



August 22, 2018

Kneehill County Council responds to Resident Concerns

Kneehill County Council remains committed to its desire for open communication with its ratepayers, and due to that commitment we feel it is time to respond to the questions being raised by both our own ratepayers and other parties with their own specific complaints and agendas.

Horseshoe Canyon

Horseshoe Canyon is a policy decision made by the previous Kneehill County Council, it was supported in a recorded vote, five councillors for, one opposed (Keiver) and one absent (Calhoun).

The decision to purchase Horseshoe Canyon was made to allow for continued public access to a unique and significant geographic feature within Kneehill County. Horseshoe Canyon presents numerous opportunities for future recreation and tourism development, the potential of Horseshoe Canyon is unlimited.

There have been many ideas floated for potential development around Horseshoe Canyon. The idea of a campground was never part of an attempt to justify the purchase of Horseshoe Canyon, it was just one of the many kinds of development ideas discussed at the time, and it has been proven to have value as there is currently a campground that has been opened alongside the Horseshoe Canyon lookout.

Visitor counts to the Horseshoe Canyon are just what the term implies, traffic counts that indicate traffic has moved into and out of the Horseshoe Canyon lookout. These counts have not been manufactured or inflated and they will vary from year to year. Whether it is just curiosity, a washroom break, or recreation we do not know for sure, however there is information available that has been compiled through the use of visitor's surveys.

It is the belief of Kneehill County Council that the Horseshoe Canyon area is one of the many prime recreational locations available to residents and visitors alike in Kneehill County.

Industrial and Commercial Development opportunities are encouraged and pursued by all individuals within Kneehill County and the County Council supports our planning department in their efforts to encourage and facilitate new and innovative developments with the county boundary.

Currently the County has no information on, or indication of plans being proposed by developers in the Drumheller and Horseshoe Canyon area. Although Council has discussed the potential of development along the Highway 9 corridor above the Town of Drumheller. Kneehill County Council believes that the Drumheller area and Highway 9 corridor are obvious and logical locations for either industrial or commercial development to take place.

Future development in the Horseshoe Canyon area, if any, could be centered around recreation and tourism developments and there are no plans for industrial developments alongside Horseshoe Canyon.

Churchill Water Service Area Project

The Churchill Water Service area upgrade is a project that has been under discussion by Kneehill County Council for some time. Long term issues with the Churchill Water Service that need to be addressed are aging infrastructure, inadequate water supply for the current system customers, and other problems that have arisen due the overload on a system that is currently far beyond its design capabilities.

The previous Council approved a water study and had an engineering report done to look at upgrading the Churchill Water Service area and for reasons of their own the project was set aside at that time.

The current Council recognises the importance of water and the problems inherent within the Churchill water system, and has chosen what we feel is the best possible route to address the concerns and needs for water in that area. The proposed upgrade will provide improved, more reliable water service for the current customers, provide for farmers and industry a bulk water fill that is not in the valley, provide increased capacity to allow for additional residential water customers and possibly in the future allow for industrial/commercial development near Drumheller and possible future recreation and tourism development near Horseshoe Canyon.

Currently the approved money to be utilized for the Churchill Water project is \$4.5 million dollars. The money to be utilized for Churchill is money that is dedicated for the maintenance, improvement and upgrading required by our current water systems, of which the Churchill Water Service is one, or the development of new water systems.

There are no massive water reserves that the County has stockpiled, but there are carefully managed dollars that have been set aside to safe guard the future of our various water systems and to provide funding to allow for maintenance and development work to be carried out.

It is also important to note that the current water rates for existing Kneehill water customers, no matter where you are located within the County, are well below the County's cost for water and our current water customers are being subsidized on their water.

Other water projects have been in discussion around the Council table, but at this time due to a number of reasons, nothing solid has been initiated by Council.

Canadian Badlands Tourism

Canadian Badlands Tourism is an organization that Kneehill County is proud to be a member of, along with 60 other municipalities, including the other municipalities within Kneehill County. Kneehill County pays an annual requisition to the Canadian Badlands organization and has contributed other funding to help sponsor events that they host, like our sponsorship of the annual convention hosted this year in Medicine Hat. Kneehill County takes it membership seriously and this Council, choose to assist Canadian Badlands as had the previous Council. Any suggestion of impropriety or illegal behavior on the part of any of our staff is a completely untrue.

Any decision concerning funding of organizations, such as this sponsorship of Canadian Badlands, is brought to Council by our administration, namely the CAO, and the decision to support or not is made by Council motion. It is the CAO's responsibility to bring forward all such requests for support to Council and then Council chooses which direction to take. The decision to support Canadian Badlands is a Council decision and as such the responsibility rests with Kneehill County Council.

Rural Fire Strategy

Kneehill County's Rural Fire Strategy and the decision to hire a County Fire Chief is a policy decision made by Council in support of our own strategic planning document developed by Council in February of 2018. Policy direction and decisions are the responsibility and right of Council.

There is a lot of talk about how this Council has created a new position within our organization of Kneehill County Fire Chief, that is untrue, and while it has been a few years since the County has had a County Fire Service Coordinator, the position has existed previously, unused by the previous Council in recent years, but now reinstated by the current Council with a title change to County Fire Chief.

Kneehill County Council recognizes and appreciates the value of and contribution being made by the men and women that serve in the various fire departments within the Kneehill area. Fire is a highly sensitive topic and there are many individuals who feel they have "ownership" of the issue of fire, however, the responsibility for rural fire management rests with the Kneehill County Council, Kneehill County Administration, and the Kneehill County Fire Chief. Any suggestion that Kneehill County is not entitled to hire a qualified, professional Fire Chief to advise Council on matters pertaining to fire fighting for our 5000 plus residents is unreasonable. The suggestion that the Fire Chiefs that are members of the Fire Management Committee ought to be Council's sounding board and advisory committee is inappropriate. As employees of their respective municipalities, those Fire Chiefs are directly responsible to their own Councils and as such have a direct conflict of interest with that of Kneehill County. The Fire Chiefs of the urban municipalities should recognize that it is inappropriate for them to direct Kneehill County Council as they are in no way responsible to Kneehill County Council or our administration for their day to day responsibilities and duties.

The Kneehill Rural Fire Chief position, the responsibilities that would be assigned to that individual, and the Rural Fire Management Strategy were discussed at length by Council at our Strategic Planning Session, in several Committee of the Whole meetings and at numerous other occasions prior to the Council decision that was made on February 27, 2018. Yes, Council had reached a consensus of opinion prior to the February Council meeting, and as a consequence there was not a lot of additional discussion regarding the hiring of a Kneehill County Fire Chief required at that time. The Rural Fire Chief is a policy decision of Kneehill County Council.

The Kneehill Rural Fire Chief is responsible for fire management and fire operations within the county and the Torrington Station Chief answers to him in day to day matters of fire operations. It is important to note that the only Kneehill County Fire Station is Torrington, all other fire departments are under the direction of the Council of the municipality in which they reside. The Kneehill Rural Fire Chief acts as a liaison between/with the other municipal fire departments on matters pertaining to fire management within Kneehill County and is an advisor to Kneehill County Council and our administration on fire management and related matters.

The Fire Management Committee has its own responsibilities and agenda, it exists at the discretion of Kneehill County Council, and they work directly with our Rural Fire Chief and our Protective Services Manager. However, the Rural Fire Strategy, and its development is a Kneehill County Council policy decision, and as such no consultation is required with the Fire Management Committee or our regional fire "partners".

Stakeholders such as the other municipal Councils, will be involved in discussions with Kneehill County Council at such time that the Rural Fire Strategy is in place and when and if any change in direction on rural fire management is decided on by Kneehill County Council.

Speaking of stakeholders, the conservative funding cost estimate for fire services within Trochu, Three Hills, Linden, Acme and Carbon, to Kneehill County is \$587,232.00 in the 2018 budget year. These dollars do not include the additional costs of fire service for Kneehill County's own Fire Station and Department located in Torrington, nor the capital cost to the County for the ownership of the Trochu Fire Hall building. Kneehill County has consistently provided the above funding to our urban neighbours and their fire services for many years, and to this point there is no decision by Council to take any other path.

It is also important to note that the provision of new fire trucks for the urban municipalities of Trochu, Three Hills, Linden, Acme and Carbon under the current Master Fire Agreement, with the exception of one pumper truck the Town of Three Hills have provided for their own use, falls directly to the County. So when the urban municipalities and their fire departments are talking new fire trucks, of which there are 5 pumpers, 5 tankers and one rescue unit, the urban municipalities are, at this time, fully expecting Kneehill County to purchase and provide those trucks for their use. Kneehill County also, of course, purchases fire trucks, one pumper and one tanker, and all other equipment for our own Fire Station located in Torrington.

The discussion around fire costs, fire management, equipment, personnel and the overall strategy on rural fire management is a conversation that is currently underway within Council and the strategy will be more completely developed going forward into the future. As the Rural Fire Strategy is developed there will be discussion with our urban neighbours regarding the future vision for rural fire management within Kneehill County.

The reality is that volunteer firemen are technically employees of the municipality under whose authority they operate and as such they are responsible to that municipality for their actions. Each municipality provides Workers Compensation and liability insurance coverage for the firemen and those fire fighters are for legal purposes viewed as the responsibility of the municipality for whom they serve. Volunteer or not, someone ultimately has to be legally responsible for the actions and behaviors of the fire fighters and that is the municipality in which they operate.

The Torrington Fire Hall and its volunteers are legally the responsibility of Kneehill County. They are covered by County liability insurance and WCB insurance, and they are considered employees of Kneehill County. The County has recognized the value and contribution of the Torrington fire fighters and worked to assist the fire fighters in Torrington with training by providing generous compensation for successful completion of training. Our fire fighters are supported, trained, equipped and have their training paid for by Kneehill County. Kneehill County firefighters are also expected to be accountable and responsible to behave appropriately and within the guidelines of the code of conduct the fire fighters agree to at the time they join the fire department.

The removal of Mr. Bauer and Mr. Look from their respective positions as Station Chief and Deputy Station Chief for Torrington Fire was not a decision taken lightly by Kneehill County Council. Mr. Bauer and Mr. Look lost the Kneehill County Council's confidence and both Mr. Bauer and Mr. Look were given an opportunity to correct the actions that they had taken and remain in their positions with Torrington Fire in a meeting held with the Reeve, Deputy Reeve and CAO of Kneehill County. However, both men chose not to do so. Consequently, they were removed from the Chief, Deputy Chief positions and the reasons for their change in status were outlined to both men in the letters that they received at that time. They were not dismissed from their roles as first responders and fire fighters with the Torrington Fire Department.

One of the concerns raised was the apparent inability of the Torrington fire service to speak to Council. Ratepayers of Kneehill County can address Kneehill County Council on matters of importance to them,

however, they must follow the appropriate protocols which include a request to come to Council as a delegation and having previously been recognized and scheduled as a delegation. The appearance of any ratepayer unannounced and without appropriate notice would not receive the recognition of Council. There was never a request to speak to Council as a delegation, and as there is a clearly defined chain of command within the Kneehill County fire service. These fire service members had ample opportunity to address these concerns and choose not to follow that route.

County Peace Officers

County Peace Officers and their responsibilities are a policy decision of Council. The hiring of an additional County Peace Officer was a Council policy decision with a very specific goal in mind – presence and visibility. Council’s expectation is that the additional officer would provide a higher level of visibility and presence of policing on County gravel roads. The officer’s job is to be visible and to report any suspicious activity that is noted.

Kneehill County Peace Officers are focussed more on education than enforcement, however, when necessary and there is clear violation of provincial or other laws, they are expected to take appropriate action.

The idea of hiring an enhanced RCMP officer for Kneehill County has been discussed by Council. An enhanced RCMP Officer would not accomplish the Council’s objective of increased visibility and presence of policing on county gravel roads.

The idea of an enhanced RCMP Officer has never been totally dismissed by Kneehill County Council and there has been discussion with other interested municipal Councils to encourage them to develop a proposal of how the enhanced RCMP Officer would be funded and function within Kneehill County. To date no proposal for enhanced RCMP policing has been received by Kneehill County Council for our consideration.

Regional Resource Urban Sustainability Grant

Regional Resource Urban Sustainability Grant funding was originally a policy decision of the previous County Council. The funding was implemented in 2015 and was designed to assist our urban neighbours during a time when the County was experiencing a resource based funding surplus. The removal of the grant funding in 2018 was a Council policy decision in recognition of the decline in future resource revenues to be received by Kneehill County and the need to find ways to reduce County expenditures.

Kneehill County’s revenues from oil and gas are under constant attack and are declining, as is also being experienced by any farm or ranch that has oil and gas surface leases. Those leases are either being renegotiated, payments are arbitrarily reduced, or ignored by the oil companies and the requirement for maintenance and upkeep of their surface leases is not being fulfilled as originally agreed to.

The short term notice of the loss of the Urban Sustainability Grant funding for the urban municipalities is perhaps regrettable, however at no time was the Urban Sustainability Grant funding ever promised or guaranteed to any municipality and the continuation of the funding was always at the discretion of Kneehill County Council.

The towns and villages within Kneehill County are responsible to manage their own expenses and revenues just as is the County. The responsibility to control spending, and generate revenue within another municipality is outside of the decision making of Kneehill County Council, however our budget, revenues and expenditures are our responsibility and we are expected to manage within our means.

Kneehill County has been and continues to be a good neighbour to our urban municipalities, and outside of fire service costs, currently are providing hundreds of thousands of dollars to those municipalities each year, to this point for 2018 the dollars directed to the towns and villages for shared services and other projects totals \$773,504.00 (including the \$250,000 recreation funding). Kneehill County has made clear to our urban neighbours our willingness to continue to partner with them, however funding is now more directed, on a project by project basis, with Council being more involved in the decision process.

Funding proposals are now project by project, with no obligation to County, respectfully submitted for Council's consideration. Recent examples are the flood relief for Carbon and Linden's infrastructure funding provided in 2018, and we remain committed to being a good neighbour. Kneehill County has not withdrawn from helping our urban neighbours, we are just more targeted in our response and aware of our own declining revenues.

Another example of Kneehill County's commitment to our urban municipalities was the reinstatement of recreation funding of \$250,000, as a good faith gesture toward our urban municipalities. Throughout the history of the recreation funding program it has always been the urban municipalities responsibility to decide on how the funding should be distributed. They have the freedom to choose and County Council does not dictate how the money is to be divided.

Carbon Disaster Relief

Disaster relief for Carbon was not an obligation of Kneehill County, but was a neighbourly response to a community in need. The Village of Carbon requested help in their recovery from the 2018 flooding, the amount of money to be provided was mutually agreed to by Kneehill County and the Village of Carbon and the County provided the help requested.

There is no ulterior motive behind the County's help for Carbon, there is no ICF with Carbon, any suggestion of an ICF being completed with Carbon is completely untrue, there is no incentive or carrot to get Carbon to agree to some future plan, there is no public relations stunt to be revealed, just one neighbour helping another.

(ICF – Intermunicipal Collaborative Framework – a newly required process by the province where neighbouring municipalities agree to a method (framework) by which they jointly share the cost of shared services like recreation, transportation, solid waste, water/waste water and fire services.)

Yes, Kneehill County has applied for Disaster Relief funding from the province to assist in our own flood recovery and the costs of repairs and maintenance required as a result of that flooding. None of the money applied for by Kneehill County will be used for any purpose other than to address our own flood damages. Our application has nothing to do with Carbon or any assistance the County may have provided to Carbon.

If it is inappropriate for Kneehill County to assist the Village of Carbon in a time of need, then it logically should be inappropriate for Kneehill County to help any of the other urban municipalities within our boundaries.

Ron Gorr Memorial Arena in Torrington

The Ron Gorr Memorial Arena is a County owned facility that is in need of upgrades and maintenance within the Hamlet of Torrington. It is County policy to maintain and keep our facilities up to date and if necessary to rebuild. The County sets aside funds (reserves) to allow for those repairs and maintenance to be done in a timely manner and thus has the necessary funds to carry out the proposed project.

Would the closure of the Ron Gorr Memorial Arena be the preferred option? Kneehill County Council does not think that would be preferred.

What about the approximately \$130,000 building repair and maintenance project scheduled for the Torrington Fire Hall? Is that an appropriate action of Council? Of course, it is an expected, normal course of business.

What about the yearly cost of maintenance of the Trochu Fire Hall? Should the County not maintain another County owned facility in an urban municipality for fear of offending? After all, Trochu Fire Hall is a County owned facility in an urban municipality.

These are the normal costs of doing business and of owning facilities and buildings, and Kneehill County Council and Administration remain committed to preserving and maintaining our facilities, to extending and enhancing their lifetime and usefulness.

Acme Sewage Lagoon and the Soleterra d'Italia Ltd. (Soleterra) development within Kneehill County

Soleterra had originally intended to build within the Village of Acme, however due to unforeseen difficulties, Soleterra eventually decided to locate just outside of Acme within Kneehill County.

Kneehill County at no time competed with the Village of Acme for the Soleterra development. Soleterra and the Village of Acme spent several months trying to work out the development issues that they had, and in the end Soleterra made the decision to locate within the County.

Discussions between the Village of Acme and Soleterra, the Village of Acme and Kneehill County have been unable to resolve the issues surrounding Soleterra's desire to access the Village's sewage lagoon. And the Village of Acme has proven to be unwilling to resolve outstanding issues with Soleterra or with Kneehill County and as a result Soleterra is considering the other options available to them to deal with their effluent. Within the Soleterra development application there has always been an alternative plan for effluent management if a positive plan could not be negotiated with the Village of Acme.

Any suggestion of inappropriate behavior, providing of favors or other impropriety is completely untrue.

Kneehill County would rather have developments like Soleterra within our region, and the benefits that result for businesses and residents. If Soleterra after being unsuccessful in their negotiations with Acme had moved to locate within a different part of Alberta, there would have been no benefit to anyone. As it now stands the potential for significant spinoffs for businesses and residents within Acme and Kneehill County still exists.

There are no questions to be answered about due diligence with Soleterra. Kneehill County's planning staff have followed all the required and appropriate steps in the land use redesignation, subdivision and development application processes. The appropriate parties were notified and given an opportunity to provide input just as they are in all other similar requests.

In the Soleterra application process, the minutes of the public hearing (October 11, 2016), the documents to show who was notified, who came and spoke to the public hearings, and Municipal Planning Commission meetings are available and a matter of record.

Kneehill County Council is proud of the quality of the work our Planning Department does to assist, encourage and facilitate developments within the County. Kneehill County's Planning Department is second to none, our staff perform their duties consistently, with diligence and integrity. There are no short cuts, side deals or underhandedness.

The development approval process, land re-designation and land use documents outline the processes that must be followed in every case, with specific requirements to be met depending on what development is being proposed. Those requirements are met and followed for each application received, all appropriate timelines, notifications and public meeting expectations are followed. The public and affected parties are always notified and given opportunity to provide comment or input to the County's Planning Department and the Municipal Planning Commission.

There are NO SECRET meetings and plans, all development proposals follow the required steps. Planning and Municipal Planning Commission decisions are not based on emotion or NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard), but are a legal process that follow Kneehill County Land Use Planning and Development documents, policies and guidelines.

Kneehill County Chief Administrative Officer (CAO)

The contract and salary of the CAO of Kneehill County have never been an issue that is hidden or done under the cover of secrecy and is a matter of public record.

The salary and benefits provided to the Kneehill County CAO are consistent with other rural jurisdiction within the Central Zone of Alberta. A recent (July 2018) salary survey resulted in the following information:

Municipality	Salary	Benefits	Total Compensation
Lacombe County	\$290,359	\$92,079	\$382,438
Red Deer County	\$276,257	\$34,086	\$310,343
Rocky View County	\$244,228	\$40,997	\$285,205
Kneehill County	\$231,007	\$38,969	\$269,975
Stettler County	\$214,538	\$11,421	\$225,959
Starland County	\$209,011	\$30,231	\$239,242
MD of Bighorn			\$223,249 (2016 number)
Mountain View County	\$199,334	\$40,219	\$239,553
Wheatland County	\$177,760	\$34,550	\$212,336

The CAO of Kneehill County is not moonlighting or in violation of any of his day to day obligations with Kneehill County by managing the Aqua 7 Water Commission. The management of the Aqua 7 Water Commission is one of the CAO's duties that has been assigned to him by County Council. Any suggestion or implication that is contrary to this statement is completely untrue. Kneehill County is the managing partner of the Aqua 7 Water Commission and is compensated by the Water Commission for that responsibility.

Kneehill County Administration and Medical Clinic Building was a policy decision made by the previous County Council. At the time of the initiation of the construction process, County Council asked their CAO, if he would consent to take on the oversight/management of the project as the CAO was aware of the objectives and goals that the Council of the day had for the new building being constructed. The County CAO agreed to oversee the building project on behalf of and at the request of County Council. It should be noted that at no time during the construction process were the CAO's other administrative duties and responsibilities neglected nor was his ability to perform the tasks assigned to the CAO impeded.

It was after the successful completion of the new administrative building and medical clinic, which was completed ahead of schedule and significantly under the proposed budget, that Council decided to award the CAO a bonus for his performance and diligence during the building project. It was only at that time, post-construction, that Council had any discussion with the CAO about the possibility of extra compensation, and the approximately \$50,000 bonus was a one-time payment in recognition of a job well done. There never was a project manager contract, never was any contract awarded to the CAO, but there was a request by Council that the CAO consider the project manager/oversight responsibilities, which the CAO agreed to.

CAO authority is granted by County Council and through the Municipal Government Act (MGA) of the Province of Alberta. Under the MGA it is made clear that the CAO is the administrative head of the municipality and as a consequence all policies directed at Administration must have the CAO or designate as the administrative person responsible. County Council is responsible for the direction and goals, policy creation and oversight of Kneehill County. The CAO and through him, his administration is responsible for implementing the direction and policy of Council and as such is directly accountable to Council for the performance of administration required duties.

The CAO job description both of Kneehill County and through the MGA recognize that the CAO is directly responsible to County Council and that it is the CAO who exercises control over the managers, departments and employees overall. It is the CAO's job to direct, guide and manage all aspects of the administration and day to day functions of the County. It is the CAO who assigns management responsibility to his administrative team, and thereby through his managers manages and directs all employees of Kneehill County. It is the CAO who must answer to Council for the performance of all other employees within the organization and for his own performance of the duties assigned to him.

The CAO job description that is utilized by Kneehill County, the duties and responsibilities assigned to the CAO, the control of departments, managers and employees as a whole, the management of administration and operations, are all consistent with the CAO job descriptions throughout 68 other rural municipalities and some 300 plus urban municipalities throughout Alberta, and with Municipal Government Act of Alberta.

Council policies are reviewed on a once in three-years basis and any old policies that have not been reviewed will be brought forward for review by Council and for updating to match up with the current regulations within the MGA. Policy review is routine, it is expected and policies are changed to reflect the current MGA and any other policy changes made by County Council.

The CAO of Kneehill County has the full confidence of each and every Kneehill County Councillor and based on the most recent performance review conducted by Council, the CAO, Mr. Al Hoggan, meets and exceeds all of Kneehill County Council's expectations.

Kneehill County Employees and Working Conditions

The employees of Kneehill County are well paid for their work, have an excellent benefit package paid for by the County, they are encouraged to seek out training opportunities and to grow in their job responsibilities. Kneehill County Council believes that the employees of Kneehill County are performing well above expectation, they are world class in their abilities, well trained, competent individuals who attend to day to day responsibility with imagination, diligence and integrity.

The Kneehill County Human Resource Manual guides employees in the performance of their duties and gives them direction for how they ought to behave within the workplace, it has ample allowance for employees with workplace issues to have those issues resolved. If employees have grievances with the CAO they are encouraged to discuss such issues with the Reeve and any other grievances have resolution methods outlined within the Human Resource policy manual. There are built in safe guards throughout the Human Resource policy to allow employees to come forward without fear of reprisal and County Council would take a very strong stand against abuse levelled at any employee.

As with any organization, Kneehill County Council also recognizes that there are former employees of our organization that may feel that their time with Kneehill County was not a good experience and they may possibly carry a grievance or grudge against the County, such matters are outside of Council's control and without knowledge of the individual and the circumstance of their departure from County employment it is impossible to address the issue that the individual may have.

It is also true that there are former employees of Kneehill County who have been relieved of their duties for legitimate reasons and for failure to fulfil the responsibilities they were assigned. In those circumstances the responsibility for the outcome of their employment lies strictly with those individuals and not with Kneehill County and those issues have absolutely nothing to do with workplace climate or other imagined difficulties.

In Summary

If you truly want to know what is happening, County Council and County staff are prepared to answer the questions raised. If you have a constructive suggestion or criticism, or you just disagree, as long as the conversation is respectful, you will find both Council and staff receptive to your thoughts.

Kneehill County Council and our staff are ready to answer any question or concern that our ratepayers may raise. Kneehill County Council is interested in your thoughts and feedback. Council looks forward to hearing from you.

All engagement does influence, but does not dictate a decisions made.

In closing, the Kneehill County Council takes the responsibilities of office very seriously, and are committed to remain true to the Code of Conduct that each Councillor has signed. Each Kneehill

Councillor has taken this role on because of their passion for Kneehill County. Councillors are working together as a unit to provide direction that will best serve the interests of the municipality as a whole.

Reeve Jerry Wittstock

Deputy Reeve Kenneth King

Councillor Wade Christie

Councillor Jim Hugo

Councillor Glen Kiever

Councillor Faye McGhee

Councillor Debbie Penner