

From: [Ron Minks](#)
To: [Rachelle Trovato](#)
Cc: [Feinan Long](#); [Joshua Culling](#); [Martin Frigo](#); [Matt Brassard](#)
Subject: RE: NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING: Bylaw 2020-13 Acheson Industrial ASP
Date: Wednesday, December 02, 2020 3:08:23 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)

Hi Rachelle,

The following comments are provided for Parkland County's consideration (hopefully not too late):

- There are several Maps where the ASP border are identified. The City of Edmonton is clearly identified east of the ASP while Enoch is not identified to the south. We ask that Parkland County consider also identifying Enoch south of the ASP. This occurs on pages 10, 13, 14, 16, 22, 40, 60, 63, 64, 67, 78.
- Page 17 – indicates preliminary feedback (one on one) session with ECN in the spring of 2020. Can parkland County share who participated on behalf of Enoch and what was Enoch's feedback?
- Page 26 – Can Parkland County share their development policy and design standards for berms, fencing, and landscaping? We are curious to learn about how, when, and what the applications of these screening techniques will be used and how those techniques impact neighbors.
- Page 43 – Special Area B. Parkland County, the City of Edmonton, and Enoch are currently working on the Boundary Interface Protocols Strategy (BIPS) and have agreed that all 'projects' within 1.6km (1,600m) of the boundary defined in the BIPS document will include engagement with each other. Enoch would like to be identified and consulted in a similar manner as the CoE as it relates to this area.
- Page 49 – Section 3.1 Environment and Section 3.2 Parks, Open Space and Recreation – as noted in the ASP, Enoch would be open to collaborate on the following:
 - o Conservation of potential and existing wildlife corridors
 - o Expansion of existing and/or new recreational facilities (indoor, outdoor, publicly and privately owned facilities)
 - o Explore opportunity to develop regional trail networks
 - o However, there is no mention of Traditional Land Use (TLU) or other exploration of culturally significant areas pertaining to ECN's potential interests in the ASP.
- Page 60 – Map 8 Transportation Network illustrates the proposed network in Acheson. We have several interests:
 - o Upgrades to 231 street at/near 79th ave/Hwy 628 will include four (4) different jurisdictions (GoA/AT, Parkland County, City of Edmonton, and Enoch). We would like to be consulted early in the development of the future road alignment such that impacts to Enoch can be considered.
 - o Hwy 628 alignment and stranded land parcels south of 628 and north of ECN. Land described as zone 7 and zone 8. As Hwy 628 is being considered for upgrades (functional planning, preliminary design), Enoch would like to be consulted around the future of those stranded parcels of land.
 - o Hwy 60 upgrades illustrate a significant interchange upgrade at Hwy 628. This will impact Enoch's access/egress and planned developments south along Hwy 60 as well as access to Enoch along our northern boundary. We would like to be consulted early in the development of the future Hwy 60 upgrades at Hwy 628.
- Page 63 – Map 9 Water Infrastructure Network illustrates the proposed water network. Enoch does not have a secondary (redundant) water source connection. Is there an opportunity to consider a

secondary water feed to Enoch in the event our primary feed from the EPCOR system along 79th avenue/215street is interrupted?

- Page 64 – Map 10 Sanitary Infrastructure Network illustrates the proposed sanitary collection network. Enoch's long-term sanitary servicing will likely require a connection to the ACRWC main line north of Hwy 16. Is there an opportunity to discuss a future alignment and/or protect and alignment for a future sanitary forcemain from Enoch to the ACRWC?

- Page 72 – The principal and intent of intermunicipal collaboration is critical to the long-term success of communities. However, the language we currently use in planning does not reflect the unique status of First Nations and the relationship(s) between our communities. We are not a municipality. Would Parkland County consider using alternate language to describe our unique relationship? We currently have an MOU with Parkland and wonder if it might be appropriate to identify the MOU and/or the BIPS document in the ASP to raise awareness in both communities of our already existing collaborative relationship.

- Page 73 – Section 5.1 Intermunicipal Collaboration

o Circulation of applications to ECN within 0.8km (1.6km to CoE). As noted above, the BIPS suggests referrals to either ECN or CoE within 1.6km of our shared boundary.

o Collaboration with the CoE regarding issues related to 231st is identified. As noted above, ECN should be included in the discussion as it relates to the southern leg of 231st.

- From a learning/sharing perspective, would Parkland County be open to a review session with Enoch's Planning and Development Services so that we can ask questions and share perspective in person (online zoom/MS Teams meeting)?

ay hiy,



Ron Minks

Chief Operations Officer

O: 780-470-4505

C: 587-896-5835

ron.minks@EnochNation.ca

PO Box 29, Enoch, AB T7X 3Y3

EnochNation.ca

Self-sufficient | Unified | Prosperous

This e-mail, including any attachments, is privileged and may contain confidential or proprietary information intended only for the addressee(s). Any other distribution, copying, use, or disclosure is unauthorized and strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and permanently delete the message, including any attachments, without making a copy. Thank you.

From: Rachelle Trovato <Rachelle.Trovato@parklandcounty.com>

Sent: November 12, 2020 2:19 PM

To: Ron Minks <ron.minks@enochnation.ca>

Cc: Feinan Long <Feinan.Long@parklandcounty.com>; Joshua Culling