



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

Date/Time: Thursday, September 15 / 1:00 – 2:30 PM

Location: MS Teams – video conferencing and The Water Centre - 625 25 Avenue SE

Attendees:

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

*Note taker

Agenda

- 1. Welcome and Agenda Overview** (Quinn)
- 2. Meeting Norms (Hybrid)** (Quinn)
- 3. Consultation Timeline** (Quinn)
- 4. Recap** (Brian)
- 5. Projects** (Brian)
- 6. Discussion** (Brian)

Feedback collected:

Question #1 - Project Criteria: Is the alignment of projects to growth clear?

- Based on the example methodology, shouldn't the entirety of the interchange costs not be split 50/50? (slide 14).
- The benefit methodology is what will be used to balance the difference between 30 and 60 years. Second major change after the denominator. It feels like we are going to rely on the benefit methodology as a balance. How are we ultimately going to arrive and agree on that appreciating that this isn't infrastructure type by infrastructure type?



- How does this approach correspond to Council-directed principles, specifically transparency? If it is simplified to the point that we cannot justify it with real numbers, it does not feel like it subscribes to the principles.
- Industry provided via BILD specific to each of these slides. When will The City be able to respond to each of those items in writing knowing that we likely won't be able to go through each in this presentation? Having municipal answers might help provide responses (e.g. what projects should be excluded).
- Names and costs have changed (from 2016/18 bylaw) and it is difficult to follow what projects are new.

Question #2 - Future Inclusions: Are projects assigned to future levy bylaws appropriate?

- For projects removed from the bylaw: So these were previously charged in the 2016 bylaw? Seeking clarity here. The explanation provided in this presentation makes sense and adapts to change. It might be here (slide 11) where it is difficult to understand the discretion that has gone into selecting these projects and the associated criteria. Shouldn't there be something more black and white around transportation studies that state 30 or 60-year growth? And this growth will require X amount of infrastructure. It is hard to evaluate without the benefit allocation presented in the same breath. You can probably argue that all these projects surrounding greenfield areas are required, but what benefit is being attributed? For example, Sarcee Trail widening---why does this project fit criteria and others not?
- It will be important to understand that the intent is to apply one benefit factor to all infrastructure projects. This seems like a change to past bylaws. It does look like it equates to benefits beyond the 30-year horizon. Industry likely will expect the benefit factor consider this beyond the 30 years.
- Referring to slide 14, it appears growth is subsidizing most of the cost of the interchange to the benefit of other counties. Why is this not an assumed cost share for this intersection? It seems unfair in a way that growth is paying for an interchange, and I am just focused on this because it is in the presentation, as it seems to outweigh the partial cost that is being presented.

Question #3 - Eligible Projects: Is there a project missing that should be included in the bylaw?

- Are the road widenings new projects that were not in the 2016/18 Bylaw?
- Hard to comment on missing projects without clarity on benefit allocation.

Question #4 - Projects levied for partial costs: Is this approach reasonable?

- Still confusion around a change in methodology so seeking clarity on why the topics are being approached in the order shown by slide 5. We do not know how methodology impacts numbers. Flagging that we are talking about projects when there are other relevant and important topics that should be discussed first so we can get to indicative numbers and rates. Lac of clarity on the benefit side of things.
- In the last meeting in March, land and denominator were discussed. Questions were not answered or agreed to by industry. If there isn't alignment on broader methodology, how can we have a coherent discussion on which projects are attributed to said land and future land? When will questions and potential concerns on the denominator be addressed? Industry does not feel like it has enough information about changing the denominator so when do we have that conversation? Transportation was not proven to be ineffective in the previous bylaw.



- I don't necessarily think the denominator needs to be the same across all streams. I am raising concerns that we may get to the end of this and not have all the information industry feels it needs.

General Feedback/Comments

- Are there any government grants that would be provided for these project and how will those grants be reconciled in the methodology?
- Regarding project certainty aspect probably starts in the billions and if review every two years, we can potentially set a levy that will last the next 60 years. Some of these things about wanting certainty, because you will have pluses and minuses, and it will shake out on the end. I will challenge the notion that we only need a 30-year horizon if we want the project certainty. Essentially, we are still unsure of the need for this change and no previous concerns seem to have been raised that the previous levy was insufficient.
- If the City had come forward with costs changes, project lists, inflation, etc., but that is not what is being proposed. It is the changes that are bringing a higher level of scrutiny. IF the benefit allocation comes out at the end and the rate goes down, we will be surprised. It does not seem like that is the direction this is headed.
- At this stage, industry was hoping to be at a different point focused on land and projects. Benefit areas (approx. 3 billion of infrastructure) is critical to understand the impact on new growth. How are we dealing with benefit? Not all projects have the same benefit. This is a critical part of the OSL principles. In the regulation, the municipality must consider transportation impact assessment and technical studies. Industry liked the old methodology because benefit was clearly defined and explained. With a different timeline and lower number of projects, we should be able to get to accurate numbers and benefiting area. Benefit will have the biggest impact on the equation at the end.
- The message coming across is that changes are being made to methodology and the benefit allocation will be based on judgement rather than an empirical approach. This may not be the intention, but that is what is being received. The other part that intersects with this and considers timing, is Council budget season; whatever you are being charged with to present to Council must be baked or near baked. Can you help us understand the intersection of those two things and when we can see what is being prepared for that business and budget cycle conversation?
- Looking at the formula, has the City calculated based on a benefitting factor inputted based on projects and info being presented here?
- Thank you for the commitment to looking at where we are going here. The other piece to help industry along between engagements, there should be some continuity between what is in the annual report, the google maps and spreadsheet work, series of projects that are in the white papers---all of these things in the context of projects and methodology, what is in and what is out, might help the engagement and seeing where we are going. How is the data taking us from one place to the next? Having this information might help carve the path.

Summary of Action Items

- City to revisit consultation plan and see whether benefit can be moved up in discussions
- City committed to an additional discussion around denominator