

Municipal Government Act Review

What We Heard: A Summary of Consultation Input

Business and Industry Session
Held in Grande Prairie on April 3, 2014

Released on June 24, 2014

Developed by KPMG for Alberta Municipal Affairs



Contents

Introduction	1
Purpose	1
The Municipal Government Act Review.....	1
Session Overview	2
Regional Consultation Methodology.....	3
Summary of Input.....	5
General Comments about the MGA	5
Governance and Administration	6
Municipal Powers, Structures, Annexations and Other Changes.....	6
Municipal Governance and Administration	6
Municipal Finances	7
Municipal Accountability, Liability, and Risk Management.....	9
Municipal Services and Delivery.....	9
Public Participation and Municipal Relations	10
Assessment and Taxation	11
Taxation and Municipal Finances	11
Exemptions from Assessment and Taxation.....	11
Market Value, Equalized and Supplementary Assessment.....	12
Industrial and Agricultural Property Assessment	12
Assessment Administration	13
Public Participation and Assessment Appeals.....	13
Planning and Development	14
Fees and Levies.....	14
Land Management and Planning Tools	14
Subdivision and Development Authorities and Processes	15
Land Dedication and Use of Reserves	15
Regional Approaches.....	16
Public Participation and Planning Appeals	16
Appendix A: Session Agenda.....	18

Introduction

Purpose

This document provides a summary of what was heard during a consultation session for the *Municipal Government Act* (MGA) review. The summary below includes the comments and opinions of the participants of the Business and Industry Session held in Grande Prairie.

These contributions have not been reviewed or edited for accuracy. Comments recorded here reflect the opinions of individuals offered in person and recorded by session facilitators; they do not necessarily represent the opinion of the Government of Alberta.

The input summarized below will be considered by Alberta Municipal Affairs as part of the review of the legislation. Municipal Affairs would like to thank the participants of this session, as well as all Albertans participating in the review of the MGA. Any inquiries related to this summary or to the consultation process should be directed by email to the MGA Review Team at mga.review@gov.ab.ca.

The Municipal Government Act Review

The MGA is designed to help build strong, prosperous and sustainable communities throughout Alberta. Alberta Municipal Affairs is reviewing and refreshing the MGA to address evolving circumstances and priorities in Alberta's many communities, and to ensure the MGA continues to meet its objective. A successful MGA review process will continue to position Alberta as the leading Canadian jurisdiction in terms of municipal legislation, having incorporated sound thinking, input and research into a clear Act that meets the needs of the Province and municipalities. In order to achieve this vision, an inclusive and comprehensive engagement process was developed to ensure stakeholders across the province have opportunities to provide input to the review.

As part of the MGA review, regional consultations were held in eleven locations around the province to give Albertans an opportunity to provide input face-to-face. In each location, different types of sessions were held, including Technical Sessions, a Business and Industry Session, a Municipal Administrators Session, an Elected Officials Session, and a Public Open House.

These engagements were conducted in February 2014 to April 2014 in 11 locations throughout the province. Each location was held over 3 days in the following locations:

- Brooks
- Calgary
- Edmonton
- Edson
- Fort McMurray
- Grande Prairie
- Lethbridge
- Medicine Hat
- Peace River
- Red Deer
- Vermilion

Sessions were promoted via news releases, direct email invitations, social media, and by the Minister of Municipal Affairs at stakeholder conventions. Information on regional session locations, dates and registration were on the MGA Review website.

Input to the MGA Review has also been provided through other channels, including the MGA Review website (mgareview.alberta.ca), the MGA Review Consultation Workbook, and official submissions.

Session Overview

Session	Business and Industry Session
Location	Muskoseepi Park, Grande Prairie
Date	April 3, 2014
Number of Participants	15

- This session was open to anyone who wished to attend. Participants were asked to register in advance in order to receive background materials before the session.

Regional Consultation Methodology

How sessions were organized

Regional consultations were structured around one or more of the three themes of the MGA Review:

- Governance and Administration
- Assessment and Taxation
- Planning and Development

Participants were provided with agendas in advance, which identified a list of potential topics for discussion. These topics were taken directly from the MGA Review Consultation Workbook. Several of the topics for discussion appear under more than one of the three themes of the review because they are relevant to more than one theme (e.g. public participation). The agenda is attached as Appendix A.

At this session, participants provided input through facilitated table discussions. The goal of the facilitated conversations was to give the opportunity to all participants to discuss the issues that mattered most to them. Given the large size and scope of the MGA, participants at each table were asked to focus their discussion on those topics that they felt were most important to provide input on, using the list provided in advance. In addition, this session included time for “open discussion” during which participants could provide any additional input that they felt was important to the review. Table facilitators and note takers included staff from Municipal Affairs, KPMG and ADR Education.

Capturing input and reporting

Input from session participants was captured on flipcharts by facilitators during the discussion. It was explained to participants that:

- Comments were being recorded on flipcharts so that they could be captured and considered by Municipal Affairs as part of the review of the MGA.
- Comments would not be attributed to individuals or organizations.
- Other avenues were also available to provide written input to the review.

The summary below documents the input heard from participants and recorded on flipcharts. These comments have been transcribed and organized according to the list of topics for discussion; they have not been screened for accuracy and do not reflect consensus of participants. As a result, comments and opinions listed may be contradictory. Comments that apply to issues outside of the scope of the review (e.g., suggested changes to other legislation) have been removed.

It is important to emphasize that this summary reflects the input heard from participants, and does not necessarily reflect the position of the Government of Alberta.

How the Summary of Responses is Organized

Input from session participants is organized according to the three themes for the review:

- *Governance and Administration*
- *Assessment and Taxation*
- *Planning and Development*

Within these themes, comments are organized according to the applicable topics for discussion, using the list provided to participants in advance. In some sessions, not all themes may have been discussed.

Summary of Input

General Comments about the MGA

The following input was received and documented related to the MGA in general.

Comments from participants included that:

- Municipal Affairs should use the MGA review process as an opportunity to make Alberta more competitive.
- There should be a preamble to the MGA outlining the benefits of inter-municipal cooperation and encouraging collaboration.
 - The benefits of collaboration are seen by all municipalities and industry.
- The MGA should consider how we want to define Alberta and the role of agriculture.
- Alberta should investigate the regional collaboration methods used in British Columbia.
- The MGA needs to be re-written so related issues are grouped together, as opposed to being scattered across the legislation.
- The MGA needs to be a user-friendly document that is written in plain language.

Governance and Administration

The following input was received and documented related to governance and administration.

Municipal Powers, Structures, Annexations and Other Changes

Municipal powers

Comments from participants included that:

- The scope of municipal powers is working well where there is a sufficient revenue base.
- Municipalities have no say on school boards' decisions or education property taxes. Municipalities should have more influence when it comes to these education issues.

Municipal structures

Comments from participants included that:

- Villages shouldn't be an autonomous municipal structure and should instead join the neighbouring municipal district.
- Some villages can be sustainable on their own and do not need to be joined with other municipalities.

Fundamental changes and municipal restructuring

Comments from participants included that:

- A municipality failing financially should not trigger dissolution. There should be structures in place to prevent municipalities from failing.
- Municipal districts should have more say and more compensation when villages are absorbed into the larger municipal district.
- If a municipality is dissolved, the Province needs to cover any debts or costs to the absorbing municipality associated with dissolution.
- It is necessary for the Province to be able to force municipal boundary changes, but this responsibility shouldn't be taken lightly. There should be lots of input from all impacted stakeholders before a boundary change is implemented.

Municipal Governance and Administration

Municipal governance

Comments from participants included that:

- The municipal governance and administration model is working well under the current MGA.

- Shadow population residents should have the ability to vote in the neighbouring municipality in which they work. However, they should only be able to vote in one municipality.

Municipal administration

Comments from participants included that:

- Separation of the chief administrative officer and council is working well in the current MGA.
- The parameters of the chief administrative officer position are working well in the current MGA.

Municipal Finances

Financial administration

Comments from participants included that:

- Financial administration is working well in the current MGA.
- Municipal budgets should be more accessible to industry and the public.

Regional funding approaches

Comments from participants included that:

- The MGA must be careful not to force collaboration or cost sharing.
- Cost sharing helps provide services for everyone to enjoy.
- If efficiencies are possible, regional cooperation saves money for the taxpayer.
- The costs and revenues between rural and urban municipalities are too different. This creates competition and an unfair playing field for collaboration.
- The problem is that the current MGA does not allow regional funding approaches to happen quickly. This costs residents more before regional efficiencies can be implemented.
- Cost sharing agreements are complicated when participants don't pay for their share and other players can't force them to pay.
- Well-managed municipalities shouldn't have to bail out poorly managed municipalities. Municipalities should be rewarded for strong financial management.
- The relationship between Woodlands County and the town of Whitecourt is a best practice for regional collaboration and regional funding approaches.
 - The relationship is working in everyone's best interest.
 - These municipalities have better relationships with business as a result of their collaboration.
- A regional structure might work better than the current structure. Standardized regions for cooperation could be created.
- The MGA also needs to address cooperation between non-adjacent municipalities. These municipalities still impact each other.

- The British Columbia model for jurisdictional taxation sharing works well and should be considered for Alberta.
 - The British Columbia model decreases competition between municipalities and provides process uniformity across the province, which makes it easier for business and property owners to work in the system.
- Sharing linear property tax revenue would be a challenge.
 - If pooling linear property tax revenue was population-based, revenues would largely go to Edmonton and Calgary.
 - Regional pooling and distribution of linear property tax revenue might work well. Linear property tax revenue should be distributed in the region it is collected in.

Municipal revenue sources

Comments from participants included that:

- Private investment in public infrastructure has worked well in other jurisdictions, and should be encouraged in Alberta.
 - Private-public partnerships can speed up development. They don't work well for existing infrastructure, but are good for new ventures.
- More legislated revenue tools for municipalities are not needed. Municipalities need to be smarter and more innovative using current opportunities and common sense.
- It would be helpful to consider shadow populations who use municipal services in setting grant funding amounts.
- The oil and gas industry brings huge revenues to the province, and these businesses should be treated well under the MGA.
- Property taxes don't currently capture shadow populations, which use a significant amount of municipal services.
 - A hotel tax or user fees could help to compensate for costs of servicing shadow populations.
 - Royalties collected by the Province could be distributed to municipalities to cover costs of shadow populations.
- Population grants should consider shadow populations in calculating the funds the municipality will receive. There need to be incentives under the MGA to encourage cost sharing and collaboration among municipalities.
- Cost sharing should not be mandated in the MGA in to maintain flexibility in application across the province.
- Pooling resources across regions could resolve the differences in tax rates that are caused by high assessment values within municipalities.
- The Province needs to review the areas of the province that do and do not have significant resources.

Municipal Accountability, Liability, and Risk Management

Compliance and accountability

Comments from participants included that:

- Compliance and accountability provisions are not working well under the current MGA. The MGA needs more “teeth” and enforcement provisions to protect the taxpayers.
- There should be an auditor general to ensure enforcement of the MGA.
- An auditor general for municipalities would increase transparency. It shouldn’t be necessary for a problem to occur before Municipal Affairs steps in to assist a municipality.
- There should be an appeal body or ombudsman to give an impartial perspective on regional agreements.
 - If a municipality gets dedicated funding from the Province, it should be mandatory to use it for the dedicated purpose.

Provincial powers

Comments from participants included that:

- The Province does not provide concrete enough responses to municipalities regarding questions about the MGA.
 - A central source of provincial information and support in working with the MGA is needed by industry and municipalities.
 - The Province should provide municipalities the information and resources they need to meet the needs of their communities.

Municipal Services and Delivery

Service provisions

Comments from participants included that:

- The current MGA is working well in terms of service provision.
- It should be up to the municipality to determine its service levels.
 - For example, it is not realistic for municipal districts to provide garbage service.
- Shadow populations of workers who only live in a municipality part of the year can have an impact on the services provided in municipalities.

Regional Services Commissions

Comments from participants included that:

- Regional services commissions are not frequently used in the Grande Prairie region. There could be better awareness of how regional services commissions work and how they could serve this area.

Municipally Controlled Corporations

Comments from participants included that:

- Municipally controlled corporations are good and necessary for rural areas.

Public Participation and Municipal Relations

Municipal relationships and dispute resolution

Comments from participants included that:

- Municipalities want to see what other municipalities are doing well to collaborate. The Province should collect best practice information and make it available. This will allow municipalities to learn from each other.
 - However, it can be difficult to compare best practices, as municipalities are so different from one another.
- Municipalities should determine the dispute resolution approach that works best for them.
- Unnecessarily long disputes are wasteful. Dispute resolution should be forced, because disputes are costing everyone money.
- There should be an option for business to come to the table with municipalities to help negotiate during dispute resolution.
- The dispute resolution process is not working well.
 - For example, in one instance, a municipality requested mediation from the Province but it didn't occur.
 - The current requirement for willing participation of both parties is problematic.
 - Participation in mediation should be mandated in the MGA.
 - Municipalities can't afford to resort to the courts to resolve disputes.

Public participation

Comments from participants included that:

- The MGA should ensure industry has a voice in communities so that businesses can discuss impacts and participate in decision-making and problem solving. There should be an organization for industry that is equivalent to the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association and the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties.
- Engagement of industry needs to be mandated in the MGA. The MGA should provide some guidelines around consultation with business.

Assessment and Taxation

The following input was received and documented related to assessment and taxation.

Taxation and Municipal Finances

Taxation

Comments from participants included that:

- The difference between residential and non-residential tax rates is getting larger.
- There may need to be a “top line” that limits how much non-residential property tax rates can be raised annually.
- With the wide range of taxation and levy options being applied, businesses can be driven out of communities. Amounts that are charged vary from municipality to municipality.
 - A limit should be set on the amounts that can be charged to business so costs are more consistent across the province.
 - Accountability for charges to industry needs to increase, as there currently is none.
 - Municipalities need to understand how attracting and keeping business in the community is in their best interests.
- Businesses do not have a vote. There needs to be business representation in municipal tax decisions.
- Residential and non-residential property tax rates should be linked.
- Residential and non-residential property tax rates should not be linked.
- The well drilling equipment tax is not equal to the taxes paid by other industries. Only the oil and gas industry is required to pay for their impact on roads and other infrastructure.
 - Other industries should be required to pay for their impacts as well.
 - Some industries pay infrastructure costs in other ways, such as through taxes on structures. Some industries don’t have sites without structures to tax; they don’t need an additional tax.
 - Municipalities should have to be transparent about the use of well drilling equipment tax revenue.

Exemptions from Assessment and Taxation

Exemptions and other special tax treatment

Comments from participants included that:

- Exemptions are working well in the current MGA.

Market Value, Equalized and Supplementary Assessment

Market value assessment and administration

Comments from participants included that:

- Market value assessment doesn't work for industrial properties, since market value is not how these properties are valued for sale.
 - The assessment rates currently being used are not accurate.
 - Responses to appeals regarding market value assessment have been very inconsistent. Appeal responses should align with bulletins added to the MGA.
 - Industrial properties should be assessed as linear property.
- Market value assessment of residential property could cause citizens to no longer be able to afford to live where they live now.
- The MGA needs to create flexibility to have differing residential tax rates among different hamlets within a municipality. This could cause competitive advantages and disadvantages among communities and developments.
- There needs to be more transparency about the market value assessment of machinery and equipment property.

Industrial and Agricultural Property Assessment

Machinery and equipment property assessment

Comments from participants included that:

- Machinery and equipment property should be assessed provincially, like linear property is. This would provide consistency and minimize competitiveness, since some municipalities are not as attractive to investors as others.
- The MGA should standardize how decisions are made about machinery and equipment assessments.
- The MGA should keep Alberta competitive with other provinces by not assessing machinery and equipment at all. Other provinces don't assess this property type.

Transportation properties

Comments from participants included that:

- There is inequity between taxing airports owned privately and those owned by municipalities.

Farm property assessment

Comments from participants included that:

- Farm property exemptions should be equal across urban and rural municipalities.
- The intent of exemptions for farms, namely providing small farms with support, no longer applies to commercial farm operations.
 - The MGA could allow different tax rates for family farms and commercial farming operations.

- Commercial farms should be assessed like other businesses to recognize their larger impact.
- Farmland should not have exemptions or tax breaks.

Assessment Administration

Assessment administration

Comments from participants included that:

- There should be one centralized agency to administer all industrial assessment to create consistency across the province.

Public Participation and Assessment Appeals

Public participation

Comments from participants included that:

- Notification processes in the MGA should be expanded to allow municipalities to use current technology and social media.
- The current public participation processes work well in the MGA.

Assessment complaints and appeals

Comments from participants included that:

- There should be one central composite assessment review board.
- There needs to be a centralized appeal body to hear industrial properties appeals.
- There should be a centralized assessment body for linear and machinery and equipment properties. This would provide consistency across the province.
- Members of assessment review boards need to have higher skill levels than they currently do, as well as more subject matter expertise and more awareness of other jurisdictions.
- There should be a standardized approach and decision-making process for appeals of all services.
- The current structure of assessment review boards and subdivision and development appeal boards creates perceived bias and conflict of interest because councillors act as board members. More objective board membership is needed.

Planning and Development

The following input was received and documented related to planning and development.

Fees and Levies

Fees and levies

Comments from participants included that:

- Provisions for fees and levies in the MGA are working well, but are not being enforced. There should be an inspector who monitors compliance to provisions for fees and levies in the MGA.
- Those who benefit from growth should pay for growth, but only for the proportion that they benefit from.
- There is a need to ensure that revenue from fees and levies goes to its dedicated purpose, and not into general municipal coffers. The use of fees and levies needs to be more transparent.
- Fees and levies should remain a one-time charge. For example, the cost of a two-lane highway should be levied for the initial development, and not the cost of a four-lane highway that will be needed in the future.
- Permit fees are not sufficient to cover the costs of administering development permits.
- The MGA should standardize or at least provide guidelines around how fees and levies are used in different municipalities. This would encourage consistency and decrease competition between municipalities.

Land Management and Planning Tools

Statutory plans and land use bylaws

Comments from participants included that:

- Inter-municipal development plans are too general, leaving room for contention between municipalities with differing opinions.
- Inter-municipal development plans should require more specificity. Then municipalities could use them to work together in the way that works best for them.
- The MGA should provide more details about what intermunicipal development plans should address, and specify a role for consultants to support negotiations.
- Area structure plans should require offsite improvements to be identified. Municipalities should be transparent about how development fees are allocated, and not allocate them to general revenue.

Subdivision and Development Authorities and Processes

Administrative decision-making processes

Comments from participants included that:

- Administrative decision-making processes are working well in the current MGA.
- There should be a new servicing bylaw that would include specific requirements to replace development agreements.
 - Development agreements are too flexible and can be taken advantage of by developers.
- The formula for development agreements should be standardized across the province in a regulation, and should include limitations.
- The current timelines for subdivision decisions are all long and are not consistent across municipalities.
 - Timeliness is important. There should be deadlines for municipalities related to land-use planning and development. If municipalities don't meet the timeline, they should refund the appeal fee.
 - Timelines should be shortened and consistent across the Province. For example, the timeline could be 14 days for municipalities to finalize paperwork and 60 days to process the application.

Land Dedication and Use of Reserves

Land dedication (reserves)

Comments from participants included that:

- Municipal reserve requirements should be reduced to five per cent.
- Currently, credit is not given for some municipal reserves, such as land around waterways. Walkways should count as reserves for linear parks.
- Municipalities should pay for the servicing costs of reserves, and recover these costs through levies.
- More clarity is needed about whether municipalities can change environmental reserves.
 - The MGA is too open to interpretation when it comes to environmental reserves.
 - There should be a riparian setback matrix implemented.
 - Better definitions for wetlands, streams and environmental reserves are needed (more clarity on wetland definitions and requirements, in particular).
 - The Province should narrow the description of environmental reserves in the MGA. The current descriptions are too flexible. For example, environmental reserves should include a floodway, not a floodplain. However, this kind of change could allow development on floodplains, which may be a concern.
- Developers should be reimbursed if school reserve land isn't used for schools within a given timeframe.

- There should be more realistic parameters on school reserves when 10 per cent of land is required for a reserve, yet the Province isn't building a school there.
- Municipalities should pay for land for arterial roadways larger than two lanes.
- Providing cash-in-lieu to municipalities is preferred by developers to providing land.

Regional Approaches

Managing growth and development

Comments from participants included that:

- The Province should have a bigger role in some municipal planning decisions, as municipal decisions can become a provincial issue. For example, the flooding of communities in southern Alberta caused by municipal planning decisions had to be addressed with provincial tax dollars.
- The MGA should keep communities affordable by managing development and sprawl. Development doesn't need to occur on a larger scale than necessary.
- There is no accountability for commercial operations that leave municipalities with polluted land after their development, such as gas stations.
 - The MGA needs to hold businesses accountable for polluting land and have strong consequences in place.
 - Commercial operations should be subject to the same consequences as oil and gas companies, which are already held accountable for impact to land.
- The Province needs to clarify how the *Alberta Land Stewardship Act* ties into municipal or regional land-use planning. The MGA should override regional plans.
 - It is difficult to plan local development when the *Alberta Land Stewardship Act* is very high-level and vague.
 - Municipalities should make the planning decisions for their communities.
- There should be parameters established to clarify what can be included in bylaws. The MGA must balance competing and conflicting pieces of legislation that affect development and planning, such as the *Water Act* and *Alberta Land Stewardship Act*.
 - There needs to be more clarity on how other legislation interacts with municipalities' planning and rights.

Public Participation and Planning Appeals

Planning and inter-municipal appeals

Comments from participants included that:

- Subdivision and development appeal boards should be staffed from surrounding municipalities to reduce bias.

- Subdivision and development appeal board members should have subject matter expertise.
- There should be centralized appeal boards to ensure there is no preference that results from local residents or councillors making local decisions.
- There shouldn't be councillors on subdivision and development appeal boards.
- Appeals shouldn't go back to the councillors who made the original decision.
- Subdivision and development appeal boards need to be accountable for their decisions. The planning and development appeal process should be more transparent.

Appendix A: Session Agenda

MGA Review: Business and Industry Session

Agenda Item	Timing
1. Welcome and introductions	9:00-9:10
2. Potential topics for discussion: The following topics will be available for table discussion: Governance and Administration <u>Subject 1: Municipal Powers, Structures, Annexations and Other Changes</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipal powers • Municipal structures • Fundamental changes and municipal restructuring <u>Subject 2: Municipal Governance and Administration</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipal governance • Municipal administration <u>Subject 3: Municipal Finances</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial administration • Regional funding approaches • Municipal revenue sources • Fees and levies <u>Subject 4: Municipal Accountability, Liability, and Risk Management</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance and accountability • Liability and risk management • Provincial powers <u>Subject 5: Municipal Services and Delivery</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service provisions • Regional services commissions • Municipally controlled corporations <u>Subject 6: Public Participation and Municipal Relations</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipal relationships and dispute resolution • Public participation • Municipal Government Board Assessment and Taxation <u>Subject 1: Taxation and Municipal Finances</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taxation • Municipal revenue sources • Fees and levies <u>Subject 2: Exemptions from Assessment and Taxation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exemptions and other special tax treatment 	9:10-9:20

Agenda Item	Timing
<p>Assessment and Taxation continued</p> <p><u>Subject 3: Market Value Equalized and Supplementary Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market value assessment and administration • Equalized assessment • Progressive and supplementary assessment <p><u>Subject 4: Industrial and Agricultural Property Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linear property assessment • Machinery and equipment property assessment • Transportation properties • Farm property assessment <p><u>Subject 5: Assessment Administration</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment administration <p><u>Subject 6: Public Participation and Assessment Appeals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public participation • Assessment complaints and appeals • Municipal Government Board <p>Planning and Development</p> <p><u>Subject 1: Fees and Levies</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fees and levies <p><u>Subject 2: Land Management and Planning Tools</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory plans and land use bylaws <p><u>Subject 3: Subdivision and Development Authorities and Processes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning authorities • Administrative decision-making processes <p><u>Subject 4: Land Dedication and Use of Reserves</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land dedication (reserves) <p><u>Subject 5: Regional Approaches</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipal relationships and dispute resolution • Managing growth and development • Regional funding approaches <p><u>Subject 6: Public Participation and Planning Appeals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipal Government Board • Public participation • Planning and inter-municipal appeals 	
<p>3. Change tables (if needed)</p>	<p>9:20-9:25</p>

Agenda Item	Timing										
<p>4. Table facilitation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two topics will be prioritized for discussion for each block <table border="1" data-bbox="310 464 1157 701"> <tr> <td data-bbox="310 464 618 510">Block 1: 9:25-9:55</td> <td data-bbox="618 464 1157 510">Governance and Administration Topics</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="310 510 1157 556">Break (10 mins)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="310 556 618 602">Block 2: 10:05-10:45</td> <td data-bbox="618 556 1157 602">Assessment and Taxation Topics</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="310 602 1157 648">Break (10 mins)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="310 648 618 695">Block 3: 10:55-11:35</td> <td data-bbox="618 648 1157 695">Planning and Development Topics</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussion will focus on what is working well, desired changes, and potential impacts of changes to the legislation 	Block 1: 9:25-9:55	Governance and Administration Topics	Break (10 mins)		Block 2: 10:05-10:45	Assessment and Taxation Topics	Break (10 mins)		Block 3: 10:55-11:35	Planning and Development Topics	9:25-11:35
Block 1: 9:25-9:55	Governance and Administration Topics										
Break (10 mins)											
Block 2: 10:05-10:45	Assessment and Taxation Topics										
Break (10 mins)											
Block 3: 10:55-11:35	Planning and Development Topics										
<p>5. Open discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are there any other relevant topics participants want to address? 	11:35-11:55										
<p>6. Wrap-up</p>	11:55-12:00										