budgets for contracted services. At the highest end, 85% of Castle Island's analyzed budget was allocated for contracted costs with only 15% representing in-house services. As the project municipalities all hold different contracts for service provision and are spending a high percentage of their budgets on these contracts, regionalization efforts have great potential to improve on overall costs and service levels by increasing bargaining power, improving efficiencies, and potentially sharing services, staff, and equipment.

The following sections provide more detailed comparison of key service areas for potential regionalization of the project municipalities by assessing service levels, costs on a per-capita and per-lot basis, percentages of total budget for services, and balancing information around satisfaction of service levels.

The categories assessed in detail are:

- Legislative Services and Administration
- Operations and Maintenance
- Capital Projects
- Planning and Development
- Emergency Services
- Bylaw and Community Peace Officer Services
- Community Services
- Assessment Services

### 2.1 Legislative Services and Administration

The legislative services and administration analysis includes costs for both council and CAO salaries and reimbursements. Costs also include administrative staff salaries. With slightly different staff structures across the project municipalities, public works staff costs and assessment contracts are also included where applicable. Where possible these differing costs were broken out into specific categories to ensure clear comparisons across summer villages.

Assessment services are accounted for under administration costs for the summer villages, and therefore, are included under administration for analysis in this study.

Figure 4 is a snapshot of costs for CAOs and council. Figure 5 provides a more detailed summary of administrative costs for each of the project municipalities. The cost for council is not included in the second table as it is accounted for separately.

Fig. 4: Costs of Council and CAO Snapshot by Project Municipality

2021 Council Budgets	Castle Island	Ross Haven	Sunset Point	Val Quentin*	West Cove	Yellowstone	Total
Council	\$188	\$8,250	\$29,350	\$29,515*	\$20,000	\$25,900	\$113,203
Salary/ Remuneration/ Honorarium/ Meeting Fees	-	\$7,000	\$17,550	\$23,100*	\$13,000	\$12,900	\$73,550
Mileage/Sub./Expenses	\$188	\$1,250	\$1,500	\$6,415	\$4,500	\$10,200	\$24,053
Training	-	-	\$4,000	-	\$1,500	\$2,500	\$8,000
Contingency/Other	-	-	\$6,300	-	\$1,000	\$300	\$7,600
CAO	\$9,005	\$44,520	\$45,000	\$36,940	\$71,000	\$51,000	\$257,465
Total	\$9,193	\$52,770	\$74,350	\$66,455	\$91,000	\$76,900	\$370,668

\*Val Quentin includes payments of \$5,200 to their public works manager as part of their honorarium expenses.

Fig. 5: Administrative Costs by Project Municipality (CAO included, no Council costs included)

	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)/ Capita	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)/ Lot	Total Contract Costs	Total Contract Costs/ Capita	Total Contract Costs/ Lot	Adequate Contract Service Level	Percentage of Total Budget
Castle Island	\$16,540	\$1,654	\$919	\$2,800	\$280	\$156	Meets Expectations	42%
Ross Haven	\$182,250	\$1,139	\$954	-	-	-	Meets Expectations	67%
Sunset Point	\$94,550	\$559	\$511	-	-	-	Meets Expectations	18%
Val Quentin	\$103,600	\$441	\$582	\$9,080	\$39	\$51	Meets Expectations	24%
West Cove	\$123,250	\$827	\$516	\$80,200	\$538	\$336	Meets Expectations	37%
Yellowstone	\$ 95,350	\$696	\$653	\$58,452	\$427	\$400	Meets Expectations	28%

## OBSERVATIONS

Some differences and anomalies were noted during analysis. Overall, the cost of administration (without council cost) averages approximately 35% of the total budgeted costs with the Summer Village of Sunset Point reporting the lowest percentage cost, and the Summer Village of Ross Haven the highest. Ross Haven reported \$79,123 included for wages, with CAO costs adding another \$42,000, and approximately \$20,000 for utilities in this category that the other municipalities do not have.

Council reimbursements average approximately \$22,600 per year, per municipality. This calculation does not include council reimbursements for the Summer Village of Castle Island as their council is mainly volunteer. With a volunteer council and low cost of doing administrative business, Castle Island may not see significant cost benefit from a shared administration model for these items.

For the rest of the Summer Villages, the potential for shared service in legislative services and administration is high, and as this is a large part of the budget component, shared administration could potentially reduce overhead costs and increase efficiency.

## 2.2 Operations and Maintenance

To gain a greater understanding of specific service levels and associated costs, Operations and Maintenance services were broken into the following categories:

- Water
- Wastewater Utilities
- Public Works and Parks and Recreation
- Solid Waste

For analysis, parks and recreation servicing was combined with general public works, as the majority of the project municipalities reported these services under one budget item. Water and wastewater have been analyzed separately as the contracts and services provided for these varied significantly between the summer villages.

### WATER

Water service is provided to all summer villages from private water wells or individual cisterns. West Interlake District Water Commission provides bulk water stations for truck fill water service. Currently the nearest bulk water fill station for most communities is located in the Village of Alberta Beach with the next nearest for the south lake communities at Kapasiwin; however, there are plans for future fill stations to service the more remote communities around Lac Ste. Anne.

The West Interlake District Water Commission water charges are based on an assigned volume of water to each village that is negotiated with the Commission. Several summer villages are paying down a debenture on the cost of joining the Commission which is the majority of the cost of water.

Fig. 6: Budgeted and Contract Water Servicing Costs by Municipality

	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)/ Capita	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)/ Lot	Total Yearly Contract Costs	Total Contract Costs/ Capita	Total Contract Costs/ Lot	Adequate Service Level	Percentage of Total Budget
Castle Island	\$165	\$16	\$9	\$165	\$17	\$9	Meets Expectations	0%
Ross Haven	\$7,230	\$45	\$38	\$7,230	\$45	\$38	Meets Expectations	3%
Sunset Point	\$8,743	\$52	\$47	\$8,743	\$52	\$47	Meets Expectations	2%
Val Quentin	\$6,550	\$28	\$37	\$6,293	\$27	\$35	Meets Expectations	1%
West Cove	\$4,475	\$30	\$19	\$4,475	\$30	\$19	Meets Expectations	1%
Yellowstone	\$2,000	\$15	\$14	\$1,903	\$14	\$13	Meets Expectations	1%

The Summer Village of Castle Island also has a local public well that provides water to some residents, and the cost of the initial debenture has been paid down. As a result, the current cost of water is comparably low for Castle Island. With the debenture paid, and general community satisfaction with current service levels, it likely does not make sense for Castle Island to participate in other arrangements for water service.

The responses from the steering committee meetings and from the public engagement indicated that residents were generally satisfied with the level of service and were not looking to change delivery method. The exception to the high level of satisfaction is that West Cove would like to have a truck fill located closer to the summer village. Yellowstone is potentially looking at capital projects for a reservoir for fire storage volume water and a piped system to increase the level of service, but it is likely that they would continue to participate in the West Interlake District system.

## WASTEWATER

Servicing for wastewater across the project municipalities varies greatly. Budgeted operational costs for wastewater, as shown in Figure 7, range in percent of total budget from 1% in the Summer Village of West Cove, to a high of 42% in the Summer Village of Sunset Point. This large range is mainly due to varying wastewater disposal contracts.

Fig. 7: Budgeted and Contract Wastewater Servicing Costs by Municipality

	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)/ Capita	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)/ Lot	Total Yearly Contract Costs	Total Contract Costs/ Capita	Total Contract Costs/ Lot	Adequate Service Level	Percentage of Total Budget
Castle Island	\$3,494	\$349	\$194	\$3,400	\$340	\$189	Meets Expectations	9%
Ross Haven	\$5,100	\$32	\$27	\$5,100	\$32	\$27	Meets Expectations	2%
Sunset Point	\$216,414	\$1,281	\$1,170	\$216,414	\$1,281	\$1,170	Meets Expectations	42%
Val Quentin	\$123,525	\$526	\$694	\$123,692	\$526	\$695	Meets Expectations	26%
West Cove	\$4,000	\$27	\$17	\$4,000	\$27	\$17	Meets Expectations	1%
Yellowstone	\$33,000	\$241	\$226	\$31,065	\$227	\$213	Meets Expectations	10%

The Summer Village of West Cove operates its own lagoon, and operator costs are not included in the wastewater costs. There is potential for West Cove to investigate expanding their lagoon and offering service to other jurisdictions; however, the capital cost, current lagoon capacity, and geographic location does limit this opportunity for shared services in wastewater.

The two communities of Sunset Point and Val Quentin are serviced by the TriVillage Regional Sewage Services Commission and their costs are significantly higher than the North 43 Lagoon Commission utilized by several of the other municipalities. It would not make sense for Sunset Point or Val Quentin to alter their service provision with the TriVillage system at this time due to contractual arrangements and debentures.

Ross Haven has very low operating costs as they are on private disposal systems and do not pay into a commission; however, the costs present are for a special levy to cover the building of a force main to the North 43 Lagoon.

The opportunity to share services for wastewater management is low for all the jurisdictions, as each one has contracted service that makes the most sense geographically. Potential for overall efficiencies may be found in shared administration of these services.

## PUBLIC WORKS AND PARKS/RECREATION

Public works maintenance and parks maintenance were accounted for together in analysis as several of the summer villages reported these services under the same line item in their budgets. Some summer villages currently contract out public works maintenance services, and some have full- or part-time employees to perform the work.

Fig. 8: Budgeted and Contract Public Works and Parks/Recreation Costs by Municipality

	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)/ Capita	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)/ Lot	Total Contract Costs	Total Contract Costs/ Capita	Total Contract Costs/ Lot	Adequate Service Level	Percentage of Total Budget
Castle Island	\$11,936	\$1,194	\$663	\$18,500	\$1,850	\$1,028	Meets Expectations	30%
Ross Haven	\$27,082	\$169	\$142	\$90,303	\$564	\$473	Meets Expectations	10%
Sunset Point	\$122,031	\$722	\$660	\$67,978	\$402	\$367	Meets Expectations	22%
Val Quentin	\$130,075	\$554	\$731	\$32,895	\$140	\$1,828	Meets Expectations	28%
West Cove	\$117,380	\$788	\$491	\$65,500	\$440	\$368	Meets Expectations	35%
Yellowstone	\$122,200	\$892	\$837	\$49,000	\$358	\$205	Meets Expectations	36%

As shown in Figure 8, The percentage of total budget for public works and parks maintenance ranges from 10% to 36%, with an average of 27%. There is significant consistency between four of the summer villages with budgets all between 30-36%.

Overall, the level of service for maintenance was indicated as satisfactory with many communities expressing they could benefit from an increased level of service. General satisfaction in Ross Haven specifically is quite high as the summer village has a dedicated maintenance employee plus summer student.

There is potential to share services in public works and parks/recreation across the summer villages. Neighbouring communities such as Ross Haven and Yellowstone together as well as Sunset Point, Val Quentin and potentially Castle Island have stronger opportunities in directly sharing maintenance facilities, equipment, staffing and contracts, but there is a strong possibility that shared administration of public works services could be beneficial for all six project municipalities.

## SOLID WASTE

Service levels for solid waste management are comparable across all of the project municipalities. All except for Ross Haven contract waste services out, and the value of the contracts for these services is very similar overall. The solid waste cost for the Summer Village of Ross Haven is shown as zero in Figure 9, as this service is provided by their public works employee. For Ross Haven, the value of the solid waste services is included in administration costs for staffing. Castle Island has the lowest cost, due to the smaller number of residents.

Solid waste services have the potential to be a shared contract, or shared service amongst the summer villages and shared administration of services certainly could lead to efficiency.

Fig. 9: Budgeted and Contract Solid Waste Servicing Costs by Municipality

	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)/ Capita	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)/ Lot	Total Contract Costs	Total Contract Costs/ Capita	Total Contract Costs/ Lot	Adequate Service Level	Percentage of Total Budget
Castle Island	\$3,475	\$347	\$193	\$4,500	\$450	\$250	Meets Expectations	9%
Ross Haven	\$7,000	\$44	\$37	-	-	-	Meets Expectations	3%
Sunset Point	\$34,000	\$201	\$184	\$34,000	\$201	\$184	Meets Expectations	7%
Val Quentin	\$34,150	\$145	\$192	\$26,536	\$113	\$149	Meets Expectations	7%
West Cove	\$39,200	\$263	\$164	\$39,200	\$263	\$164	Meets Expectations	12%
Yellowstone	\$25,200	\$184	\$173	\$24,500	\$179	\$168	Meets Expectations	7%

## OVERALL OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

Operations and maintenance services compose a large part of each summer village's budget. Based on feedback collected in public engagement, and from CAO and steering committee feedback, the level of service for operations and maintenance is satisfactory overall.

The summer villages show very similar service levels, with some exceptions as outlined above. There is little desire to connect residents to individual lot services such as water or wastewater lines on a shared regional system, as it was determined through past research to be cost prohibitive.

A concern voiced by the many of the project municipalities was over access to water, indicating that the Alberta Beach Truck Fill station is located too far away from some of the more remote summer villages; however, West Interlake District Water Commission does have plans to expand out to areas closer to Ross Haven and Yellowstone as well as West Cove over the next few years. This expansion would provide improved service and shorter haul distances, in turn, reducing costs. Co-ordinated effort will help ensure that these expansions are of top priority for West Interlake District and that future connection costs are planned for by each municipality.

Parks and road maintenance and other operational tasks are mainly contracted out with some municipalities using employee or volunteer work. There could be potential cost savings by sharing a public works permanent staff member who could perform operations and maintenance duties, oversee the purchasing and contracting out of maintenance, and provide the opportunity for "bulk buying power", making operations more efficient, attracting better quality contractors, and potentially saving costs.

## 2.3 Capital Projects

The ability to jointly co-ordinate projects to obtain better contractors and better prices would be beneficial to the municipalities; however, because the need for capital projects can vary widely, it may not be feasible to join services on a regular basis but could occur on an as-needed basis. One example of a joint initiative that was raised in the public engagement was the possibility of jointly developing a regional pathway system around the lake that would physically link the different summer villages and provide an opportunity for recreation. Joint participation in general capital project opportunities could occur but would require collaboration between municipalities regarding the need for upcoming capital work.

As an option, shared administration for capital projects could prove quite beneficial for all project municipalities. One key person or project manager could be shared jointly on projects across the summer villages to economize on staff requirements. Shared administration would allow for streamlined coordination and identification of opportunities, prioritizing projects and funding, and increased buying power in contracting of work for capital projects.

## 2.4 Planning and Development

Assessment of costs for planning and development includes the salaries of development officers and administration for performing planning services. Many of the summer villages' planning roles are performed on an hourly, as-needed basis or by the municipality's CAOs; therefore, some costs incurred for planning are included under the administration line item.

Fig. 10: Budgeted and Contract Planning and Municipal Development Costs by Municipality

	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)/ Capita	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)/ Lot	Total Contract Costs	Total Contract Costs/ Capita	Total Contract Costs/ Lot	Adequate Service Level	Percentage of Total Budget
Castle Island	-	-	-	-	-	-	Meets Expectations	0%
Ross Haven	\$8,700	\$54	\$46	\$5,260	\$33	\$28	Meets Expectations	3%
Sunset Point	-	-	-	-	-	-	Meets Expectations	0%
Val Quentin	\$6,050	\$26	\$34	\$5,400	\$23	\$30	Meets Expectations	3%
West Cove	\$10,500	\$70	\$44	\$7,500	\$50	\$31	Meets Expectations	3%
Yellowstone	\$11,400	\$83	\$78	\$5,400	\$39	\$37	Meets Expectations	3%

In Figure 10, the Summer Villages of Castle Island and Sunset Point show zero costs as these planning services are performed in house by CAOs and are included in the administration costs for these summer villages.

Overall, costs for planning and development make up a very low percentage of total budgets; therefore, any cost savings gained in these areas will be minimal.

There is strong potential to share planning and development services between the summer villages; however, the overall hours needed to perform the associated duties would not change significantly, and therefore not a lot of savings would be gained. Sharing administration for planning and development may increase overall efficiency of the service and provide the opportunity to attract employees.

## 2.5 Emergency Services

For the purposes of this study, analysis of emergency services includes the fire, EMS, and emergency management costs for each summer village. Some costs include the additional cost of a community peace officer, and in some cases, the community peace officer contracts are reported separately by the summer villages. Where community peace officer costs are broken out, the analysis is shown in the following section in Figure 12. The cost of RCMP servicing has been removed from the numbers, as this is a provincially provided service.

Director of Emergency Management (DEM) costs are reported differently across the summer villages, with some communities accounting for this cost under administration and as a CAO duty, while others account for it separately. While DEMs were raised as a possible focus in discussion with the steering committee, the Province of Alberta requires each municipality have its own DEM. Because of this requirement, the only potential regionalization option that would change DEM servicing is amalgamation. In amalgamation, a small cost savings may be realized for reduction to one DEM; however, it would not be any significant cost reduction compared to the overall budget.

Fig. 11: Budgeted and Contract Protection/Emergency Services Costs by Municipality

	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)	Total Budgeted Amount (2021) / Capita	Total Budgeted Amount (2021) / Lot	Total Contract Costs	Total Contract Costs / Capita	Total Contract Costs / Lot	Adequate Service Level	Percentage of Total Budget
Castle Island	\$2,083	\$208	\$116	\$2,800	\$280	\$156	Meets Expectations	5%
Ross Haven	\$27,925	\$175	\$146	\$23,506	\$147	\$123	Meets Expectations	10%
Sunset Point	\$61,558	\$364	\$333	\$63,058	\$373	\$341	Meets Expectations	12%
Val Quentin	\$7,900	\$34	\$44	\$32,963	\$140	\$185	Meets Expectations	2%
West Cove	\$24,000	\$161	\$100	\$30,000	\$201	\$126	Reviewing Satisfaction	7%
Yellowstone	\$37,800	\$276	\$259	\$37,800	\$276	\$259	Reviewing Satisfaction	11%

With the exception of the Summer Village of West Cove, all of the project municipalities have contracts with Onoway Regional Fire Services operated by North West Fire Rescue – Onoway. West Cove is serviced by Lac Ste Anne County Fire Services due to the geographical distance from other service providers.

Castle Island indicated the longest response time for fire service and has the highest per-capita and per-lot costs for this service; however, the percentage of total overall cost of this service is low. Val Quentin includes the cost of this service under administrative services. Sunset Point has the highest percentage of total costs dedicated to emergency services. The overall contract amounts are very similar for fire services. This service presents minimal potential for increased bargaining power if approached through a combined contract; however, geographical distance will still affect response times and costs, so there a combined contract is unlikely to create any significant financial efficiencies. It is likely most reasonable for the Summer Village of West Cove to maintain its separate agreement with the County due to distance.

## 2.6 Bylaw and Community Peace Officer Services

Participants in public engagement identified bylaw enforcement and community peace officer (CPO) services as one of the most important topics for improvement across the summer villages. Similarly, in discussion with administration and elected officials from the project municipalities, there was a desire expressed for improved service and potentially a dedicated peace officer. Figure 12 details the cost of existing CPO services by community.

Fig. 12: Bylaw and Community Peace Officer Costs by Municipality

Summer Village	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)	Cost of Service Per Capita	Cost of Service per Lot	Percentage of Total Costs (%)
Castle Island	0	0	0	0
Ross Haven	\$4,419	\$28	\$19	1
Sunset Point	\$26,056	\$154	\$136	4
Val Quentin	\$11,400	\$49	\$61	3
West Cove	\$8,006	\$54	\$28	2
Yellowstone	\$8,000	\$58	\$48	2

To assess a potential shared dedicated peace officer, the study looked at average costs for a community peace officer role in Alberta. An average base salary for the role of Level 1 Community Peace Officer, based on multiple job postings during the study period and two salary surveys, is in the range of \$71,000-85,000 per year, plus benefits. This role would require a vehicle and equipment as well as working space. If the role was divided evenly among all six of the project municipalities, the cost would be approximately \$12,000 per year plus overhead.

Currently three of the summer villages report budget expenditures to contract CPO service, and those contracts range from \$8,000 to \$25,000. Other municipalities had budget items for a community peace officer, but the cost was not broken out and may be included in the administration category for those communities.

A dedicated community peace officer could potentially reduce the costs for some villages and could provide a higher level of service than what is currently experienced. As one of the main areas identified where the level of service was inadequate, a joint cost-shared service could be very beneficial in this case.

## 2.7 Community Services

The community services included here are for library and Family and Community Support Services (FCSS) costs.

Fig. 13: Budgeted and Contract Community Services Costs by Municipality

	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)/Capita	Total Budgeted Amount (2021)/Lot	Total Contract Costs	Total Contract Costs/Capita	Total Contract Costs/Lot	Adequate Service Level	Percentage of Total Budget
Castle Island	\$1,339	\$134	\$74	\$1,344	\$134	\$75	Meets Expectations	3%
Ross Haven	\$6,932	\$43	\$36	\$6,132	\$38	\$32	Meets Expectations	3%
Sunset Point	\$12,613	\$75	\$68	\$12,613	\$75	\$68	Meets Expectations	2%
Val Quentin	\$13,030	\$55	\$73	\$8,670	\$37	\$49	Meets Expectations	3%
West Cove	\$8,735	\$59	\$37	\$8,735	\$59	\$37	Meets Expectations	3%
Yellowstone	\$10,482	\$77	\$72	\$9,191	\$67	\$63	Meets Expectations	3%

The costs for this service category are low compared to the overall budget, and the summer villages already access the same regional libraries. The main library costs are contributions to regional branches at Alberta Beach and Darwell as well as the Yellowhead Regional Library system which is charged to member municipalities on a per-capita basis that would not see a change from any regionalization effort. There is little potential to amalgamate or share these services over the collaborations that are already in place. The cost of centralizing infrastructure or duplicating services already offered in other jurisdictions would be prohibitive.

## **2.8 Overarching Opportunities for Regionalization Including Administrative and Operational Functions**

In preparing an inventory and analysis of servicing across the summer villages, notable opportunities for increased regional collaboration were observed. The following summarizes general insights on the ability to share or centralize services inventoried in the previous sections.

In public engagement activities, most residents/ratepayers were satisfied with the overall level of service provided in their communities. Some challenges were identified in bylaw enforcement and policing for all involved communities, and sanitary sewer specifically in the Summer Village of Ross Haven. Other comments were made about emergency management, communication and understanding of community emergency resources.

There is significant potential for cost reductions and efficiencies with shared administration and joint staffing seems most beneficial for the summer villages overall. Cost savings could be seen in reduction of salaries and costs for council members if the amalgamation option is pursued. Cost savings and potential outcomes around council and CAO reductions are explored in Section 6.1.4 on amalgamation.

In both public engagement and municipal workshops, bylaw enforcement and community peace officer servicing were emphasized as challenging in the summer villages. There is opportunity to pursue a shared, dedicated community peace officer for service across the municipalities, increasing efficiency and improving on the current service level. If this service is managed through shared administration, it could result in costs savings for some communities and higher costs for others; however, all summer villages would see a higher level of service. It is notable that several participants in public engagement indicated that bylaw enforcement and community peace officer service is one area they would be willing to pay more for.

Public works was another key area identified by the public engagement results and municipal feedback as a potential focus for improved services. Currently, Ross Haven delivers public works servicing with in-house employees, while most of the project municipalities contract out services. Costs for public works range from 10% to 36% of the total analyzed budgets, with four of the six municipalities spending over 30% of their service budget on public works. Shared administration for public works duties using a dedicated public works employee for maintenance and management of additional contracting could prove much more efficient for the project municipalities. Duties and hours needed to complete this work would not change; however, shared management of contracts would be an opportunity to leverage combined buying power, attracting high quality contractors for larger scopes of work. This model has potential to increase efficiencies, improve service levels, and reduce costs overall. Capital projects could be jointly managed in the same way, and potentially by the same shared employee, to maximize efficiencies, collaborative potential, and service procurement.

Similarly, solid waste servicing could be a focus for increased collaboration for the summer villages. Entering a joint agreement could increase efficiencies and lower costs overall, though costs for some communities could be impacted by geographical distance. All the project municipalities currently contract out their solid waste servicing with the exception of the Summer Village of Ross Haven that handles it in house under public works. Moving to shared servicing for waste could

reduce hours needed from a public works employee for Ross Haven. Shared administration of the service could generate efficiencies and reduce costs.

With shared administration and a strong unified regional voice, the project municipalities would have a stronger presence and combined negotiating power for commissions if negotiating as a block on water and wastewater contracts. Increased leverage with West Interlake District Water Commission could be utilized to push for truck fill improvements moving forward more quickly.

### 3 Asset and Infrastructure Management

Information on the tangible capital asset values was provided by administration from the project municipalities for this study; however, lists of actual assets for every municipality were not available, making it difficult to analyze the potential for sharing capital assets.

In general, because of the physical distance between project municipalities, it does not make sense financially or efficiently to share assets required for weekly and general maintenance tasks. If there is a specialized item that is infrequently used, it could be shared among the communities. The summer villages could coordinate the bulk purchase of assets such as mowing equipment or vehicles. Assets such as community halls or administration buildings have the potential to be shared, especially if the municipalities choose to go with a shared administration or public works.

As the detailed asset information is not available, the life cycle costs of these assets were not reviewed, nor was funding for the purchase of capital assets. Asset and debt levels as well as debentures should be closely considered if amalgamation is a preferred option.

The value of tangible capital assets for each summer village ranged from \$197,000 to \$667,000. The Summer Village of Castle Island held the lowest value overall but the highest value on a per-capita and per-lot basis due to their small population.

Fig. 14: Capital Assets with Per-Lot and Per-Capita Values by Municipality

Summer Village	Total Capital Assets	Value of Assets / Capita	Value of Assets / Lot
Castle Island	\$12,681,760	\$1,268,176	\$667,461
Ross Haven	\$60,684,820	\$379,280	\$267,334
Sunset Point	\$66,183,290	\$391,617	\$346,509
Val Quentin	\$45,878,830	\$195,229	\$245,341
West Cove	\$56,275,040	\$377,685	\$197,456
Yellowstone	\$37,862,160	\$276,366	\$229,468

## 4 Municipal Finance

### 4.1 Comparative Financial Positions

To gain a better understanding of the financial health of the six summer villages involved in this study, the actual costs from the municipalities 2020 audited financial statements were analyzed.

The tables below compare the general financial positions of each municipality using the 2020 audited financial information. Figure 15 shows the overall financial numbers of the summer villages, which are then broken out into per-capita numbers, and per-lot numbers. These breakdowns were important to gain a true comparison of each municipality. Tax/mill rates were also analyzed to gain a better understanding around revenue generation. Lastly, the three final tables in this section are simplified comparisons used to garner a quick snapshot of the financial health of each municipality, as well as grants received for 2020.

Fig. 15: Overall Financials (2020) by Municipality

2020 Financials (Total)	Castle Island	Ross Haven	Sunset Point	Val Quentin	West Cove	Yellowstone
2020 Actual Revenue	\$65,251	\$330,101	\$511,604	\$413,381	\$344,651	\$396,041
2020 Accumulated Surplus	\$551,125	\$4,122,059	\$1,306,583	\$2,226,007	\$2,621,963	\$1,097,481
Total Capital Assets	\$12,681,760	\$60,684,820	\$66,183,290	\$45,878,830	\$56,275,040	\$37,862,160
Financial Assets	\$170,399	\$845,787	\$764,636	\$986,922	\$408,790	\$861,031
Cash End of Year	\$299,026	\$830,876	\$635,306	\$291,462	\$171,844	\$502,505
Real Property Taxes	\$100,985	\$420,214	\$518,990	\$454,530	\$452,874	\$276,365
Linear Property Tax	\$131	\$0	\$2,401	\$0	\$2,041	\$3,186
Special Assessments	\$40,750	\$28,625	\$0	\$56,100	\$0	\$102,082
Total Taxable Assessment	\$12,681,760	\$60,684,820	\$66,183,290	\$45,878,830	\$56,275,040	\$37,862,160
2020 Actual Expenses	\$68,917	\$306,782	\$505,013	\$441,533	\$428,035	\$382,978
Debt Limit	?	\$495,152	\$767,406	\$620,072	\$516,977	\$594,062
Total Debt	-	-	-	-	-	-

Fig. 16: Per-Capita Financials (2020) by Municipality

	Castle Island	Ross Haven	Sunset Point	Val Quentin	West Cove	Yellowstone
2020 Actual Revenue	\$6,525	\$2,063	\$3,063	\$1,640	\$2,313	\$2,891
2020 Accumulated Surplus	\$55,113	\$25,763	\$7,824	\$8,833	\$17,597	\$8,011
Tangible Capital Assets	\$1,268,176	\$379,280	\$396,307	\$182,059	\$377,685	\$276,366
Financial Assets	\$17,040	\$5,286	\$4,579	\$3,916	\$2,744	\$6,285
Cash End of Year	\$29,903	\$5,193	\$3,804	\$1,157	\$1,153	\$3,668
Real Property Taxes	\$10,098	\$2,626	\$3,108	\$1,804	\$3,039	\$2,017
Linear Property Tax	\$13	-	\$14	-	\$14	\$23
Special Assessments	\$4,075	\$179	-	\$223	-	\$745
Total Taxable Assessment	\$1,268,176	\$379,280	\$396,307	\$182,059	\$377,685	\$276,366
2020 Actual Expenses	\$6,892	\$1,917	\$3,024	\$1,752	\$2,873	\$2,795
Debt Limit	?	\$3,095	\$4,595	\$2,461	\$3,470	\$4,336
Total Debt	-	-	-	-	-	-

Fig. 17: Per-Lot Financials (2020) by Municipality

	Castle Island	Ross Haven	Sunset Point	Val Quentin	West Cove	Yellowstone
2020 Actual Revenue	\$3,625	\$1,728	\$2,765	\$2,322	\$1,442	\$2,713
2020 Accumulated Surplus	\$30,618	\$21,581	\$7,063	\$12,506	\$10,971	\$7,517
Tangible Capital Assets	\$704,542	\$317,722	\$357,748	\$257,746	\$235,460	\$259,330
Financial Assets	\$9,467	\$4,428	\$4,133	\$5,545	\$1,710	\$5,897
Cash End of Year	\$16,613	\$4,350	\$3,434	\$1,637	\$719	\$3,442
Real Property Taxes	\$5,610	\$2,200	\$2,805	\$2,554	\$1,895	\$1,893
Linear Property Tax	\$7	-	\$13	-	\$9	\$22
Special Assessments	\$2,264	\$150	-	\$315	-	\$699
Total Taxable Assessment	\$704,542	\$317,722	\$357,748	\$257,746	\$235,460	\$259,330
2020 Actual Expenses	\$3,829	\$1,606	\$2,730	\$2,481	\$1,791	\$2,623
Debt Limit	?	\$2,592	\$4,148	\$3,484	\$2,163	\$4,069
Total Debt	-	-	-	-	-	-

Fig. 18: Tax Rates by Municipality

Tax Rates	Castle Island	Ross Haven	Sunset Point	Val Quentin	West Cove	Yellowstone
General Municipal (Residential/Farmland)	4.24	2.79175	5.7253	4.7370	4.5066	5.4887
General Municipal (Communal Residential)	-	-	10.179	-	-	-
General Municipal (Non-Residential)	4.24	2.79175	5.7253	-	11.1001	17.2520
Alberta School Foundation Fund (Residential/Farmland)	2.586	2.56	2.4425	2.5302	2.5903	2.6776
Alberta School Foundation Fund (Non-Residential)	3.7	3.76	2.4425	2.7537	3.7186	3.6856
Lac Ste. Anne Seniors Foundation (Residential/Farmland)	0.2182	0.2176	0.2135	0.2133	0.2186	0.2174
Lac Ste. Anne Seniors Foundation (Non-Residential)	0.2182	0.2176	0.2135	0.2133	0.2186	0.2174
Designated Industrial Property (Residential/Farmland)	0.76	0.0766	0.076	0.0766	0.0766	0.0766

The tables and discussion below show a snapshot of what the financial position of each of the summer villages looks like for the 2020 year. 2020 financial statements and the actual budgets were used for comparisons. This snapshot will guide the discussion on how the financial position of each summer village will impact the viability of the different regionalization options.

Fig. 19: Details on Financial Position by Municipality

2020 Actual*	Castle Island	Ross Haven	Sunset Point	Val Quentin	West Cove	Yellowstone
Net Revenue	\$65,250	\$330,101	\$511,604	\$413,381	\$344,651	\$396,041
Total Operating Expenses	\$68,916	\$306,782	\$505,013	\$441,533	\$428,035	\$392,978
Operating Surplus/ (Deficit)	(\$3,666)	\$23319	\$6,591	(\$28,152)	(\$83,384)	\$13,063
Financial Assets	\$334,180	\$845,787	\$273,403	\$510,308	\$408,790	\$546,758
Capital Assets	\$379,923	\$3,276,272	\$1,033,181	\$1,715,699	\$2,303,682	\$550,723
Debt	-	-	-	-	-	-
Debt Limit	not available	\$495,152	\$767,406	\$620,072	\$516,977	\$594,062

\*from 2020 financial statements

Summer Village	Net Revenue / Capita (2020 Financial Statements)	Total Expenses / Capita (2020 Financial Statements)	Surplus (Deficit) / Capita
Castle Island	\$6,525	\$6,892	(\$367)
Ross Haven	\$2,063	\$1,917	\$146
Sunset Point	\$3,063	\$3,024	\$39
Val Quentin	\$1,640	\$1,752	(\$112)
West Cove	\$2,313	\$2,873	(\$560)
Yellowstone	\$2,891	\$2,795	\$96

Operating Grant Amounts from 2020 Financial Statements	Castle Island	Ross Haven	Sunset Point	Val Quentin	West Cove	Yellowsto ne
Total Net Revenue	\$65,250	\$330,101	\$511,604	\$413,381	\$344,651	\$396,041
Grant Revenue (operating)	\$4,378	\$19,780	\$39,011	\$15,903	\$20,159	\$85,155
Percentage of Total Revenue for Grants	7	6	8	4	6	21

## COMPARISON TO ALL ALBERTA SUMMER VILLAGES

In reviewing provincial 2020 data on total revenues and expenditures, the Summer Villages on Lac Ste Anne tend to have lower revenues than other Alberta summer villages, but also keep their expenditures comparatively low. Data for this analysis is from the [Municipality Measurement Index](#).

For total revenues:

- Four municipalities are in the lowest revenue/capita third:
  - West Cove
  - Sunset Point
  - Val Quentin
  - Yellowstone
- One municipality is average (the middle third):
  - Ross Haven
- No data provided for Castle Island

For total expenditures:

- Two municipalities are average (the middle third):
  - Val Quentin
  - Yellowstone
- Three municipalities are good (the lowest expenditure/capita third)
  - West Cove
  - Sunset Point
  - Ross Haven
- No data provided for Castle Island

## OBSERVATIONS BY MUNICIPALITY

**Castle Island**, based on 2020 financial statements and actual budgets, has the highest total per-capita revenue and expenses, and appears to be operating at a small deficit in that year. The financial and capital assets indicated are lowest for this summer village; however, this is expected, as Castle Island is much smaller in size. There is a small reserve fund set aside and a special assessment/levy charged to fund the wastewater lagoon commission. There was also a small expenditure towards capital assets in 2020.

**Ross Haven** is operating at a small surplus in 2020 which is the highest operating surplus compared to the other summer villages. They are not in the top highest net revenue per-capita of all the project municipalities; however, they operate with low expenses. In addition, Ross Haven has the highest overall value of financial assets, and the highest value off non-financial assets, putting them in a strong financial position overall.

**Sunset Point** is also operating at a small operating surplus; however, they have more net revenue and more overall expenses. Sunset Point's financial assets are the lowest of the summer villages, and their capital assets are in the middle. There was grant funding of \$251,000 in 2021 contributing to the overall revenue. There was a large drainage improvement project completed, in 2021, indicating that there is a larger expenditure on maintenance and capital projects. This municipality has higher franchise fees contributing to revenue than the others.

**Val Quentin** has the lowest per-capita net revenue and the lowest operating expenses. They have a slight per-capita deficit in 2020. The financial and capital assets are average in comparison to the other summer villages. Costs for the TriVillage Regional Sewage Services Commission are the highest expense reported by Val Quentin.

**West Cove** has the highest per capita operating deficit in 2020 and the per-capita gap between revenue and expenses is high in relation to the other project municipalities' budgets. Financial assets of West Cove are on the lower end of all the summer villages, but their capital assets fall on the higher end.

**Yellowstone** is operating close to break-even with a slight surplus. Yellowstone appears to fall comparatively in the middle, although their capital assets are lower than most of the summer villages.

### 4.2 Implications of Current Municipal Finance Position

In summary, most of the project municipalities run fairly close to break-even between their net revenues and total expenses; however, considering the assets and financial positions, all appear to be in reasonable financial positions. Most of the summer villages obtain the majority of funding from general tax revenue, and grant funding levels comprise a fairly low percentage of revenue, indicating that the summer villages are not reliant on grant funding for operations. Large capital projects still rely mainly on grant funding and debenture borrowing. Levels of financial and capital assets vary widely across the municipalities. Based upon the 2020 financial statements, none of the summer villages have used any of their borrowing capacity, and capital projects or purchases appear to be funded through grant funding, reserves, or special levies and debentures. All the project municipalities, with the exception of West Cove, have special levies or assessments for

infrastructure improvements. Operating grant funding comprises a small portion of the net revenue for each municipality, and therefore is not a significant factor in regionalization.

As a result of the reasonable financial positions, no significant concerns were raised that would impact regionalization option preference.

## 5 Governance

To gain a fulsome understanding of collaboration potential for the project municipalities, a scan was conducted to review regulatory context, existing collaborative efforts and similarities in governance between the project municipalities. While these factors are less quantifiable in understanding precise gains or losses in potential regionalization, they help to assess general similarities and alignment of vision, goals, and actions across the region.

The purpose of this section is to provide an inventory and overview of existing structures and conditions including:

- Local Policy and Regulations;
- Joint Planning and Initiatives; and
- Governance

Findings of overarching opportunities in these structures are provided in summary at the end of the section.

### 5.1 Local Policy and Regulations

To understand local planning and regulatory context, several existing policies, plans and documents were reviewed for each project municipality including Municipal Development Plans, Land Use Bylaws, and Intermunicipal Development Plans where applicable. This document scan provided insight into consistencies across the municipalities in terms of community character, land use, and long-term strategy as well as strong visible consistencies in the development of policy documents pointing to potential for planning collaboration across the region.

#### MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Municipal Development Plans set long-term vision, goals, and policy for growth, development, and land use. Generally, the project municipalities' Municipal Development Plans share common goals and recurring themes such as environmental stewardship, water quality, securing potable water, improving stormwater systems, and connecting development to sanitary systems. Sunset Point and Val Quentin's plans additionally address the need for a recycling system while Yellowstone's plan has a significant focus on the creation of recreation opportunities. A number of the communities set goals for working with other municipalities on service delivery, and all plans speak to maintaining quiet, safe residential and recreational small-town feel of a summer village.

#### LAND USE

The project municipalities are all primarily made up of residential (single detached) with park and recreation land uses. Sunset Point and Val Quentin have defined a Medium Density Residential use for duplexes, fourplexes, and row housing, but none of the lots are currently used or zoned this way.

None of the six summer villages have current commercial land use; however, Sunset Point and Val Quentin have defined commercial districts in their Land Use Bylaws, and West Cove allows for some discretionary commercial uses. Home-based businesses are generally allowed throughout the

summer villages. Ross Haven is also home to Ross Haven Bible Camp that serves as regional amenity as well as the land that was previously Ross Haven Golf Course and are zoned under semi-public land use.

## INTERMUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT

The Summer Villages of Sunset Point and Val Quentin share an Intermunicipal Development Plan with the Town of Alberta Beach and Lac Ste Anne County that provides policy guidance for long-term planning and development of lands along their shared boundaries. The Plan lays out goals for providing strategic commercial opportunities, promoting the creation of regional recreation, and planning for regional economic and environmentally sustainable growth. Additionally, the Municipal Development Plans of West Cove and Yellowstone specifically outline goals of creating future Intermunicipal Development Plans with the County.

## PLAN AND POLICY CREATION

When looking at the different policy and planning documents created for the six project municipalities, not only do they share common goals and themes, but they also share formatting and writing style. The Municipal Development Plans, Land Use Bylaws, and other policy documents for the summer villages were completed by two contracted firms and share many similarities. Additionally, public engagement for development of the plans for Sunset Point and Val Quentin was done collaboratively. There is notable opportunity for collaboration and shared procurement of these policy development services for the summer villages' future needs.

### 5.2 Joint Planning and Initiatives

The Summer Villages on Lac Ste Anne currently collaborate on a number of different initiatives, commissions, and shared service delivery. The following list provides an inventory of existing initiatives including project municipalities and other partners involved and a description of the initiative. The resulting inventory helps provide context on existing collaborative culture as well as overlaps and gaps that may present opportunity for increased collaboration, shared services, and additional efficiencies.

---

#### Initiative | East End Bus

Who is Involved:

Project municipalities: Summer Villages of Ross Haven, Sunset Point, Val Quentin, Yellowstone

Main partners: Lac Ste Anne County, Town of Onoway, Village of Alberta Beach

Other members: Summer Villages of South View, Silver Sands, Sunrise Beach, Birch Cove, Nakamun Park

What is it: Affordable and accessible community transportation program for seniors and people with disabilities and mobility challenges. The service is available for special rental and also provides scheduled shopping, medical trips, and excursions. The Bus Committee for County East End

includes representation from all member municipalities plus a member at large and meets either in the Town of Onoway or Village of Alberta Beach.

---

### **Initiative | Highway 43 East Waste Commission**

Who is Involved:

Project municipalities: Summer Villages of Castle Island, Ross Haven, Sunset Point, Val Quentin, West Cove, and Yellowstone

Other members: Lac Ste Anne County, Village of Alberta Beach, Towns of Mayerthorpe and Onoway, Hamlet of Sangudo, Summer Villages of Birch Cove, Nakamun Park, Sandy Beach, Silver Sands, and South View

What is it: The Highway 43 East Waste Commission is a regional solid waste management services commission that operates mainly out of its main regional landfill in Gunn. The commission works with the 16 involved municipalities in a regional cost-shared recycling program. Tippage fees are collected from users to fund operations. Lac Ste Anne County separately manages eight waste transfer sites.

---

### **Initiative | Intermunicipal Collaboration Framework, Alberta Beach Bylaw #283-21**

Who is Involved

Project municipalities: Summer Village of Sunset Point

Other members: Alberta Beach

Additional: Certain services are addressed in conjunction with the Summer Village of Val Quentin

What is it: The bylaw addresses service funding and delivery between the above municipalities including transportation, water, wastewater, solid waste, emergency services, fire services, enforcement services, recreation, libraries, FCSS, seniors housing, and economic development.

---

### **Initiative | Intermunicipal Collaboration Framework, Alberta Beach Bylaw #284-21**

Who is Involved:

Project municipalities: Summer Village of Val Quentin

Other members: Alberta Beach

Additional: Certain services are addressed in conjunction with the Summer Village of Sunset Point

What is it: The bylaw addresses service funding and delivery between the above municipalities including transportation; water; wastewater; solid waste; emergency and protective services including emergency management, fire services, CPO services, bylaw enforcement, and animal control; recreation including Beachwave Park, boat launch, and municipal parks; social services

including libraries, FCSS, East End Bus, seniors housing, Onoway Regional Medical Clinic; land use planning, and economic development.

---

#### **Initiative | Intermunicipal Collaboration Frameworks in place with Lac Ste Anne County**

Who is Involved:

Project municipalities: All project municipalities hold separate ICFs with the County

Other members: Lac Ste Anne County

What is it: The bylaw addresses service funding and delivery between the above municipalities including details of funding, responsibility for, and delivery of a variety of services.

---

#### **Initiative | Lac Isle and Lac Ste Anne (LILSA) Water Quality Management Society**

Who is Involved:

Project municipalities: Summer Villages of Castle Island, Ross Haven, Sunset Point, Val Quentin, West Cove, Yellowstone

Other Partners: Summer Villages of South View, Silver Sands, Lac Ste Anne County, Alexis Nakota Sioux Nation

How: The society consists of an eight-member board with six elected members plus one appointed by Lac Ste Anne County, and one appointed by Alexis Nakota Sioux Nation.

What is it: LILSA is a non-profit society committed to promoting the preservation of Lac Isle and Lac Ste Anne through promoting and supporting best practices for lake management and water quality improvement. The society also functions to support and encourage all municipalities in the watershed to adopt goals to proactively work towards better lake quality.

---

#### **Initiative | North 43 Lagoon Commission**

Who is Involved:

Project municipalities: Summer Villages of Castle Island, Ross Haven, and Yellowstone

Other members: Lac Ste Anne County

What is it: The commission was established in to operate and maintain the North 43 Lagoon north of Lac Ste Anne and provide sanitary sewage services to the above municipalities.

---

#### **Initiative | Onoway Regional Medical Clinic**

Who is Involved:

Project municipalities: Summer Villages of Ross Haven, West Cove, and Val Quentin

Other members: Town of Onoway, Lac Ste Anne County, and the Summer Village of Silver Sands

**What is it:** The clinic provides a range of regional health services and is co-operated by above the six municipal partners. High-level strategic direction is provided by the Onoway Regional Medical Clinic Board of Directors as set up by the partnering municipalities.

---

#### **Initiative | Physician Recruitment Initiative (Lac Ste Anne Physician Recruitment Committee)**

Who is Involved:

Project municipalities: Summer Village of Castle Island, Ross Haven, Sunset Point, Val Quentin, West Cove, and Yellowstone

Other members: Lac Ste Anne County, Town of Onoway, Village of Alberta Beach, Summer Villages of Birch Cove, Nakamun Park, Sandy Beach, Silver Sands, South View, and Sunrise Beach

**What is it:** The committee works to ensure adequate physician and supporting services are available in Onoway for the surrounding region. Member municipalities commit financial resources to support these initiatives and a representative to sit on the committee.

---

#### **Initiative | Summer Villages of Lac Ste Anne County East (SVLSACE), Summer Village Regional Emergency Management Partnership**

Who is Involved:

Project municipalities: Summer Villages of Ross Haven, Sunset Point, Val Quentin, West Cove, Yellowstone

Other Members: Summer Villages of Birch Cove, Nakamun Park, Sandy Beach, Silver Sands, South View, Sunrise Beach

Mutual Aid Partnerships: Towns of Onoway and Mayerthorpe, Village of Alberta Beach. Future Collaborative Group includes Lac Ste Anne County

**How:** One elected representative from each Summer Village on the Advisory Committee. One DEM and DDEM from each community on the management committee for administration and executive function of the organization.

**What is it:** Group of 12 Summer Villages for communications and community resources. Main current function is the Summer Village Regional Emergency Management Partnership (SVREMP). The partnership was established to meet legislative requirements for planning and delivery of emergency management on a regional scale, develop knowledge base and consistent process, and share implementation costs amongst partners.

Other SVLSACE associated services include a seniors' foundation and All-net Connect messaging and community safety alerts system.

---

## Initiative | Tri Village Regional Sewer Services Commission

Who is Involved:

Project municipalities: Summer Villages of Val Quentin and Sunset Point

Other Members: Village of Alberta Beach

What is it: The commission is responsible for providing wastewater services to the above municipalities; for the operations and maintenance of the shared sewer and lagoon system; and for installing and maintaining proper sewer infrastructure including mains, connections, lift stations etc.

---

## Initiative | West Inter Lake District (WILD) Regional Water Services Commission

Who is Involved:

Project municipalities: Summer Villages of Castle Island, Ross Haven, Sunset Point, Val Quentin, West Cove, and Yellowstone

Other Members: Summer Villages of Lake View, Nakamun Park, Sandy Beach, Seba Beach, Sunrise Beach, Kapasiwin, Lac Ste. Anne County, Parkland County, the villages of Alberta Beach and Wabamun, Town of Onoway, Alexis Nakota Sioux Nation, and Paul First Nation

Additional members: Future additional summer villages and First Nation partners are in discussion to join the Commission

What is it: Potable water commission with four communities tied in with distribution systems, six operational truck fills and one more future truck fill station planned. Treated water is purchased from the Capital Region Parkland Water Services Commission at Stony Plain. The WILD system will transmit water by pipeline through a network of mains and branches to member communities with truck fill stations at major points along the line. The Commission has received significant provincial and federal funding for its four phases of development, and a planned fifth phase will include a truck fill closer to the Summer Village of West Cove.

---

## Initiative | Yellowhead Regional Library Board

Who is Involved:

Project municipalities: Summer Villages of Castle Island, Ross Haven, Sunset Point, Val Quentin, West Cove, and Yellowstone

Other members: Lac Ste Anne County, Village of Alberta Beach, and more for a total of 53 municipalities and three school divisions as of the revised schedule for 2022. Additional municipalities are eligible for membership.

What is it: Yellowhead Regional Library is a co-operative library system that services and supports communities with materials, librarians and resource-sharing staff, programming and development tools, and technology services for member community libraries. The main regional library utilized by the project municipalities that is supported through Yellowhead Regional Library Board is the Alberta Beach Public Library. The system charges a per capita levy for municipal members (\$4.96 per capita in 2021 and 2022).

---

### 5.3 Governance

As with policy and joint initiatives, a review of general governance was conducted for the project municipalities to understand current context. This section provides a brief overview of governance in the project municipalities including council structure, elections, special considerations for part-time residents of Summer Villages, and existing civic facilities.

Governance structures are consistent across the project municipalities. All the summer villages have a council structure of three elected officials who serve a 4-year office term. Generally, councils consist of one mayor, one deputy mayor, and one councillor, and are elected at large.

Elections follow a 4-year cycle similar to all other municipalities in the Province of Alberta; however, summer villages have different nomination periods and election dates than other municipalities. Elections in summer villages are held in the summer months to ensure procedures are accessible to the most residents and ratepayers including those who are seasonal. The Province of Alberta allows summer village municipalities to set their own dates for nomination and election. Candidate nomination can take place between June or July of an election year with election held four weeks after the nomination period closes. Nomination day and subsequent election is set by council resolution. Eligible part-time residents can both vote and run for local office in summer villages.

Due to their small populations, it is not uncommon to have uncontested elections in summer villages. In the 2021 municipal election, three of the six project municipalities reported election by acclamation. In the project municipalities where there were a greater number of candidates, council roles were determined based on percentage of votes - The role of Mayor is the elected official with the highest percentage of votes; Deputy Mayor, with the second highest percentage of votes; and Councillor, with the third highest percentage of votes). Acclaimed council roles are determined internally.

## CIVIC FACILITIES OVERVIEW

Generally, the project municipalities have few civic facilities and a number of them are shared for various purposes. For council meetings, Sunset Point and Val Quentin both use the Sunset Point Multipurpose Facility (4719 Sunset Dr.), and West Cove holds council meetings at their West Cove Community Centre. The other summer village councils meet in other municipalities. Ross Haven and Yellowstone councils hold meetings in Onoway facilities at the Onoway Civic Centre and Onoway Heritage Centre respectively, and Castle Island council convenes in St Albert.

All the project municipalities have public parks, and several have playground equipment. Ross Haven and Val Quentin also have additional public recreation amenities including baseball diamonds and multi-purpose courts.

Maintenance and public works facilities are present in West Cove and Ross Haven and the Summer Villages West Cove has newly acquired a boat launch from the federal government. Yellowstone also has some financial commitments and peace officer servicing commitments in relation to a County-owned boat launch in the Summer Village.

#### **5.4 Overarching Policy Opportunities for Regionalization**

In assessing the existing local policy and regulations, joint planning and initiatives, and governance structures of the project municipalities, there are several emergent opportunities for regionalization.

Existing policies outline shared values, unified goals, and similar development structures for all the project municipalities. There is potential for collaboration in planning and development to reach these common goals, and to do so more efficiently. Should the summer villages pursue regionalization options other than amalgamation, there is potential for collaboration on the efficient development of new or revised policies including elements like joint procurement of consultants and shared public engagement opportunities.

The summer villages are already working together in many ways with regional initiatives such as those for emergency management, lake health, and various service commissions, pointing to an existing collaborative culture and shared regional goals. While each community has unique needs and circumstances, there are many regional similarities that point to potential for efficiencies to be found in more joint initiatives, planning, and shared services.

Sharing civic facilities where possible also presents an opportunity. Shared council chambers, administrative offices, and maintenance facilities have the potential to increase efficiency and lower costs. Further efficiencies in governance could potentially be found in a formal restructuring to a shared single council, should amalgamation be pursued.

Additionally, there is potential to further leverage amenities and assets to support regional tourism and community identity. Many of the summer village websites already promote facilities and amenities available in the different communities. Providing more consistent information around regional amenities, or potentially sharing one website for all the summer villages with a community directory, could be an opportunity to show a strong unified presence, streamline website maintenance, and celebrate the unique value that each community offers the region.

## 6 Next Steps

With the technical analysis completed, services have been inventoried and comparisons developed to understand potential efficiencies. The next step is to develop regional governance recommendations. The data provided in this technical report will be assessed from the perspective of which, if any, of the regionalization options will reduce taxes/costs, increase efficiencies, and still provide residents with the summer village experience they desire.

Once draft recommendations have been developed and reviewed, public engagement on the draft will be held to understand the public's perspective on the options.