# Off-site Levy Bylaw Review – Community Services Working Group
# Stakeholder Consultation Meeting Notes

**Date/Time:** June 27, 2023 / 11:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

**Location:** MS Teams – video conferencing

**Attendees:**

| Internal | External |
|---|---|
| Rodney Babineau | Marcello Chiacchia |
| Marcus Berzins | Jamie Cooper |
| Radhika Bhalla | Shameer Gaidhar |
| Jennifer Black | Paul Gedye |
| Shannon Cox | Brian Hahn |
| Garrath Douglas | Guy Huntingford |
| Quinn Eastlick | Graeme Melton |
| Nazrul Islam | Jackie Stewart |
| Michael MacDonald | |
| Muhammad Muhammad | |
| Jan-Steyn Pieterse | |
| Laura Urbain* | |
| Erika Van Boxmeer* | |
| **Regrets** | |
| Shelina Daya | Raminder Brar |
| Cody Van Hell | Theo Kaufmann |

* Note taker.

## Agenda

1. **Welcome and agenda overview** (Jennifer Black)
2. **Introductions** (Jennifer Black)
3. **Preliminary levy rate** (Jennifer Black)
4. **Principles** (Jennifer Black)
5. **Methodology** (Jennifer Black)
6. **Levy rate model intro** (Michael MacDonald)
7. **Discussion and next steps** (Jennifer Black)

## Feedback collected:

### General Feedback/Comments

- Year ending Dec. 31, 2022, for emergency response is approx $78M. How is that balance factored in?

- Is there interest on a negative balance? If there are still funds in the pool, why is interest being collected on it?
- What are the rates on the $78M? What about the investment income and the balances?
- Need a reconciliation of the before and after phase. Are you bifurcating the 2022 pools and the 2023 pools? Are there a pre-2023 and post-2023 balances? Can you provide the rationale for the committed but not collected funds (for development agreements signed in the past few years) and the multiplication for those development agreements. What's the reconciliation of this and if that balance doesn't end at zero? What happens with the fund? To the extent that it's surplus, then what? Want to be involved in this conversation as it moves forward.
- Request written clarification on the transition reconciliation - balances on hand and billed but not collected (due to 3-year lag) - understanding that the old and new bylaw will be tracked separately.
- Previous balance, current commitments, committed not collected (there is good forecasting being used, the importance of how that balance is being applied is going to be important for understanding).
- Slide 9 – Capital expenditures, there's a general feeling in industry that the specs for fire halls are higher than what's necessary to provide fire protection. Want to note that if we're building more than it's necessary, we're asking people to pay more than is needed to live/buy a house – regardless of the infrastructure.
    - We have seen the fire halls, whether it's physical structure or building envelope, they're building elaborate buildings (across Alberta). It's important for the people designing/building the structures, as much as the developers pay these costs, we flow them through to the end users. We know you have specific specs to meet your requirements. There are lots of things that are necessary, it's important to value engineer these designs over time. Firefighters have mentioned that they don't use all the features within existing fire halls. It's important that we review this and just build what's needed. There is an exterior cladding being used on the exterior that aren't durable but very expensive.
    - This has come up numerous times over the decade, it's always a question of concern. Ex. of a temporary fire hall that's more utilitarian and less costly is the Waldon Fire Hall. There are some fire halls where it's gone too overboard. It helps with housing affordability in the city, which we're trying to address at every level possible.
    - When off-site levies are reviewed, there are concerns about particular to utilitarian needs of the structure
- Slide 10 - You had a decline in development agreements, you're assuming density increases will get us more efficient with our lands. Have you run a sensitivity test on our land absorption and the rate? Can you run a sensitivity test so we know what the impact will be on our assumptions in the levy rate?
- Slide 14 – Annual update is good. Will all levies for Community Services follow the same model?
- Application of grants – they will have an impact on the rates? How do you propose dealing with them within the model? How will we deal with those on the true ups? In the past, The City has said they'll apply to the City portion. If the grant exceeds The City portion, then the levy paid will be higher than when the grant is applied.

- The model goes to 2055. Is that when all the land within the approved Area Structure Plans will be consumed by? Will the assumed consumption rate be adjusted year-to-year as consumption happens?
- You've assumed a certain benefit percentage. Can you provide the back up for that information? Are there some examples that you can give us to show how it was calculated?
- Do you have details on the leviable land calculations - breakdown of the 9069 Ha - what does that include (res/commercial/industrial?) and where?
    - Previous number was ~11,000Ha, why is the number different now?
    - A breakdown of the type of land and where it is located would be helpful
    - Can you provide more transparency on the land number?
- Benefit – can you explain to us what benefit really means? Our understanding – splitting it between the current and new leviable land, so we only need to collect a portion of it. It's all Greenfield land. Is this correct?

## Summary of Action Items

- Will do a reconciliation between the old and the new bylaw.
- Will run a sensitivity test on our land absorption and the rate.
- Will do a walkthrough of how the benefit percentage was calculated at the next working group session.
- Will do a breakdown of the type of land and where it's located for the 9,069 HA.
- Will send the presentation and models ahead of the next meeting.