
Council Chambers, Irricana Centennial Centre, 222 2 Street

Date: March 9, 2026 **Time:** 7:00PM

A. ATTENDANCE

B. CALL TO ORDER

C. AGENDA

D. PRESENTATIONS

E. MINUTES

Item E1: Minutes from September 8, 2025 Committee of the Whole

F. CORRESPONDENCE FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

G. COMMITTEE REPORTS

H. OLD BUSINESS

I. NEW BUSINESS

Item I1: Municipal Penalty Structure – Governance Review

Item I2: Animal Control Bylaw Review & Discussion

Item I3: Council Public Engagement Practices & Protocols

Item I4: Financial Controls & Reporting – 2026 Work Plan Update

J. COMMUNICATION / INFORMATION

K. CLOSED SESSION

L. ADJOURN

Item E1

Minutes from September 8, 2025 Committee of the Whole

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Council Chambers, Irricana Centennial Centre, 222 2 Street

Date: September 8, 2025 Time: 7:00PM

A. ATTENDANCE

Chairperson: Julie Sim
Mayor: Jim Bryson
Deputy Mayor: Lisa McAree (Absent)
Councillors: Kim Schmaltz, Nathaniel Fleming
CAO: Doug Hafichuk

B. CALL TO ORDER

(i) The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Sim at 7:00 pm.

C. AGENDA

(i) Adopt Agenda

Addition to Agenda: Item I2: Work Plan Update

Moved by Mayor Bryson to adopt the Agenda, as presented.

CARRIED

D. PRESENTATIONS

(i) None

E. MINUTES

(i) Minutes of the June 23, 2025 Committee of the Whole

Moved by Councillor Schmaltz to accept the Minutes of the Committee of the Whole Meeting for June 23, 2025, as presented.

CARRIED

F. CORRESPONDENCE FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

(i) None

G. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(i) None

H. OLD BUSINESS

(i) None

I. NEW BUSINESS

(i) Item I1: Council Policy on Development Incentives (Draft)

(ii) Item I2: Work Plan Update

J. COMMUNICATION / INFORMATION

(i) None

K. COUNCILLOR UPDATE

L. CLOSED SESSION

(i) None

M. ADJOURN

(i) Adjournment

Moved by Chairperson Sim to adjourn the meeting at 9:05 pm.

CARRIED

Dawna Polson
Chairperson

Doug Hafichuk
Chief Administrative Officer



Committee of the Whole Report

To: Chairperson and Committee Members
From: Chief Administrative Officer
Date: March 9, 2026
Purpose: **Provided For Information**
Subject: Municipal Penalty Structure Governance Review

Summary:

This report initiates a governance-level discussion regarding the structure and consistency of municipal fines across Town bylaws. Currently, specified penalties are embedded individually within each bylaw and are not organized within a standardized severity framework. While this model is legally sound, it presents limitations in terms of proportionality, consistency, and routine review.

Administration is seeking Committee feedback on whether a more structured approach to municipal penalties is desirable before preparing any formal amendments for Council consideration.

Purpose of Discussion

The purpose of this discussion is to examine whether the Town's current approach to municipal fines remains appropriate as the organization continues to mature, or whether a more standardized structure would better support long-term governance.

At present, fines are defined within individual bylaws and are reviewed only when those bylaws are amended. There is no cross-bylaw framework to ensure comparable infractions are treated consistently, nor is there a centralized mechanism to support routine review of penalty levels.

Over time, this can create a situation where fine amounts remain static, lack proportional alignment, or receive limited attention as part of annual governance cycles.

Committee is therefore asked to consider whether:

- A standardized severity-based structure would improve consistency and transparency;
- Escalation for repeat offences should be aligned across bylaws; and
- Municipal penalties should be centralized to improve visibility and routine review.

This discussion is not intended to increase fines or expand enforcement authority. Rather, it is intended to confirm whether structural alignment would support clearer, more disciplined governance going forward.

Background Context

Under the *Municipal Government Act*, Council may establish offences and prescribe fines up to \$10,000 unless otherwise limited. Municipal enforcement may proceed through voluntary compliance tools or through formal prosecution under the *Provincial Offences Procedure Act (POPA)*.

The Town currently operates under a traditional enforcement model. Most minor infractions are addressed through voluntary compliance measures, with escalation to formal ticketing where appropriate.

Two enforcement tools are commonly used:

- **Violation Tag:** A locally issued notice that identifies an offence and provides an opportunity for voluntary payment. Tags are intended to resolve matters without engaging the court system.
- **Violation Ticket (under POPA):** A provincially prescribed court document that formally initiates prosecution. If disputed or unpaid, the matter proceeds through Provincial Court, and the Town may be required to present evidence.

In practice, violation tags are typically used for lower-risk or first-time non-compliance. More serious matters, repeat offences, or safety-related concerns may warrant immediate issuance of a violation ticket.

Current Framework / Status

At present, specified penalty amounts are embedded directly within individual bylaws (e.g., Animal Control, Business Licensing, Community Standards, Traffic Control).

Each bylaw defines its own fine amounts. There is no standardized severity framework or cross-bylaw classification system. Escalation provisions may vary between bylaws, and penalties are reviewed only when a specific bylaw is amended.

This approach is straightforward and self-contained. However, it does not provide an easy mechanism for assessing proportionality across bylaws or ensuring routine review of fine amounts.

Observations and Constraints

Administration has identified several governance considerations:

1. Out of Sight, Out of Mind Risk

Because fines are dispersed across multiple bylaws, they may not receive regular review or adjustment over time.

2. Limited Cross-Bylaw Consistency

Comparable infractions in different bylaws may carry different penalties without a clear severity rationale.

3. Escalation Variability

Repeat offence escalation is not standardized across bylaws.

4. Proportionality & Defensibility

A defined severity structure improves clarity and supports proportional enforcement, particularly if matters proceed to court.

To address these considerations, Administration is proposing discussion of a five-level severity model:

- *Level 1 – Minor Regulatory Non-Compliance*
- *Level 2 – Moderate Regulatory Non-Compliance*
- *Level 3 – Significant Regulatory Non-Compliance*
- *Level 4 – Serious Risk to Public Safety or Property*
- *Level 5 – Aggravated or High-Risk Regulatory Conduct*

Under this model, the majority of routine infractions would fall within Levels 1–3. Levels 4 and 5 would be reserved for exceptional circumstances involving heightened safety risk or infrastructure harm.

Escalation could be standardized through a 12-month window, with increased penalties for second and third offences and mandatory court escalation thereafter.

Administration's preliminary view is that embedding this framework within the Master Rates Bylaw would provide simplicity and allow for routine annual review, and is likely to scale efficiently while the community continues to grow.

Next Steps (Subject to Direction)

If Committee supports development of a standardized penalty framework, Administration would:

1. Prepare draft language establishing severity levels and associated rates within the Master Rates Bylaw;
2. Prepare an omnibus amendment bylaw updating affected bylaws to reference severity levels rather than individual dollar amounts; and
3. Return to Council for formal consideration.

Implementation would apply prospectively and would not affect offences committed prior to the effective date.

Financial Considerations

This discussion is not revenue-driven. In practice, enforcement actions that proceed to court may result in net administrative cost once staff time and legal expenses are considered.

The primary objective of a standardized framework would be improved governance alignment, consistency, and administrative simplicity. Centralizing penalty levels would also support more deliberate annual review alongside other municipal rates.

Recommendation Motion(s):

Option #1:

Motion #1: **THAT** the Committee of the Whole direct Administration to incorporate the feedback provided and prepare draft amendments to establish a standardized municipal penalty framework embedded within the Master Rates Bylaw for Council's consideration.

Option #2:

As determined by the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

"Doug Hafichuk"

Chief Administrative Officer

ATTACHMENTS:

N/A



Committee of the Whole Report

To: Chairperson and Committee Members
From: Chief Administrative Officer
Date: March 9, 2026
Purpose: **Provided For Information**
Subject: Animal Control Bylaw Review & Discussion

Summary:

Council has expressed interest in discussing the Animal Control Bylaw following recent inquiries related to backyard beekeeping and higher-intensity residential animal uses. While the bylaw remains operationally functional, these matters raise questions about clarity and future alignment with community expectations.

This report initiates a planning-level discussion to determine whether a bylaw review should proceed and, if so, what scope and timing would be appropriate.

Purpose of Discussion

The purpose of this discussion is to determine whether reviewing the Animal Control Bylaw is a strategic priority at this time and to clarify what outcome Council would be seeking from such a review.

The current bylaw remains enforceable and effective for routine enforcement matters. The question before Committee is therefore not whether the bylaw is failing, but whether emerging questions—such as beekeeping, urban husbandry, or residential animal intensity—warrant proactive clarification.

Before undertaking any formal drafting work, Committee is asked to consider:

- Whether Council is seeking clarification on a narrow issue or broader modernization;
- Whether the matters identified represent a growing policy need or isolated inquiries; and
- Whether this work should be prioritized within the 2026 work plan or considered in a future planning cycle.

Confirming the intended objective will help ensure that any administrative effort produces measurable governance value and aligns with previously established priorities.

Background Context

The Town's Animal Control Bylaw (Bylaw 001:2017) establishes provisions related to:

- Animal licensing (primarily dogs);
- Nuisance behaviours;
- Impoundment authority; and
- Specified penalties.

The bylaw reflects a traditional animal control framework and continues to function effectively within the Town's current scale and enforcement capacity.

Two recent matters have highlighted the need for discussion:

1. Backyard Beekeeping Inquiry

The bylaw does not expressly address beekeeping. In practice, nuisance-related concerns have been managed through the Community Standards Bylaw. The absence of express language has led to questions regarding policy clarity.

2. Higher-Intensity Residential Animal Uses

Situations involving elevated numbers of animals within residential districts have raised questions regarding intensity thresholds and regulatory clarity. These matters may intersect with land use regulation, though the Animal Control Bylaw itself does not define specific limits.

These matters are not currently widespread enforcement challenges but provide an opportunity to consider whether clarification would benefit residents, staff, and Council.

Current Framework / Status

The Town's Animal Control Bylaw is primarily structured around traditional companion animal control, with emphasis on:

- Dog licensing requirements;
- Animals running at large;
- Nuisance behaviours (noise, aggression, waste);
- Impoundment authority; and
- Specified penalties for defined contraventions.

The bylaw does not establish specific provisions for several emerging or specialty animal uses. In particular, it does not address matters such as:

- Backyard beekeeping;
- Urban chickens or backyard hens;
- Broader small-scale urban husbandry;
- Numeric thresholds for household pets;
- Temporary fostering or rescue-type operations; or
- Clear distinctions between companion animals and agricultural animals.

Where issues arise outside the express provisions of the Animal Control Bylaw, administration has historically relied on:

- the **Community Standards Bylaw** (nuisance-based enforcement); and
- the **Land Use Bylaw** (where intensity of use becomes relevant).

This layered approach has functioned in practice; however, it does not always provide explicit direction regarding Council's policy intent in these areas.

Observations and Constraints

Administration offers the following observations for Committee's consideration.

1. The Current Bylaw Is Operationally Functional

The Animal Control Bylaw continues to function effectively in routine enforcement matters. The discussion before Committee is therefore not driven by regulatory failure, but by questions of policy clarity and future alignment.

2. Policy Ambiguity Exists in Select Areas

As noted in the Current Framework section, the bylaw does not expressly address certain emerging or specialty animal uses. While these matters can often be managed through nuisance provisions or related bylaws, the absence of explicit language may create uncertainty regarding Council's policy intent.

Committee may wish to consider whether proactive clarification would provide value to residents, administration, and future Councils.

3. Scope Directly Impacts Work Plan Alignment

Opening a bylaw for review—whether narrow or comprehensive—requires administrative drafting time, policy analysis, and potentially legal review. Depending on scope, this work may involve comparator research, policy development, and multiple Council discussions.

If undertaken in 2026, this work would need to be balanced against other priorities within the municipal work plan.

4. Outcome Clarity Is Recommended Before Scope Is Defined

Before initiating amendments, it is important to identify the intended outcome. For example:

- Is the objective limited to clarifying beekeeping?
- Is Council seeking broader urban husbandry policy?
- Is the concern primarily residential animal intensity thresholds?
- Or is a broader modernization exercise desired?

Clarifying the objective will help ensure that the scope of work remains proportionate.

5. Coordination with Broader Planning Initiatives

Questions related to animal intensity, land use compatibility, and residential thresholds may intersect with future Municipal Development Plan and Land Use Bylaw discussions. Council may wish to consider whether alignment with those broader initiatives would produce a more cohesive long-term framework.

Potential Discussion Questions

To assist Committee in framing the discussion, the following questions may be helpful:

1. What specific outcome is Council seeking from a review of the Animal Control Bylaw?
2. Is the primary concern clarification of beekeeping, broader urban husbandry policy, or residential animal intensity thresholds?
3. Are current enforcement tools insufficient, or is the issue primarily one of policy clarity?
4. Does this matter warrant priority within the 2026 work plan?
5. Would coordination with upcoming planning initiatives produce better long-term value?

Next Steps (Subject to Direction)

Based on Committee feedback, Administration would:

- Confirm whether this matter is to proceed in 2026 or be deferred to a future work plan;
- Define the scope of work consistent with Council's intended outcome; and
- Return with draft amendments or a revised bylaw for formal consideration.

Financial Considerations

The primary cost associated with this initiative would be administrative time and potential legal review. No significant direct financial impacts are anticipated; however, undertaking this review would require prioritization within existing administrative capacity.

Recommendation Motion(s):

Option #1:

Motion #1: **THAT** the Committee of the Whole direct Administration to prepare proposed amendments to the Animal Control Bylaw consistent with the feedback provided and return to Council for consideration within the 2026 work plan.

Option #2:

Motion #1: **THAT** the Committee of the Whole defer consideration of amendments to the Animal Control Bylaw to the 2027 work plan..

Option #3:

As determined by the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

“Doug Hafichuk”

Chief Administrative Officer

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 'A' – Animal Control Bylaw (Bylaw 001:2017)

Item I2

Attachment 'A' – Animal Control Bylaw (Bylaw 001:2017)

**BYLAW # 09:2018
of the TOWN OF IRRICANA
in the PROVINCE OF ALBERTA**

Being a bylaw of the Town of Irricana, in the Province of Alberta to regulate, restrain the running at large, the licensing, and the impounding of animals.

WHEREAS the Municipal Government Act, S.A. 2000, Chapter M-26, as amended, provides that a Council may pass bylaws in relation to the regulation, restraining running at large, licensing, and impounding of animals.

AND WHEREAS Council has deemed it necessary to regulate the restraining running at large, licensing, and impounding of animals;

AND WHEREAS should any issue pertaining to procedure, process or regulation arise that is not covered under this Bylaw, the MGA or any other enactment will take precedence. Failing that it shall be decided by a majority of Council.

TITLE:

This bylaw may be cited as the "Animal Control Bylaw".

PART I DEFINITIONS

- 1.1 "Altered": means spayed or neutered;
- 1.2 "Animal": means any domestic or tamed animal kept for companionship or pleasure;
- 1.3 "Attack": means an assault or aggressive action by an animal towards a person or other Animal, which results in bodily harm, grievous bodily harm, or death to a person or other Animal;
- 1.4 "At Large": means any animal that is not under care and control of a person able to control that animal, and not on a permitted leash, while off the property of its owner;
- 1.5 "Bite": means a wound causing the bruising, piercing or laceration of skin with teeth or mouth part of an animal;
- 1.6 "Bylaw Enforcement Officer": an employee or independent contractor appointed by the Town of Irricana to enforce all provisions of this and other Town of Irricana Bylaws, and includes any member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and when authorized, a Community Peace Officer, appointed by the Alberta Provincial Government. A Bylaw Enforcement Officer is a Designated Peace Officer for the purposes of s. 594 of the Municipal Government Act;
- 1.7 "Care and Control": means
 - a. Exercising physical control or effective control of an Animal;
 - b. Having been given physical or effective control of an Animal by its owner for the purpose of controlling the Animal for a specific period of time;
 - c. Where no one or more Persons with the knowledge and consent of the other, has physical or effective control of an Animal, it may be deemed to be in the control of all of them;

- 1.8 “Cat”: means any member of the feline family;
- 1.9 “Contractor”: means any person under the contract by the Town of Irricana to maintain and administer a pound facility or Animal Shelter;
- 1.10 “Dog”: means any member of the canine family;
- 1.11 “Grievous Bodily Harm”: means any wound inflicted on a person or Other Animal by a dog, that would permanently disfigure or otherwise cause permanent injury or loss of any body part.
- 1.12 “License Department”: means the Chief Administrative Officer, for the Town of Irricana, or his/her designate;
- 1.13 “Minor Injury”: means any physical injury to a person or other Animal, caused by an animal that results in minor bleeding, bruising, minor tearing of skin, or any other injury, that is not life threatening, disfiguring, or debilitating;
- 1.14 “Nuisance”: means any form of disturbance or annoyance, as determined by the Bylaw Enforcement Officers discretion, created by an Animal;
- 1.15 “Owner”: means a person over the age of 18 who:
- a. claims and receives custody of an Animal from the custody of an Animal Shelter or a Bylaw Enforcement Officer; or
 - b. harbors or permits an Animal to be present on any property of the owner or under that person’s control; or
 - c. has been issued a license under Part II of this Bylaw; or
 - d. has the care, charge, custody, possession, or control of an Animal; or
 - e. owns or claims a proprietary interest in an Animal.
- 1.16 “Permitted Leash”: means a restraint made of material capable of restraining the Animal on which it is being used;
- 1.17 “Private Property”: means all property within the Town of Irricana other than property considered Public Property;
- 1.18 “Public Property”: means all property owned by or under control and management of the Government of Canada, the Government of Alberta, or the Town of Irricana, contained within the boundaries of the Town of Irricana.
- 1.19 “Tag”: means a current metal or other Tag issued by the Town of Irricana to an Owner for each Animal he/she owns, and which bears the number corresponding to a number in the master register book or database;
- 1.20 “Violation Tag” means a written notice, issued by a Bylaw Enforcement Officer, to advise a person that a violation of this Bylaw had occurred and that, by payment of s specified amount to the Town of Irricana within a set time period, that person will avoid prosecution for the offence.

- 1.21 "Violation Ticket": means a ticket pursuant to Part 2 of the Provincial Offences Procedure Act, R.S.A. 2000, c-9-34, as amended, and any regulations thereunder;

PART II LICENSING OF ANIMALS

- 2.1 Every person, who owns, keeps, or harbors an Animal, for a period of fourteen (14) days, which is three (3) months of age, or older shall pay the Town of Irricana a yearly license fee as set out in Schedule "B".
- 2.2 Upon payment of the current yearly license fee, the Town of Irricana or its designate shall issue a License and Tag, with a number.
- 2.3 Where a license is required, and has been paid for by the tender of an uncertified cheque, the license is automatically revoked if the cheque is not accepted and cashed by the bank on which it was issued.
- 2.4 The Tag shall be securely affixed to a collar, harness or other device which shall be worn on the Animal for which it was issued at all times, when off the property of the Owner.
- 2.5 If a Tag is lost or destroyed, the Owner shall apply for a replacement, which shall be issued upon payment of a specified fee.
- 2.6 The Tag is not transferable from one Animal to another and no refund will be made for any issued tag.
- 2.7 The Owner, keeper, handler, or harbourer, of any type of Assistance Dog, Guide Dog, or Police Service Dog, will be issued a license and Tag free of charge.

PART III LICENSING OFFENCES

- 3.1 A resident of the Town of Irricana who is the Owner of an Animal is guilty of an offence if he/she fails to obtain a license for such Animal;
- 3.2 The owner of an Animal is guilty of an offence if he/she provides false or misleading information to the Bylaw Enforcement Officer or Licensing Department, upon completion of his/her Animal License Application form;
- 3.3 The owner of an Animal is guilty of an offence if he/she fails to ensure that the Animal wears a collar and Tag while off the property of the Owner.
- 3.4 Any owner of an Animal residing in the Town of Irricana for a period longer than ninety (90) days in one year is required to have a current license for the Town of Irricana, unless the owner is visiting and has a current license for such Animal within another municipality. In any prosecution or proceedings for a contravention of this section, the onus of proof of length of time in the Town of Irricana, shall rest upon the owner of the Animal.

PART IV ANIMAL CONTROL OFFENCES

- 4.1 The Owner of an Animal is guilty of an offence if such animal Runs at large;
- 4.2 The Owner of an Animal is guilty of an offence if;

- a. Such Animal defecates or sprays on Public or Private Property and the Owner or person in care and control of the Animal fails to immediately remove such defecation, other than when on the Property of the Owner, or;
 - b. He allows defecation to accumulate, on his property to such an extent that it is reasonably likely to cause a nuisance or pose a health risk.
- 4.3 The owner of an Animal is guilty of an offence if he allows such Animal within a site containing playground apparatus and/or sand play area located on Public or Private Property other than the property of the Owner.
- 4.4 The owner of an Animal is guilty of an Offence if he allows such Animal to bark, meow, howl, or otherwise make or cause a noise or noises so as to disturb the quiet and repose of a person;
- 4.5 Any person who allows an Animal to damage any private or public property, other than the property of the owner;
- 4.6 The owner of an Animal is guilty of an offence if such Animal is exercised while the owner or person in care and control of such Animal, remains inside of a motor vehicle, whether the vehicle is running or not.
- 4.7 The owner of an Animal is guilty of an offence if he leaves such Animal unattended on Public or Private Property, including the property of the Owner, which the public has access to.

PART V ANIMALS DISPLAYING THREATENING BEHAVIOR

- 5.1 The owner of an Animal is guilty of an offence, whether on or off the Owner's Property, if the Animal:
- a. Chases, lunges, or otherwise exhibits threatening behaviour towards a bicycle or motor vehicle;
 - b. Chases, lunges, or otherwise exhibits threatening behavior towards any other animal, or;
 - c. Chases, lunges, or otherwise exhibits threatening behavior towards a person.

PART VI ANIMALS CAUSING INJURY TO PERSON OR ANIMAL

- 6.1 The owner of an Animal is guilty of an offence, whether on or off the property of the Owner, if such Animal:
- a. Attacks or Bites any person causing any injury or death;
 - b. Attacks or Bites any other animal causing any injury or death;

PART VII RELEASE OF IMPOUNDED ANIMALS

- 7.1 The Town appointed contractor shall keep all impounded Animals for a period of no less than five (5) days, including the day of impounding. Sundays and Statutory Holidays shall not be included in the computation of the five (5) day period. During this period, any healthy Animal may be redeemed by its Owner, upon payment to the Contractor of:

- a. The appropriate license fee when an Animal is not licensed; and
 - b. Kennel boarding fees as per contract rate for every twenty four (24) hour period or fraction thereof.
- 7.2 At the expiration of the five (5) day period any Animal not redeemed becomes the sole property of the contractor or the boarding facility.
- 7.3 The Bylaw Enforcement Officer or Contractor shall report any apparent illness, communicable disease, injury, or unhealthy condition of any Animal to a Veterinarian and act upon his recommendation. The Owner, if known, shall be held responsible for all expenses incurred.
- 7.4 The Bylaw Enforcement Officer may seize and impound:
- a. Any Animal running at large;
 - b. Any Animal not wearing an Animal Tag while off the premises of the Owner;
 - c. Any female Animal in heat not confined and housed;
 - d. Any Animal that has caused or alleged to have caused Minor Injury, Grievous Bodily Harm, or Death.
- 7.5 Any Owner attempting to claim an impounded Animal shall present government issued identification to the Contractor or the staff at the pound facility.

PART VIII INTERFERENCE WITH OFFICER

- 8.1 Any person whether or not he/she is the owner of an Animal, who is present during any type or during any time of an investigation being conducted by a Bylaw Enforcement Officer, or whether or not he/she is the owner of an Animal which is being pursued and or captured, is guilty if he/she:
- a. Interferes with or obstructs an Officer who is attempting to capture, or who has captured any animal, or obstructs the Officer from conducting any lawful investigation;
 - b. Unlocks or unlatches or otherwise opens an Officer's vehicle in which animals are captured for the impoundment have been placed, so as to allow or attempt to allow any animal to escape;
 - c. Removes or attempts to remove, any animal from the possession of an Officer;
 - d. Refuses to provide identification (name, address, date of birth) and proof thereof to an Officer upon request;
 - e. Provides any false or misleading information to an Officer;
 - f. Deliberately withholds or fails to disclose any pertinent information regarding any open investigation an Officer is involved in;

PART IX ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES

- 9.1 Any person who contravenes any provision of this Bylaw is guilty of an offence and is liable on Summary Conviction to a fine as set out in Schedule "A" herein and in default of payment of any fine, to imprisonment for up to one (1) year.
- 9.2 Notwithstanding Part IX Section 1 of this Bylaw, any person who commits a second or subsequent offence under this Bylaw may be liable to an increased fine as set out in Schedule "A".
- 9.3 A Bylaw Enforcement Officer is hereby authorized and empowered to issue a Violation Tag to any person whom the Bylaw Enforcement Officer has reasonable and probable grounds to believe has contravened any provision of this Bylaw;
- 9.4 A Violation Tag may be issued to such person:
- a. Either in person;
 - b. By mailing a copy to such person at his last known post office address; or
 - c. Upon retrieval of such persons Animal from the Town of Irricana Pound or the Contractors Pound.
- 9.5 The Violation Tag shall state:
- a. The name of the Owner;
 - b. The offence;
 - c. The appropriate penalty for the offence as Specified in Schedule "A" of this Bylaw;
 - d. The penalty shall be paid within twenty-two (22) days of the issuance of the Violation Tag to avoid prosecution; and
 - e. Any other information as may be required by the License Department.
- 9.6 Where a Violation Tag is issued pursuant to this Bylaw, the person to whom the Violation Tag is issued may, in lieu of being prosecuted for the offence, pay the Town of Irricana the penalty specified on the Violation Tag.
- 9.7 Nothing in this Bylaw shall prevent a Bylaw Enforcement Officer from immediately issuing a Violation Tag.
- 9.8 The Bylaw Enforcement Officer may enforce the provisions of this Bylaw, and where a Bylaw Enforcement Officer has reasonable grounds to believe that a provision of this Bylaw has been contravened, the Bylaw Enforcement Officer is authorized and empowered to immediately issue a Violation Ticket pursuant to Part 2 of the Provincial Offences Procedures Act, R.S.A. 2000, c p-34, as amended, to any person who the Bylaw Enforcement Officer has reasonable grounds to believe is responsible for the contravention.
- 9.9 Where a Violation Ticket has been issued to a person pursuant to this Bylaw, that person may plead guilty to the offence by submitting to a Clerk of the Provincial

Court the specified penalty set out in the Violation Ticket at any time prior to the appearance indicated in the Violation Ticket.

- 9.10 The Violation Ticket shall be served upon the person who is believed to be responsible for the contravention under the Bylaw in accordance with the provisions of the Provincial Offences Procedures Act R.S.A. 2000, c p-34, as amended.
- 9.11 Should any person be guilty of an offence for which no penalty is specified in Schedule "A" herein, then such person shall be liable on Summary Conviction to a fine not less than five hundred dollars (\$500.00).
- 9.12 Subject to the entry notice provisions of the Municipal Government Act, R.S.A. 2000 c.m.-26, a designated Bylaw Enforcement Officer or Peace Officer of the Town of Irricana, may enter upon any privately owned property, other than a dwelling house for the purposes of enforcing the provisions of this Bylaw.
- 9.13 The purchaser of an Animal from the Bylaw Enforcement Officer, Pound, or Contractor pursuant to the provisions of this Bylaw shall obtain full right and title to it and the right and title of the former owner of the Animal shall cease there upon.

PART X SEVERABILITY OF BYLAW PROVISIONS

- 10.1 Each and every separate provision of this Bylaw shall be deemed independent of all other provisions, and if any provision of this Bylaw is declared invalid by any Court, all other provisions shall remain valid and enforceable.

PART XI REPEAL

- 11.1 Bylaw 13:2003 is hereby repealed.

PART XII EFFECTIVE DATE

AND FURTHER THAT this Bylaw shall take effect on the date of third and final reading.

READ A FIRST TIME this 23 day of January A.D. 2017.

READ A SECOND TIME this 23 day of January A.D. 2017.

READ A THIRD TIME this 21 day of February A.D. 2017.

MAYOR DENNIS TRACZ

FABIAN JOSEPH
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

SCHEDULE "A"
SPECIFIED PENALTIES

PART III LICENSING OFFENCES

Section Number:	Offence:	First Offence:	Second Offence:	Third Offence:
3.1	Fail to obtain an animal license.	\$75.00	\$150.00	\$200.00
3.2	Providing false or misleading information on license application form.	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,500.00
3.3	Fail to ensure collar and/or tag worn on animal while off the property of the owner.	\$100.00	\$200.00	\$300.00

PART IV ANIMAL CONTROL OFFENCES

Section Number:	Offence:	First Offence:	Second Offence:	Third Offence:
4.1 a.	Animal runs at large.	\$150.00	\$200.00	\$300.00
4.2 a.	Fail to immediately remove defecation.	\$100.00	\$200.00	\$300.00
4.2 b.	Allow defecation to accumulate, to such an extent to annoy or pose a health risk.	\$100.00	\$200.00	\$300.00
4.3	Allow Animal in playground apparatus and or sand play area.	\$100.00	\$200.00	\$300.00
4.4	Allow Animal to bark, meow, or howl so as to cause a disturbance.	\$100.00	\$200.00	\$300.00
4.5	Allow Animal to destroy public or private property other than the property of the owner.	\$200.00	\$400.00	\$800.00
4.6	Exercise Animal while in a motor vehicle.	\$100.00	\$200.00	\$300.00
4.7	Leave Animal unattended on premises where public has access.	\$100.00	\$200.00	\$300.00

PART V ANIMALS DISPLAYING THREATENING BEHAVIOR

Section Number:	Offence:	First Offence:	Second Offence:	Third Offence:
5.1 a.	Animal chases, lunges, or otherwise exhibits threatening behavior towards a bicycle or motor vehicle.	\$200.00	\$400.00	\$800.00
5.1 b.	Animal chases, lunges, or otherwise exhibits threatening behavior towards another animal.	\$200.00	\$400.00	\$800.00
5.1 c.	Animal chases, lunges, or otherwise exhibits threatening behavior towards a person.	\$200.00	\$400.00	\$800.00

PART VI ANIMALS CAUSING INJURY TO PERSON OR ANIMAL

Section Number:	Offence:	First Offence:	Second Offence:	Third Offence:
6.1 a.	Animal attacks any Person causing minor injury.	\$500.00	COURT	COURT
6.1 a.	Animal attacks any Person causing grievous bodily harm.	COURT	COURT	COURT
6.1 a.	Animal attacks any Person causing death.	COURT	COURT	COURT
6.1 b.	Animal bites any other Animal causing minor injury.	\$250.00	COURT	COURT
6.1 b.	Animal attacks any other animal causing grievous bodily harm.	\$750.00	COURT	COURT
6.1 b.	Animal attacks any other animal causing death.	\$1,000.00	COURT	COURT

PART VIII INTERFERENCE WITH OFFICER

Section Number:	Offence:	First Offence:	Second Offence:	Third Offence:
8.1 a.	Obstructing an Officer, attempting to obstruct an Officer, or obstructing an officer who is attempting to or who has captured an Animal.	\$500.00	COURT	COURT
8.1) b.	Unlocking, unlatching, or otherwise opening an Officers vehicle in which animals are placed, so as to allow an animal to escape.	\$500.00	COURT	COURT
8.1 c.	Removing or attempting to remove any animal from the Officers Possession.	\$500.00	COURT	COURT
8.1 d.	Refusing to provide identification to an Officer.	\$500.00	COURT	COURT
8.1 e.	Providing false or misleading information to an Officer.	\$500.00	COURT	COURT
8.1 f.	Withholding information from an Officer, which is pertinent to any investigation.	\$500.00	COURT	COURT

Schedule ``B``
License Fees

License Fee between December 01st and January 31st:

- Unaltered Dog - \$20.00
- Unaltered Cat - \$20.00
- Altered Dog - \$10.00
- Altered Cat - \$10.00

License Fee after January 31st:

- Unaltered Dog - \$40.00
- Unaltered Cat - \$40.00
- Altered Dog - \$20.00
- Altered Cat - \$20.00

Replacement Tags:

- Dog - \$10.00
- Cat - \$10.00

There shall be no pro-rating on License Fees.

If an Owner is a new resident of the Town of Irricana, the fee for the License shall not differ from the fee`s listed above.

Committee of the Whole Report

To: Chairperson and Committee Members
From: Chief Administrative Officer
Date: March 9, 2026
Purpose: **Provided For Information**
Subject: Council Public Engagement Practices & Protocols

Summary:

Council has expressed interest in discussing approaches to in-person engagement with residents outside of formal Council meetings. Members of Council are regularly approached by residents seeking discussion or clarification regarding municipal matters, and these interactions form an important part of local governance.

This report provides context to support a discussion regarding how Council may wish to approach such engagement, including practical considerations related to meeting formats, consistency, and personal safety.

Purpose of Discussion

The purpose of this discussion is to explore how Council may wish to approach in-person engagement with residents outside of formal Council meetings.

Members of Council routinely interact with residents through informal conversations, community events, email correspondence, and telephone discussions. These interactions contribute to maintaining an accessible and responsive municipal government.

As Council continues to consider how it may engage with residents in a proactive and consistent manner, Committee may wish to discuss whether establishing shared practices or general expectations would assist councillors when meeting with residents in person.

The objective of this discussion is not to formalize rigid rules or protocols, but rather to consider whether a common understanding of engagement practices would

support accessibility while ensuring interactions occur in a safe, respectful, and balanced environment.

Background Context

In smaller municipalities, residents often expect elected officials to be accessible and approachable. Councillors may be approached in a variety of settings, including community events, informal conversations in the community, or through requests for meetings to discuss specific municipal matters.

Residents occasionally suggest more structured opportunities for engagement, such as community forums, town halls, or open house-style discussions where residents may speak directly with members of Council. At other times, residents may seek a more individualized discussion with a councillor regarding a particular concern.

While these forms of engagement can be valuable, they also raise practical considerations regarding how such meetings occur, including the environment in which they take place, the number of councillors present, and how expectations are managed when conversations occur outside of formal Council proceedings.

This discussion provides an opportunity for Council to consider how these interactions may occur in a manner that supports meaningful dialogue while maintaining appropriate safeguards and consistency.

Current Framework / Status

There is currently no formal municipal policy governing how councillors engage with residents outside of Council meetings. Individual councillors may speak with residents informally, respond to emails or phone calls, or participate in community discussions as part of their role as elected representatives.

Council has previously established communication practices relating to how municipal information is shared publicly and how messaging is coordinated among members of Council. Those discussions were primarily focused on having clear communication protocols, producing consistent messaging, and ensuring that all elected officials are aware of the (material) discussions being had with community members.

The discussion presented in this report is distinct from those earlier conversations. It focuses specifically on **in-person engagement** between councillors and residents and how those interactions may occur outside the formal Council meeting environment.

Administration notes that municipalities commonly consider safety and respectful workplace practices when interacting with members of the public. For example, the Town maintains a workplace safety practice that avoids situations where staff are required to interact with members of the public while working alone in the municipal office. Although rare, the office is not generally open to the public when only a single employee is present.

While councillors operate independently from administration, this example illustrates that municipalities routinely consider practical safety measures when establishing public interaction practices.

Observations and Constraints

Administration offers the following observations for Committee's consideration.

1. Accessibility Remains an Important Principle of Local Governance

Council members are often viewed by residents as the most accessible point of contact within the municipal organization. Informal conversations with residents can provide valuable insight into community concerns, priorities, and emerging issues.

Maintaining opportunities for dialogue with residents can therefore contribute positively to local governance and community trust.

At the same time, accessibility can take many forms, including public forums, community events, or individual discussions with residents. Council may wish to consider what forms of engagement best align with community expectations and Council's capacity.

2. Engagement May Occur in Several Different Contexts

Council engagement with residents may occur in a variety of formats, each with different practical considerations. For example:

- **Structured engagement events**, such as town halls, open houses, or community forums where multiple councillors may be present and discussions occur in a public setting;
- **Small group or resident-requested meetings**, where one or more councillors meet with residents to discuss a specific concern; and
- **Individual informal conversations**, which may occur during community events or through ad-hoc requests for meetings.

Each of these formats carries different expectations regarding meeting environments, participation, and how discussions are conducted.

3. Respect and Personal Safety Are Legitimate Considerations

While the vast majority of interactions between residents and municipal representatives are constructive and respectful, municipalities periodically encounter situations where discussions become heated or confrontational.

Municipal staff occasionally experience emotionally charged interactions with members of the public, particularly where residents are dealing with regulatory matters, enforcement issues, or financial concerns. In some instances, individuals may demonstrate behaviour that is persistently hostile, abusive, or harassing.

In rare but serious circumstances, municipalities may also encounter situations involving threats of harm or threats to personal safety. Administration notes that, in the past, law enforcement has advised members of Council and Administration regarding *credible threats to elected officials and municipal personnel*. While these situations are far from the norm, **they are not theoretical** and should be considered when discussing how in-person interactions with members of the public occur.

As noted earlier, the Town maintains workplace safety practices that avoid situations where staff interact with members of the public while working alone. In circumstances involving repeated harassment or abusive behaviour, municipalities may also modify how interactions occur in order to maintain safe and respectful working conditions.

While councillors operate independently from administration, similar considerations may be relevant when discussing how in-person meetings with residents occur. Ensuring that interactions take place in environments that are safe, respectful, and balanced for all participants may therefore be an important consideration as Council discusses public engagement practices.

4. Consistency and Expectations May Assist Councillors

Without shared expectations regarding engagement practices, councillors may approach resident meetings in different ways. This can create uncertainty for both councillors and residents regarding how such interactions should occur.

Some councillors may prefer meeting residents individually, while others may feel more comfortable meeting in small groups or public settings. While each Councillor will inevitably choose formats that they are most comfortable with, establishing general expectations or guiding practices may assist in navigating these situations with greater clarity and consistency.

5. Public Perception and Quorum Considerations

When multiple councillors participate in informal discussions with residents, it may raise questions regarding how those discussions relate to formal Council decision-making processes.

While informal engagement is a normal part of local governance, municipalities generally seek to ensure that formal decisions occur during properly convened Council meetings where discussions are recorded and accessible to the public.

Council may therefore wish to consider how engagement practices can remain transparent and clearly distinct from formal decision-making processes

Discussion Questions

To assist Committee in framing the discussion, the following questions may be helpful:

1. What types of public engagement opportunities does Council wish to encourage (e.g., town halls, open houses, informal meetings, or individual discussions)?
2. Should certain types of meetings occur in neutral or public locations rather than private residences or informal settings?
3. Are there situations where councillors may prefer to attend meetings with another councillor present?
4. Would it be helpful to establish general expectations or informal practices regarding how councillors meet with residents?
5. How can Council maintain accessibility while ensuring interactions occur in a safe and respectful environment?

Next Steps (Subject to Direction)

Based on Committee discussion, Council may choose to:

- Continue current practices without establishing additional guidance;
- Develop informal engagement practices to guide councillors when meeting with residents; or
- Consider a formal policy to guide structured engagement opportunities, such as in-person interactions, periodic public forums or community discussions.

Any future direction from Council would be implemented in a manner that respects the independent role of elected officials while supporting consistent and safe engagement practices.

Financial Considerations

No direct financial implications are associated with this discussion. Any future engagement initiatives, such as community forums or public meetings, could be accommodated within existing operational resources.

Recommendation Motion(s):

Option #1:

Motion #1: **THAT** the Committee receive Administration's report for information.

Option #2:

As determined by the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

"Doug Hafichuk"

Chief Administrative Officer

ATTACHMENTS:

N/A



Committee of the Whole Report

To: Chairperson and Committee Members
From: Chief Administrative Officer
Date: March 9, 2026
Purpose: **Provided For Information**
Subject: Financial Controls & Reporting – 2026 Work Plan Update

Summary:

Administration has been undertaking a comprehensive review of the Town’s financial governance systems, including financial reporting practices, internal financial controls, and the structure of municipal bank accounts.

This work forms part of the broader organizational improvements identified within the 2026 Work Plan approved by Council and supported through the 2026 Base Operating Budget.

Through this process, Administration has identified opportunities to strengthen financial transparency, improve financial reporting practices, and address structural liquidity challenges that have developed over time.

This report provides an overview of the work underway, explains the Town’s current liquidity position, and introduces potential tools that may assist Council in strengthening the municipality’s financial resilience.

Administration is seeking Committee feedback and general direction regarding potential next steps.

Purpose of Discussion

The purpose of this discussion is to:

- provide Committee with an update on financial governance improvements currently underway
- improve shared understanding of the Town’s financial position and liquidity structure

- introduce potential tools that could strengthen the Town’s financial resilience over time
- seek Committee feedback regarding possible next steps, including the concept of establishing an *Operating Stabilization Reserve*.

This item is intended primarily as an exploratory discussion. Any specific policies or financial strategies would be brought forward to Council at a later date for formal consideration.

Background Context

Over the past several months Administration has been undertaking a comprehensive review of the Town’s financial controls, reporting practices, and internal financial processes.

This work forms part of the broader organizational improvements identified within the 2026 Work Plan approved by Council and supported through the 2026 Base Operating Budget.

The objective of this initiative is to ensure that the Town’s financial management systems are reliable, transparent, and capable of supporting informed decision-making by Council.

While municipal financial reporting ultimately culminates in annual audited financial statements, strong financial governance requires much more than simply producing an audit at the end of the year. It requires internal systems that allow Administration and Council to clearly understand the municipality’s financial position throughout the year.

The work underway includes:

- Reviewing and reconciling historical financial records.
- Strengthening payroll documentation and verification processes.
- Completing outstanding GST filings and addressing remittance discrepancies.
- Identifying and correcting duplicated or missed financial transactions.
- Advancing Tangible Capital Asset tracking and documentation.
- Preparing the Town’s financial records for completion of outstanding municipal audits.

While much of this work occurs behind the scenes, it represents a significant effort, taking place while also ensuring day-to-day and seasonally-driven operations continue to move forward; a process previously described as “building the aircraft while flying it.”

As part of this initiative, Administration has been evaluating the Town’s financial governance systems against recognized best practices.

In particular, the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) provides widely recognized guidance regarding financial transparency, budgeting practices, and financial reporting.

While achieving GFOA-level recognition may take several years for a municipality the size of Irricana, Administration views these standards as a valuable ‘*North Star*’.

Using recognized best practices as a benchmark helps ensure that the systems being developed today are capable of supporting strong financial governance and transparency in the future.

This work also aligns with Council’s broader direction to continue strengthening the Town’s governance systems and ensuring that financial information provided to Council supports informed policy decisions.

Current Framework / Status

As part of the governance review, Administration has been examining the Town’s current financial structure, including the organization of municipal bank accounts and the way different categories of funds are managed.

Historically, many municipalities – particularly smaller communities - develop banking structures largely through operational convenience. Over time, accounts may be added for specific purposes without a broader structural framework.

A preliminary review suggests that the Town’s financial structure has evolved in a similar way.

While this approach has remained compliant with public sector accounting standards, it can create challenges related to financial visibility. For example, different categories of municipal funds – such as operating revenues, restricted funds, deposits, and grant funds – may reside within the same operating account.

Administration has begun examining opportunities to transition the Town from *historical convenience banking to intentional financial architecture*, where different categories of municipal funds are clearly separated and transparently managed.

Possible categories of accounts may include:

- Operating accounts
- Restricted revenue accounts
- Reserve accounts
- Trust accounts

This approach would improve financial transparency while maintaining a manageable and practical banking structure.

Observations and Constraints

Through the financial governance review described earlier in this report, Administration has gained a clearer understanding of the Town's current financial structure and liquidity position. Several observations have emerged from this work that may be helpful for Committee to consider.

Budget Performance vs Liquidity

One of the most important distinctions in municipal finance is the difference between *budget performance* and *liquidity*.

Municipal budgets measure whether revenues exceed expenditures over the course of a fiscal year. Liquidity, on the other hand, refers to the municipality's ability to meet its financial obligations at any given point in time using available cash resources.

Irricana's recent annual budgets have demonstrated sufficient revenues to offset intentional expenditures; the 2023 audited financial statements confirmed the internal expectations of a minor overall surplus (~\$8,000). 2024 and 2025 budgets appear to have produced similar results (i.e., minor-to-modest surplus), to be confirmed through the auditing process.

A municipality may have a balanced budget and still experience temporary financial pressure if cash inflows and outflows occur at different times during the year.

Municipal cash flows are inherently uneven. For example:

- Property tax revenues are typically collected later in the year

- Major requisitions, such as education property taxes, must be remitted periodically regardless of when local taxes are collected
- Capital grants may be received before or after project expenditures occur
- Unexpected infrastructure repairs can arise at any time

As a result, even municipalities with sound budgets must maintain sufficient liquidity buffers to manage these timing differences.

Current Liquidity Position

The Town’s most recent audited financial statements indicate the following:

Operating revenues: ~**\$2.38 million**

Financial assets: ~**\$322,000**

Liabilities: ~**\$865,000**

When expressed as a *working capital ratio*, this results in a value of approximately **0.37**. The Town’s current ratio suggests that improving liquidity should be prioritized as a strategic priority.

Working Capital Ratio Interpretation	
Below 0.50	Highly Vulnerable to Events
0.50 – 0.75	Vulnerable, Limited Flexibility
0.75 – 1.25	Healthy Operating Liquidity
Above 1.25	Very Strong Liquidity
Above 2.0	Operationally Inefficient

A Practical Illustration

Imagine a homeowner with the following financial position:

Home value: \$600,000

Mortgage balance: \$200,000

On paper, the homeowner appears financially strong, with \$400,000 in overall equity. However, imagine that the homeowner has only \$5,000 in the bank while facing \$15,000 in bills due this month.

Despite being financially secure overall, the household would still experience immediate financial stress because it lacks sufficient liquid cash to cover its short-term obligations.

Municipal finances can viewed in a similar way.

Visibility of Restricted Funds

Municipal accounting standards allow certain revenues to be recorded as deferred revenue until the conditions associated with those funds have been met.

While this is *fully compliant with Public Sector Accounting Standards (PSAS)*, these funds may still physically reside within the municipality's operating bank accounts.

When this occurs, the municipality's bank balance can appear larger than the amount of cash that is actually available for operating purposes, making it difficult to quantify the municipality's true liquidity and financial health.

Administration's review suggests this structure has existed within the Town's financial systems for several years, with records reviewed back to 2017 indicating long-term consistency in approach.

Although compliant with PSAS, comingling of funds becomes operationally risky if routine safeguards (i.e., reconciliation, reporting, and analysis) begins lacking – as often experienced during staffing transitions – or institutional memory is lost.

Commingling of Financial Resources

In many smaller municipalities, operating funds, deposits, and restricted funds reside within the same accounts for operational convenience.

However, when multiple categories of funds reside within the same account, it can become difficult to quickly distinguish between:

- Cash available for operations
- Cash restricted for specific purposes
- Cash that must ultimately be returned or remitted

Separating these categories of funds can significantly improve financial visibility.

Near-Term Financial Pressures

The Town is also currently managing several financial obligations that highlight the importance of maintaining adequate liquidity buffers.

These include:

- Periodic education property tax remittances exceeding \$100,000
- Regular payroll and statutory remittances
- Ongoing CRA reviews on payroll and GST accounts

The Town can likely continue to meet its immediate obligations; however, exceptional cash management will be needed to do so, and the current situation provides no margin for unexpected events.

Discussion Questions

Committee may wish to consider the following questions as part of this discussion:

1. What level of operating liquidity should the Town aim to maintain over time?
2. Should the Town adopt a more structured banking framework separating operating funds, restricted funds, and reserves?
3. Would establishing an Operating Stabilization Reserve provide an appropriate tool for strengthening municipal liquidity?

Next Steps (Subject to Direction)

One potential tool available to municipalities is the establishment of an Operating Stabilization Reserve. Such reserves provide a financial buffer that allows municipalities to manage timing differences between revenues and expenditures without relying heavily on external borrowing.

Administration has explored a potential approach that could allow the Town to establish a stabilization reserve while continuing to build long-term reserves over time. Under this concept, the Town could establish an initial stabilization reserve through short-term borrowing while continuing its planned reserve contributions.

Financial Considerations

The Town's 2026 Base Budget already includes \$75,000 in annual reserve contributions:

- \$35,000 toward an operating reserve
- \$40,000 toward a capital reserve

Administration has examined whether those contributions could support a short-term borrowing strategy to establish an initial stabilization reserve.

Assuming borrowing of \$250,000 at approximately 5.5% over seven years, annual debt servicing would be approximately \$45,000 per year, leaving roughly \$30,000 annually available for continued reserve growth.

Beginning in 2028, the Town's water system debenture will be retired, freeing approximately \$36,758 annually.

The Town also carries a mortgage on Town-owned lands with annual carrying costs of approximately \$50,000, which is scheduled to conclude in 2028, with those funds becoming available in 2029.

Year	Reserve Contribution Available	Debt Servicing	Net Annual Contribution	Estimated Reserve Balance	Working Capital Ratio
2026	\$75,000	~\$45,000	~\$30,000	\$280,000	~0.60
2027	\$75,000	~\$45,000	~\$30,000	\$310,000	~0.64
2028	\$111,758	~\$45,000	~\$66,758	\$376,758	~0.73
2029	\$111,758	~\$45,000	~\$66,758	\$443,516	~0.82
2030	\$111,758	~\$45,000	~\$66,758	\$510,274	~0.91

This illustration demonstrates how the Town’s liquidity position could improve meaningfully over time, using a strategy that relies *primarily on financial commitments already embedded within the operating budget*.

Recommendation Motion(s):

Option #1:

Motion #1: **THAT** Administration be directed to prepare a policy framework for establishing an Operating Stabilization Reserve.

Motion #2: **THAT** Administration be directed to develop a structured banking architecture separating operating funds, restricted funds, reserves, and trust accounts.

Option #2:

As determined by the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

“Doug Hafichuk”

Chief Administrative Officer

ATTACHMENTS:

N/A