



Off-site Levy Bylaw Review – Transportation Working Group Stakeholder Consultation Meeting Notes

Date/Time: Thursday, March 17, 2022 / 2 – 3:30 PM

Location: MS Teams – video conferencing

Attendees:

Internal	External
Brian Arthur	Joel Armitage
Krista Campbell	Bob Faktor
Quinn Eastlick	Brett Friesen
Feisal Lakha	Shameer Gaidhar
Pam McHugh*	Jim Gordon
Patrick McMahon	Brian Hahn
	Guy Huntingford
	Wayne King
	Alex Leliever
	Jackie Stewart

*Note taker

Agenda

- 1. Introductions** (Quinn)
- 2. Consultation expectation** (Quinn)
- 3. Consultation plan and area for input** (Brian)
- 4. New OSL Strategic Approach –what does it mean for transportation?** (Brian)

Feedback collected:

Question 1: Do you understand the impacts of the new strategy on the transportation off-site levy approach?

- Thirty-year forecast in current levy appears relatively close.
- Impacts are not yet understood by the working group because all of the underlying assumptions and details are not yet available about the proposed methodology.
- Confirming that the project eligibility list is the infrastructure that would be built out entirely to develop blue and green areas on a 30-year time horizon? Is it entirely to benefit these lands or 30 years’ worth of growth? Would the project eligibility list change if you were to take out the blue area?
- What is included in the numerator and is that dependent on whatever the denominator ends up being? It is important to fairly determine the benefit so there is not overpaying or underpaying.
- How will other sources of revenue, i.e. specific grants impact the new strategy?



- 30-year timeline seems irrelevant if the goal is proportion benefit. If 30 years' worth of land takes 60 years to develop out, the infrastructure will not increase it will just develop at a slower rate. Recommendation to move toward that type of alignment.
- These are big changes, and it makes sense to explore them in their entirety and request that changes are explored independently of other changes (e.g. numerator in the old world versus the new world and same with the denominator). Hoping that the methodologies will be evaluated separately.
- 30-year horizon is unclear.
- No questions yet about the benefit multiplier that is shown on the slide. Is this on the table for discussion? When will this come up in working group sessions?

Question 2: Is our denominator recommendation clear?

- Land question - what are the denominator values in hectares for green/blue/industrial etc.?
- We cannot fairly comment on the denominator until the working group understands what infrastructure belongs in both scenarios. Can we access current lists to determine what falls within each scenario? What happens when new lands come on and triggers the need for more transportation infrastructure? What numerator would fit in both scenarios of the denominator?
- Regarding the numerator, it is a fundamental change. Appears 100% of greenfield only and 0% established area which is a significant infrastructure change---what does this mean for the total value of numerator compared to the previous methodology?
- Recommendation to stay away from 30 years of land wording. Stick with land and tying it to the infrastructure. We should not exclude blue areas. We can't agree or fully comment until working group sees what infrastructure is required for extension to city boundaries, green, blue.
- Until white paper review happens it is difficult to comment.
- Will the denominator change if all else is equal, or approved as presented, other than reviewing cost estimates in the numerator, would anything change in the next 30 years? Assuming no more ASPs are approved, can we assume that all else would stay the same? Is it safe to assume if an ASP is approved a year from now that the levy would change? Would it constitute a bylaw update? How do we account for future variability in the rate?

General Feedback/Comments

- Will we be receiving the white papers all at once? or as/when they are to be covered?
- What is the projected ETA for each of the white papers?
- Would the estimates and actuals (of project costs) be reconciled every two years?
- How long will working group members be given to review the white papers? Currently, members do not have context around how meaty these pieces of the work area are.
- Is it possible to get a more detailed work plan? Which of the seven projects and infrastructure will be tackled and in what order? What industry feedback are we hoping to tackle and in what timeline?
- What future levy reviews would contemplate? It's a good chance to make this simple to keep updated on an ongoing basis.
- At one point The City was planning to engage a consultant to review cost estimates and assumptions. Is this work completed or where does that stand? It would be helpful to get the recommendation and list of reconciliations based on the two year review.



Summary of Action Items

- City to send first white paper before the end of March 2022