



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission
Public Hearings

Calgary

Monday, April 12, 2010
8:56 a.m.

Transcript No. 27-3-1

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission

Judge Ernest J.M. Walter, Chairman

Dr. Keith Archer
Peter Dobbie, QC
Brian Evans, QC
Allyson Jeffs

Office of the Chief Electoral Officer

Chief Electoral Officer	Brian Fjeldheim
Deputy Chief Electoral Officer	Lori McKee-Jeske

Participants

Philip Barg, President, Woodcreek Community Association
Lois Habberfield, Reeve, Rocky View County
Gordon Olsen and Leslie LeQuelenec, Calgary-Elbow Progressive Conservative Constituency Association

Support Staff

Clerk	W.J. David McNeil
Clerk Assistant and Director of House Services	Louise J. Kamuchik
Senior Parliamentary Counsel	Robert H. Reynolds, QC
	Shannon Dean
Administrator	Karen Sawchuk
Communications Consultant	Melanie Friesacher
Consultant	Tom Forgrave
Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>	Liz Sim

8:56 a.m.

Monday, April 12, 2010

[Judge Walter in the chair]

The Chair: Good morning. My name is Ernie Walter, and I'm the chair of the Alberta Electoral Boundaries Commission. I would like to introduce you to the other members of the commission here with me today: on my far right Dr. Keith Archer of Banff, next to him Peter Dobbie of Vegreville, on my immediate left Allyson Jeffs of Edmonton, and next to Allyson, Brian Evans of Calgary.

As you are aware, the five of us have spent the last seven months reviewing the electoral boundaries of our province, and I can tell you that we've examined every square inch of this province. I know I speak for all of us when I say that the commission has found it both interesting and challenging to weigh the concerns and relevant factors put before it in the preparation of the interim report. I would like to note that we are very pleased with the large amount of public feedback that we have received. We have read over 470 submissions and are looking forward to additional feedback during the hearings. Once we have considered this feedback, the commission will issue its final report by July of this year.

I think it's important that I touch on a few of our findings and recommendations setting out the areas, boundaries, and names of the 87 electoral divisions we propose for Alberta together with our reasons for the proposals as outlined in the interim report you have hopefully had an opportunity to read. I can tell you that the foundation of our decisions has been effective representation for all Albertans. In undertaking the commission's work, we have been guided by the requirements of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, relevant decisions of the courts, advice received at the first round of public hearings, and written submissions as well as the latest census information available to us.

When I speak of the census information, I'm speaking of the 2009 municipal census data for Alberta's cities, which shows that there has been a consistent pattern of growth since the 2001 census. Fifty-two per cent of Albertans currently reside in Edmonton and Calgary. Using the official 2009 population list, the total population being considered is 3,556,583. Given this pattern of growth this means the quotient, or provincial average population, has grown by 10,100 since the 1995-1996 commission and is now at 40,880. So, essentially, the act directs the commission to divide the province into 87 electoral divisions with a population within 25 per cent of the provincial average in a way that will ensure effective representation for Albertans.

Taking into account available population information and factors affecting effective representation, the majority of the commission concluded that the redistribution of the 87 divisions should allow for the following increases: Calgary by two additional divisions, bringing it to 25; Edmonton by one, bringing it to 19; and the rest of Alberta by one, providing it with 43 divisions. We believe this should ensure effective representation across the province.

The commission was required by law to divide the existing Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo division. Its population was more than 88 per cent higher than the quotient, and the law prohibits the commission from recommending a division which has a population more than 25 per cent above the quotient.

How did we come to make the recommendations outlined in the interim report? In our efforts to respect the requirement for effective representation as guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the primary principles and factors which have guided the commission's recommendations are:

Population. The commission has attempted to limit the variation in average population per division. The average population per

electoral division from the quotient is from plus 4.3 per cent in Calgary, .7 per cent in Edmonton, and minus 2.8 per cent in the rest of Alberta.

Scarcity of population. The commission recognizes scarcity of population in the two proposed electoral divisions of Dunvegan-Central Peace and Lesser Slave Lake. Dunvegan-Central Peace meets all five criteria for a special division, and Lesser Slave Lake meets four of the five criteria.

Community interests. The commission has taken into consideration community interests of which it is aware.

Community boundaries. The commission has attempted, as requested by the municipalities, to respect community boundaries in Calgary, Edmonton, and other areas.

Municipal boundaries. The commission has made every attempt to respect municipal boundaries. This has not been possible in all cases, but the commission has attempted to reduce the fragmentation of municipal boundaries resulting from the existing divisions.

Geographical features. The commission has considered geographical features, including roads, which provide natural barriers between communities of interest.

Understandable and clear boundaries. The commission has attempted to recommend boundaries which are clear and easy to understand for the residents of the areas. In addition, the commission is using digital mapping technology to describe the boundaries rather than the existing written legal descriptions previously used.

Distance and area. This is primarily an issue in the rest of Alberta. In recommending those boundaries, the commission has considered the area of the proposed electoral divisions and the travel distances involved both within the division and between the division and the Legislature. In addition, MLAs have to maintain relations with more than one school board, more than one municipal council, and several community and business organizations.

Inner-city urban issues. The commission acknowledges the submissions stressing that inner-city urban ridings generally have their own challenges such as a large number of linguistic and cultural communities, a disproportionate number of people dependent on social programs, increasing numbers of new immigrants and aboriginal people, and other urban issues.

Other Calgary and Edmonton issues. The commission also acknowledges that there may be only one council and one school authority. Maintaining relations, however, with a number of community leagues or associations, business revitalization zones, and other identifiable organizations places demands on the time of a city MLA.

9:05

Now that I've briefly reviewed our recommendations, we want to hear your views. We believe that what we hear from you, the people who will be affected by these boundary changes, is critical to recommending a new electoral map that will ensure fair and effective representation for all Albertans. I'll call on our staff to call and announce the first speaker. Each speaker will have 10 minutes to present and then 10 minutes for questions and answers from the commission.

The commission's public meetings are being recorded by *Alberta Hansard*, and the audio recording will be posted to the commission website; transcripts of these proceedings will be available online.

We would ask that you identify yourself for the record prior to starting our first presentation.

Ms Friesacher: The first presenter is Lois Habberfield, reeve of Rocky View county.

**Lois Habberfield, Reeve
Rocky View County**

Ms Habberfield: Good morning. I am Lois Habberfield, reeve of Rocky View county. Thank you for allowing me to present Rocky View county's suggestions on the proposed provincial electoral boundaries. We are currently represented by two MLAs in the constituencies of Airdrie-Chestermere and Foothills-Rocky View. We support the map and letter that have been submitted to you by Richard Marz, MLA for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills, which I have attached. Those will be the three particular ridings that currently exist that I will be referring to.

We understand that the desired population of 41,000 people is exceeded in the current Airdrie-Chestermere constituency. We feel that Airdrie, with its rapid growth and current population of some 38,000 people, warrants being its own constituency. We have recently received an annexation request from Airdrie for a large amount of land – I think it's 11,000 acres – to enable its growth for the next 50 years. It would make sense to us to include the new Airdrie municipal boundary once it has been negotiated and approved by the provincial government as the new Airdrie constituency boundary. That would leave the rural area that surrounds Airdrie to be divided up. We suggest that the rural area of Rocky View county that is currently in the Airdrie-Chestermere constituency be split between two existing ridings; namely, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills and Foothills-Rocky View. The attached map shows the boundaries we would like to see.

Let me outline our thoughts on which land should go where and why. It is of paramount importance to Rocky View county that the Balzac area be represented by the MLA for Foothills-Rocky View, who would have a rural perspective and Rocky View's interests at heart. Rocky View residents would have a large say in the choice of an MLA to protect our interests. On the other hand, if these lands were to remain in the new Airdrie constituency, we would have virtually no say, compared to Airdrie voters, in selecting the MLA. This would be disastrous for us as the east Balzac area is the main source of our nonresidential tax base and has been strategically planned in the Balzac ASP, which was adopted in 2000. We have invested tens of millions of dollars' worth of infrastructure into this key area, and we wish to see it flourish for the economic benefit it will bestow on our county. As part of this, we require a strong voice with the province of Alberta. This is partially accomplished through continued strong rural representation.

As for west Balzac, on the west side of the QE II, it should also be in the rural riding as opposed to being an afterthought in an Airdrie riding because we have a planned growth node there for 30,000 to 40,000 people over the next 50 years. This growth has been outlined in two documents: the Balzac West ASP and our growth management strategy, Rocky View 2060. That growth management strategy was adopted last June. Balzac, both east and west, should be kept intact as one community.

Secondly, we support Chestermere and the southeast part of Rocky View being added to the Foothills-Rocky View riding. We have close ties with Chestermere on fire, recreation, and library services, to name a few. Although their population combined with us and Foothills might be slightly high, the MLA for this riding would have less total communities to deal with than the MLA, say, for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills, so maybe more population but less communities. We would then support Crossfield, Irricana, and Beiseker as well as northeast Rocky View being added to Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills to boost the numbers that are needed there. At one time these areas were part of the former Three Hills-Airdrie

riding. These three communities are all serviced by water commissions that come out of the northern neighbouring jurisdictions.

In summary, Rocky View county does not support the February 2010 report, Proposed Electoral Division Areas, Boundaries, and Names for Alberta, in its current form and hopes you will consider our suggested changes. Thanks for the opportunity to speak to you today.

The Chair: Thank you.

Keith, do you have some questions?

Dr. Archer: Yeah. Thanks, Ms Habberfield. I appreciate those detailed comments. Have you had a chance to do the analysis which would provide us with an indication of the number of people that would be in these ridings if we accepted your proposal?

Ms Habberfield: We looked at it briefly, but I wouldn't want to be quoted as having exact numbers. The total population of Rocky View is about 35,000, 36,000. Foothills: I don't know what their population is. Chestermere, I believe I saw on the sign the other day when I was out there, is 13,000 and growing. Not all of Rocky View would be included in the current Foothills-Rocky View constituency because we'd be carving off a piece that would go then north to Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills. There isn't a huge population there.

We did have a meeting with Mountain View, Crossfield, Irricana, and Richard Marz, the MLA for that area. I think Didsbury and Carstairs were there. We talked about the fact that this would help grow that constituency's numbers up there, but it would add communities to his load or whoever the MLA is there in the future. We felt that if we had a slightly higher population in Foothills-Rocky View, it would be offset by the fact that you'd really only be dealing with, I think, five communities. There would be Chestermere, Foothills, Rocky View, Turner Valley, Black Diamond, and I guess Redwood Meadows, so possibly six, but nothing like the area to the north. Historically, those communities do have some close ties.

Dr. Archer: Right. But you don't have the population data. That's something, I guess, that we'll be able to try to identify and will be an important factor for us, of course, as we look at this proposal.

Ms Habberfield: Yes. There was nobody there at that meeting from Foothills, so I don't have those numbers. But if you took probably 30,000 of Rocky View and 13,000 of Chestermere, you'd be around 43,000. Then we would have whatever is in Foothills and Black Diamond and Turner Valley. It would be, I would suspect, between 40,000 and 50,000.

Dr. Archer: Okay. Fifty thousand would certainly be at the very high end for what would be permitted under the legislation. We couldn't have anything that's more than 25 per cent above the average, which is just over 40,000.

The proposal, as I understand it, then, seems to have a Foothills-Rocky View constituency that's kind of surrounding the city of Calgary for the most part. It looks like it's not entirely surrounding on the south and southeast part of the city but, otherwise, goes around the city. The Balzac area was something that you made a particular point of emphasizing to ensure that there is some continuous connection between the area.

Then the Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills riding: I think in our interim report we had placed Olds outside of this district, and your proposal and the proposal of Mr. Marz is to bring it back into the district. He

makes a point about having postsecondary institutions in a constituency. I wasn't quite sure what he was getting at. Is that something that you'd like to comment on more generally about bringing Olds back into this constituency?

9:15

Ms Habberfield: I don't think it would be my place to comment on their matters up there. If that works for the communities in that area, we have no objection to that, but we don't have a vested interest one way or the other in that recommendation.

Dr. Archer: Right. Thanks very much.

The Chair: Okay. Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Reeve Habberfield. We do appreciate the details that you've provided to us. I'd just, first, like to clarify. I'm looking at paragraph two of your presentation. It says in the last sentence that it would make sense to include the new Airdrie municipal boundary once it is negotiated and approved by the provincial government. That may take some time, so am I to understand that we can anticipate that that will be consented to by your municipal district?

Ms Habberfield: Yes. We are hoping to have an agreed-to annexation. Airdrie has proposed a boundary that we don't object to, but what we are just entering into is the negotiation phase. What we want to do is consult with the residents who live in that proposed boundary. As far as a provincial electoral boundary I don't think it would matter if we used that proposed boundary as the new electoral boundary because that has been agreed to by us as a starting point.

Mr. Dobbie: So you wouldn't be offended if we adopted that as a new recommendation?

Ms Habberfield: No. That would be absolutely fine.

Mr. Dobbie: I can't tell from the map that's attached what range road that would take us over to. I'm wondering if you could tell me.

If we could have a copy of the interim report brought to Reeve Habberfield. On page 93 it shows the Airdrie riding.

Ms Habberfield: Yes. I believe it is secondary highway 791, but I would have to look up the range road.

Mr. Dobbie: It's page 93 of the schedule. In appendix E there is a map for Airdrie.

The Chair: We may be able to bring up a map on the screen here.

Mr. Dobbie: If you could just in words describe the proposal. Does it take the north boundary of Airdrie and run parallel along that boundary heading east?

Ms Habberfield: Well, the current boundary is going to be expanded. We are agreeing that Airdrie will grow west, north, and east but not south. That's our starting point, and that was because of our economic development node in the Balzac area. We worked long and hard to get Airdrie to agree to allow us our growth in that corridor, and they would grow in the other three directions, which is reflected in our growth management strategy. I didn't bring that proposed boundary with me, but I could send it to you if you would like. It goes, I believe, not all the way to township road 274; it's a

quarter section south of there. So it's between township roads. It would be between 272 and 274. Halfway in between is where they're starting. So that would be the northern boundary.

Mr. Dobbie: And how far east?

Ms Habberfield: Well, looking at the map that Richard Marz has drawn on there, as I said, I believe it is – I have an expansion here. This may help. It looks like it's secondary highway 791, which is a little bit larger than the growth area that they're looking to take in, but it seemed like a natural boundary. It's where the utility corridor comes through.

Mr. Dobbie: All right. Because it looks like there might be a correction line on 791 – and maybe that's what's throwing me off – on the attachment.

Ms Habberfield: Yes. And then the southern boundary of Airdrie as it extends east is township road 270. That one I know. It's the Yankee Valley Road.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you. Again, it would be of assistance if you could provide us with as much detail as possible, and if you could get it directly to the commission site, then we'll be able to address this.

Ms Habberfield: Okay. Yeah.

Mr. Dobbie: You also said that you have had consultations with the municipalities that are affected by your proposal.

Ms Habberfield: We haven't had direct meetings with Chestermere or Airdrie, but it is our understanding that Chestermere does not want to become part of a Calgary riding and that they want to stay with one of the outlying areas. They seem to be the population number that tips the balance. Airdrie by itself is good; Airdrie with Chestermere is too big. Chestermere isn't big enough to be its own, so wherever you put them tips the numbers. We're trying to be supportive of what works and has been proposed by several MLAs. I believe the whole area has had a look at this, and we are trying to come up with some common ground so that it makes it easier for you to look at a readjustment of these boundaries. You have one job to do, but we have another job to do: to effectively represent where we think our constituents would be best represented in the future.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you. I don't believe we had the proposed annexation information before us before our last report, so this is very helpful. The fact that it's being done essentially by consent helps us as well.

Thank you. Those are my questions.

Ms Habberfield: I should, if you don't mind, add that you may be aware that Rocky View has a lot of municipal neighbours, 15 to name them all. Some are rural. We face continual pressure from the urban centres for annexation. This Balzac area is strategically located between Airdrie and on the boundary of Calgary, so it take a lot of negotiating and planning to protect that development node for us. It was chosen because of the airport, highway 2 corridor.

It is not able to have residential development because of the sour gas in the area and the airport, so it was identified 10 years ago as being a nonresidential growth area. That's why we put our efforts there. It has the CrossIron mall and many additional acres of business parks that we are currently developing. We have a sewer line there. It's the only place in Rocky View county that we have

servicing of that nature. It goes from Balzac to Langdon. We are able to provide servicing there, and we would hate to see our voice lost to protect that key area.

I mean, the rest can be adjusted as you need to do, but we felt that that was something we wanted to protect.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you. If it's any reassurance to you, I find it very difficult to drive by the big sports store without dropping in and leaving some money, so so far it's working for me.

Ms Habberfield: Thank you.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Yes. Thank you very much for coming this morning. I just have a couple of questions with respect to the identified communities that you're supportive of going into the Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills. I'm looking particularly at, I think, Crossfield, Irricana, and Beiseker. I'm at the second-to-last paragraph of your submission.

Ms Habberfield: Yes.

Ms Jeffs: I'm wondering. The proposal that the commission has put forward for the new constituency of Carstairs-Rocky View would have those as sort of the anchor population in that area. The thinking was, I think, that there were certain communities of interest there. Can you explain to me why you would be more supportive of seeing that added to Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills rather than the creation of a district there?

Ms Habberfield: Certainly. Both Carstairs and Didsbury are in the geographic area of Mountain View county, so they have a lot of intermunicipal relations with Mountain View county whereas Crossfield, Irricana, and Beiseker are within our geographic boundary. We have ongoing meetings with them on a regular basis, but we don't with Carstairs and Didsbury. For example, Crossfield and now Irricana are members of the Calgary Regional Partnership, and we were a member until we withdrew, unfortunately, last September due to other issues.

We feel that we have common interests, that we are coming up with a plan that works for the Calgary region. They are going to be in this Red Deer River basin plan as opposed to the Bow River basin plan or the South Saskatchewan plan. A lot of the provincial plans that are coming down lump us together with the communities that are within our boundaries, and the others are going to do their watershed planning and their regional plan with Red Deer, Olds, Didsbury. That is their natural area. They're in the Red Deer River sub-basin.

Historically that's where their schools are. Crossfield, Beiseker, Irricana are part of the Rocky View school division, which is where all our rural kids go to school, so there is a connectivity with the school kids. Of course, then the parents are all connected to those three communities. There are schools that we attend in Crossfield and Beiseker, and Irricana students attend either at Kathryn or Beiseker. None of our students go to Carstairs or Didsbury.

9:25

Ms Jeffs: Okay. So it's primarily for local regional planning. You're concerned about representation of local and regional planning issues and water issues at the provincial level and how that will be split?

Ms Habberfield: Yes. It would then involve two MLAs that would have to be on top of all the intermunicipal relationships and all the regional planning that's been done. Our growth management report does support the Calgary metropolitan plan. We just disagreed on issues like density and the voting structure, but we support the plan, and Carstairs and Didsbury are not in that plan.

Ms Jeffs: All right. Thank you.

The Chair: Brian, do you have any questions?

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and thank you very much, Reeve Habberfield, for your presentation. My colleagues have asked most of my questions, but I didn't hear you say anything about any discussions you'd had with the MLA for Foothills-Rocky View about the proposed configuration, which really is a horseshoe around Calgary, at least in terms of getting through Calgary to access, say, Chestermere from Black Diamond. If there was a meeting in both places, I guess you'd have to go on some of the secondary roads in the south of Calgary. It wouldn't be too efficient to try to go through Calgary. Notwithstanding that, has this configuration from MLA Marz been reviewed by MLA Morton, and there's a consensus on that as well?

Ms Habberfield: Yes. They did meet, and at the meeting I was at, at Mountain View county, Minister Morton was unable to be there as he was away in the United States taking his mother back to wherever she lives, I believe. Richard Marz did say that he and Ted had sat down together and come up with this solution. I met with Minister Morton last Thursday morning out at his constituency office in Springbank and explained to him that this is what we were submitting. He said that he was comfortable with that, with having Chestermere added to his area. With the new ring road, Stoney Trail, it's very convenient for him to get from the west side to Chestermere. Then also from Black Diamond or Turner Valley he could do the 22X and up. Well, not currently, but when that gets built.

Mr. Evans: When it's done, yeah. Okay. Thanks very much.

As Peter Dobbie has mentioned, congratulations on that development around Balzac. It's great for Rocky View and great for this part of Alberta.

Ms Habberfield: Thank you.

Mr. Evans: Thank you.

The Chair: It is an incredible shopping centre also.

Ms Habberfield: Well, we try and let people know that it's not just a mall. We have a huge business area that is growing around it that we are, you know, trying to support and develop so that we can diversify our tax base, which is 80 per cent residential and only 20 per cent nonresidential taxes. I don't know if you're aware, but the Nexen gas plant at Balzac has announced it's shutting down next year. It's, I believe, \$500,000 of municipal tax we are going to lose, so it's even more important that we develop this area around there.

The Chair: Any further questions for Madam Reeve?

There being no further questions, thank you so much. That was a very informative submission. We really appreciate it, and we'll certainly give it a lot of consideration.

Ms Habberfield: Thank you. I will send off the proposed Airdrie annexation boundaries to you with the details of these roads.

The Chair: Thank you.

All right. We don't have anyone presenting until 10 a.m. I think we can take a short adjournment, and we'll reconvene at 10.

[The hearing adjourned from 9:30 a.m. to 9:43 a.m.]

The Chair: Good morning. I see we have Mr. Olsen and Mr. LeQuelenec from the Calgary-Elbow PC association. Our program is 10 minutes for the presentation and 10 minutes for questions. If it happens to go longer, well, we don't have a big agenda this morning, so that's fine.

Mr. Olsen or Mr. LeQuelenec, go ahead.

Gordon Olsen and Leslie LeQuelenec, Calgary-Elbow Progressive Conservative Constituency Association

Mr. Olsen: Thank you, sir. I don't think we'll use the entire time. I do want to thank you again for the opportunity to meet and to be here to present to the commission once more. I'm joined by Les, as you mentioned, sir, who is the president of the Calgary-Elbow Progressive Conservative Constituency Association. We have a couple of points that we would like to make on the proposed boundaries for the Calgary-Elbow constituency and then offer some specific suggestions on a revised boundary.

While not wanting to repeat the presentation I made in September, I do want to revisit a couple of the themes that we tried to develop. First, we knew that in order for a new electoral map to reflect growth and change in Alberta and in Calgary specifically, our constituency would have to take on additional population. Second, because of the nature of the communities within the constituency, communities which are older and more established, really, city centre communities, an important challenge for the commission would be to preserve the existing community of interest.

Also, in my presentation I made three recommendations on how additional population could be added to Calgary-Elbow. The interim report took account of two of those recommendations, but one of the consequences was that the Elbow River became our eastern boundary, thus severing communities that were formerly and historically part of the Calgary-Elbow family. This led to numerous representations being made directly to our MLA, the hon. Alison Redford, as well as to Leslie and myself from some community association presidents, members of our board and executive, of course, as well as other concerned citizens.

Mr. LeQuelenec: Just to follow up from what Gord was saying, some in the community have chosen to contact the commission directly, and we encouraged them to do so. We share many of the concerns that they have expressed, and we'd like to spend a few moments speaking to how communities on both sides of the Elbow River have developed long-standing common interests.

I'm just going to take you through a number of examples. If we look at the communities of Riverdale, Britannia, Elboya, Windsor Park, Meadowlark Park, Mayfair, and Bel-Aire, they all possess a unique connection to each other and to the neighbouring communities on the other side of the Elbow River. They share many parks and recreational facilities with other communities. Riverdale is considered part of the Elbow Park community, and then Riverdale is connected to Britannia through the shared use of the Sandy Beach-Elbow River park area. This also connects the communities of Elboya, Mayfair, and Bel-Aire.

School boundaries are another area of interest. They demonstrate a connection between the communities on the north side of the Elbow River and on the south. L'école Elboya serves as a late immersion school for many communities, including Elbow Park and Rideau-Roxboro, and this school holds significant connections to surrounding communities on the south side of the Elbow River.

Sports is another area that we looked at. Community sports teams are an indicator of the cohesiveness of the Calgary-Elbow constituency. The Calgary Villains soccer association, which merged with the Elbow Valley Soccer Association, utilizes the Parkhill community association as a practice field and home pitch, and the club receives many players from the communities of Riverdale, Elbow Park, Parkhill, and Rideau-Roxboro as well as Elboya, Britannia, and Windsor Park. The Calgary Canucks Rugby Club has its main clubhouse at the Elboya community association, but again the club pulls heavily from communities on the north and south sides of the Elbow River. And the Glenlake hockey association draws players from across all communities within Calgary-Elbow: Britannia, Elboya, Windsor Park, Meadowlark Park, Mayfair, Bel-Aire, Chinook Park, and down to Kelvin Grove and Eagle Ridge.

These are a few of the examples of communities on both sides of the Elbow River which share common interests. As we pointed out in our September submission, these communities share in sports and recreation, travel the same transportation corridors, enjoy the River park areas, and shop in the same commercial and shopping establishments. Our view is that the Elbow River as a dividing line, given these communities of interest, is not, probably, the best choice at this time.

Mr. Olsen: When we examined the interim report and looked at the proposed boundaries for our constituency, our first inclination was to try to consolidate the new areas that were added by the commission with the existing Calgary-Elbow constituency. Unfortunately, even our rudimentary mathematic skills revealed that we would in fact be breaking the law as the population would have been well beyond the 25 per cent threshold. We then noted from the commission mandate that, whenever possible, the commission would be guided by geographic features, including existing road systems. With this in mind, we went to work.

I would like to now provide our recommendation for a new Calgary-Elbow constituency boundary. The proposed new boundary would include the new areas added by the commission in the interim report, with the exception of a small area up in the northeast corner. The eastern boundary would become Macleod Trail to Glenmore Trail. Then the southern boundary would follow along Glenmore Trail westward to Sarcee Trail and Richmond Road, which is currently part of Sarcee Trail on the west and Richmond Road on the north. In effect, communities south of Glenmore Trail would become part of the Calgary-Glenmore constituency, and everything north would be the Calgary-Elbow constituency.

These proposed boundaries would give Calgary-Elbow a population of approximately 42,900 and would be 5.4 per cent over the provincial average. Calgary-Glenmore would have a population of approximately – these are approximate numbers – 41,100 and would be .9 per cent over the provincial quotient. There would be a small increase in Calgary-Buffalo to 41,900, which would be around 2.8 per cent over the provincial average. The proposed constituency of Calgary-Acadia would realize a small increase in population to around 42,200, or 3.5 per cent over the provincial quotient. I've attached a legal description of these boundary revisions, so the commission will have them available.

9:50

Mr. LeQuelenec: Again, Calgary-Elbow and the communities that make up Calgary-Elbow have a long history. In some cases that history goes back almost a hundred years, to when the city expanded across the Elbow River and new communities such as Parkhill, Riverdale, and Elbow Park were established. We asked the commission to preserve these long-standing communities of interest as you develop your final report.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to meet with you today.

The Chair: Thank you.

Brian, do you have some questions?

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Chairman, and thanks, gentlemen, for a very clear presentation.

I'm just looking at a presentation that we received from the Calgary-Glenmore PC Association from Troy Parker, president. I'll just read you a comment in here.

We would agree to this proposal,

which is the Calgary-Elbow proposal, as they understand it, as long as the Glenmore Reservoir remained the North West border between Calgary Glenmore and Calgary Elbow, leaving the Lakeview Community in Calgary Elbow, as their community would be better served joined with neighbouring communities.

Now, I take it from your presentation that you're saying that everything south of the Glenmore Trail, which would include Lakeview, as I understand it, should be part of Calgary-Glenmore, so there's a disagreement there. Have you had any discussion further to the presentation that was received by the commission from the Calgary-Glenmore PC association to try to reconcile that difference of opinion?

Mr. LeQuelenec: I spoke with Troy and told him what we were considering in this presentation. At that time the discussion was that he said he would take it under consideration. I wasn't aware that he had actually made a submission, so this is the first time I've had the opportunity to react to this.

Mr. Olsen: I can tell you, sir, that it is not our desire to exclude any part of what is currently Calgary-Elbow. We simply started to look at the numbers. Knowing that the commission's requirement, or at least what had been done with the map, was to have – well, I guess in some instances there is a variance of up to 9 per cent, I think, within Calgary. I might be wrong in that. But we tried to keep it around what was in the interim report in terms of a small increase over the provincial quotient.

Mr. Evans: Well, thanks for that, both of you gentlemen.

Just looking at the information that we have, it looks like the population of Lakeview is about 5,500 people. Does that ring true with your information? I appreciate that Glenmore Trail is a pretty big roadway and would create some natural separations, I guess, between north and south, but then you have the reservoir itself that creates a separation between that and Glenmore. Any comments on that just in terms of relative association with or disassociation from either constituency, recognizing, as you said, Mr. Olsen, that you tried to be as close as possible to the quotient that we've identified, given the provincial statistics?

Mr. Olsen: Well, I think from my experience around the reservoir that there are some issues probably more relative to the recreational use, environmental, perhaps even community safety of that entire park system around the reservoir. There are issues always that one

has to take into account when there is this reservoir and park areas and recreational areas that are around it. I would think that the north Glenmore area has the same types of challenges as the south Glenmore recreational areas and park areas. That would be something that comes to mind in terms of a commonality.

Mr. Evans: Well, then, I'll just have one other question. Again, it would deal with population. Have you had any discussions or given any consideration to a reduction at the north end of Calgary-Elbow, recognizing, for example, that this commission has increased the north extent of the constituency through its middle? Have you had any discussions about, maybe, moving that back down to a more southerly direction to deal with the population change and to perhaps allow, then, Lakeview to come back in and not have a great difference between the quotient and the population of Calgary-Elbow?

Mr. Olsen: Again, sir, we were mindful that whenever you erase a line and draw it somewhere, there's an implication for another constituency. Then, as I mentioned, we were guided by main thoroughfares as possible boundaries that the commission would consider. That is why Macleod Trail and Glenmore Trail made sense without starting to get into redrawing some of the lines up in that northern area. It sort of moves up and across and down a little bit. As it was, there was, from our perspective, no obvious demarcation as there was Glenmore Trail and Macleod Trail.

Mr. Evans: Just a general comment. I certainly see the merit in the presentation that you've made about moving Calgary-Elbow over toward Macleod Trail with the communities in that area that you've identified that historically have been Calgary-Elbow. Really, my only issue is that Lakeview issue, and it's because the adjacent constituency association has indicated some concerns about that. So I'd encourage you to spend some more time with that. We can always hear further presentations that might find a way to deal more effectively with that difference of opinion that we have pretty obvious to us right now.

Thank you very much again.

Mr. Olsen: Okay. Thank you for your time.

The Chair: Thank you.

Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Yes. Thanks very much for coming this morning. I'm just going to ask – I know we've had a number of presentations in this area, but have you had direct contact with the communities that you've identified as wanting to bring back into the Calgary-Elbow fold, if I can put it that way, across the river? Like, are those community associations supportive of this proposal at this point? Have they been canvassed about where they would like to be?

Mr. LeQuelenec: We've had some discussions with the community associations that have been favourable. I don't have a detailed list of all of the names and contacts that we've talked to.

Ms Jeffs: I meant: with the communities that you're recommending bringing in – Riverdale, Britannia, Elboya – can you tell us which ones of those are supportive, which ones might be on the fence?

Mr. LeQuelenec: No, I don't have a list right now, but I could get that for you.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. That might be helpful. I think some of them have made other presentations, but it would be helpful to know.

Also, could you please specify the neighbourhoods that we had added in that northeast corner that you're looking at giving back to create that population balance?

Mr. Olsen: Yeah. It was purely a numbers issue, from our perspective. If my memory serves me right, it was the Erlton area. There were two polls, and it was the Erlton community. We thought: well, if we're going to make the representations to the effect that communities ought to stay together, then we would have to include both of those areas, both of those polls, which make up the Erlton community. I think it's Erlton.

Ms Jeffs: So it's really just the Erlton community.

Mr. Olsen: Yeah.

Ms Jeffs: Have you had any discussion with them one way or another about this? Okay.

Mr. Olsen: Well, you'll appreciate that if you – well, I know you'd appreciate this. It's not easy to start to talk to people about: well, you know, we're thinking of doing this and that. I mean, we took a look at what our existing boundaries were, what historically our map looked like, how we've work together with these communities, where perhaps some of the more active people are in community associations, you know, that interact. Some you don't hear from at all, and others are more interactive, if you will. I mean, we didn't have the time – again, it's a volunteer endeavour – to start to contact all these community associations and/or other groups that might be affected. That would have been a fairly lengthy process.

Ms Jeffs: Well, I appreciate that.

That Erlton portion that we had added into the riding is not historically part of the old Calgary-Elbow.

10:00

Mr. Olsen: Oh, I think Erlton had been part of the constituency.

Ms Jeffs: All right. Forgive me. It's been too long since I lived in Calgary.

Mr. Olsen: Well, you've got a lot of constituencies that you're dealing with, so I don't expect you to know specifics in respect to communities in one constituency.

Ms Jeffs: All right. Thank you. Those are my questions.

The Chair: Thank you.

Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thanks, gentlemen. The position, as I understand it, is that if something has to trump in our decision, it should be the major arterial roadways that we would use as a dividing line as opposed to the Elbow River and that your presentation primarily relies upon that.

Mr. Olsen: Yes.

Mr. Dobbie: Was the area southeast of the Elbow River traditionally part of the Elbow constituency? We've taken it out, and you want it added back. Do you know how many years it was part of the constituency?

Mr. Olsen: Sir, I'm guessing, but I think it was added in '71, when the hon. Dave Russell first became the MLA for the area. I spoke to David briefly. My recollection is not clear, but it was quite some time ago.

Mr. Dobbie: Is the entire proposed Calgary-Elbow constituency provincially as you propose it within one ward in Calgary? Do you know?

Mr. LeQuelenec: Within the aldermanic ward?

Mr. Dobbie: Yes.

Mr. LeQuelenec: No. I think there were some changes last year that split part of the eastern side of Calgary-Elbow into one of the newer easterly wards, 9 and 11, but I'd have to look at a map to confirm those details.

Mr. Dobbie: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. LeQuelenec: There were changes last year, I think.

The Chair: Keith.

Dr. Archer: Yeah. Thanks, gentlemen, for the presentation. This is one of those areas that once we start tinkering with one boundary, it's going to have some ripple effect, I think, throughout a number of ridings. I'd just like to walk you through a few of those and get your comments on those.

Just looking at the constituency map, there's an area that at the moment is part of Calgary-Glenmore. It's the area that's between Macleod Trail and Blackfoot Trail north of Glenmore Trail. If we brought that boundary down through Macleod Trail to Glenmore, that part becomes cut off from Calgary-Glenmore, becomes a bit of an orphan in the current configuration. Now, there's not a lot of population in there. It's largely commercial and industrial. I'm wondering what your recommendation to us would be for the location of that population in one of the constituencies. It would seem to me that one of the obvious options would be the Calgary-Acadia riding. That would now be the northern border of Calgary-Acadia if we went that route. But, again, I'd like to just pose that to you.

Mr. Olsen: Yes. That's right. When we looked at it – and this is from memory – I believe the area has around 225 people. We spoke to some people in the proposed Calgary-Acadia constituency. We said that this would shift to Calgary-Acadia, and there wasn't a problem with that. I think the former Calgary-Egmont constituency includes most of that area currently.

Frankly, sir, on that point we don't understand the thinking behind the Calgary-Glenmore constituency that goes from Anderson Road to the Stampede grounds and then over to Blackfoot Trail. You know, part of that area went back to Egmont or Acadia as is proposed now.

Dr. Archer: Right. Thanks.

My second question. My recollection of the boundaries at the moment is that the northeastern boundary of Calgary-Elbow is 17th Avenue as opposed to Cameron Avenue and then coming down to the Bow River.

Mr. Olsen: The current boundary?

Dr. Archer: I think the current northern boundary of Calgary-Elbow.

Mr. Olsen: It goes Richmond Road to 34th, then it falls down Macleod Trail to 50th, and then it goes back up to – I don't know – somewhere around 14th Street, and then it goes down Sifton Boulevard. It doesn't go to 17th.

Dr. Archer: It doesn't go to 17th at the moment.

Mr. Olsen: That area is currently in the Calgary-Currie constituency; 17th is included in Calgary-Currie.

Dr. Archer: Right. Well, I guess a question I would have for you is that just looking at that map, there's a little bit of a jog that comes down south of 17th Avenue, sort of the 4th Street commercial district. If we're starting to move some of the boundaries around in this area, I wonder if it makes sense to look at the northeastern boundary at the northern part of the constituency being 17th Avenue as opposed to excluding that small part of the population, which in our proposal is part of Calgary-Buffalo. That would have the potential, I guess, of looking at other ways of changing the configuration of Calgary-Buffalo. Do you have any reaction to that? It's a relatively small population, I suspect, that we're talking about, and it's all around the Western Canada high school area.

Mr. Olsen: Okay. Certainly, the commission, in their wisdom, could make those kinds of determinations. What we were trying to do was to take back, if you will, as much of what currently is Calgary-Elbow as we could. So rather than looking at new areas up in the north, we were looking to recapture some of the areas that the interim report excluded.

Dr. Archer: Right. That would be your higher priority.

Mr. Olsen: Yes.

Dr. Archer: Great. Thank you.

The Chair: Any further questions?

All right. Thank you both. That was most informative. There are a few things you were going to get for us. We would appreciate getting those at your earliest convenience.

Mr. Olsen: Thank you, sir.

The Chair: Now, we don't have another presenter until 11:40, so we'll take a short adjournment here, and we'll reconvene at that time.

[The hearing adjourned from 10:08 a.m. to 11:21 a.m.]

Ms Friesacher: Our next presenter is Mr. Philip Barg.

The Chair: Mr. Barg, thank you for coming. We'd like to hear what you have to say.

**Philip Barg, President
Woodcreek Community Association**

Mr. Barg: Well, I guess the main issue that I wanted to raise was the issue of the Calgary Woodcreek community, which was an amalgamation of the Woodlands and Woodbine communities back in about 1990 or so. With the proposed boundaries that were in the

report, the community was split between Woodlands and Woodbine. Woodlands was contained within Calgary-Fish Creek, and Woodbine was in Calgary-Lougheed.

The Chair: Could we pull that up on the screen?

Ms McKee-Jeske: Which proposed electoral division is that in now?

Mr. Barg: Calgary-Lougheed.

So if you look at the map of Calgary-Lougheed, just beside the key in the top right corner, outside of the proposed boundary is Woodlands. So it's on the east side of 24th Street. Right now we are in Calgary-Lougheed, and that works quite well because we have one MLA to work with. We've heard from other communities where they have been split, and we believe that it's easier to work with the province with one MLA for the community. I guess that's the primary issue that I want to address.

The Chair: Have you a suggestion as to how the boundaries might be changed?

Mr. Barg: The suggested boundary that we'd had was just to move the Calgary-Lougheed boundary to include the rest of the Woodlands part of the community. To the east of that, farther, is the Canyon Meadows golf course, so there is an actual physical boundary between that area and Canyon Meadows, which is part of Calgary-Fish Creek. I think that's 3,000 or so residences within Woodlands that would be added to Calgary-Lougheed. I guess I'm more concerned with having the community together than that specific boundary arrangement.

The Chair: Keith, do you have some questions?

Dr. Archer: Sure. Thanks. And thanks, Mr. Barg, for that proposal. I think we had seen that in writing as well prior to the meeting here today.

Mr. Barg: Yes, that's correct.

Dr. Archer: At the time that we were drafting the interim report, our goal was to try to ensure that the constituencies that were likely to see the greatest growth over the next five to seven or eight years would have, to the extent possible, you know, relatively lower populations. With the constituencies that were less likely to grow, we felt that there was a little bit of room to provide slightly larger populations. That's exactly what took place in these two ridings. Calgary-Lougheed in the interim report was about 5 per cent below the provincial average, 38,779, and Calgary-Fish Creek was a bit above, 10.5 per cent above, 45,000. Our expectation was that Calgary-Fish Creek probably is built out just about to its maximum now so likely won't be growing a lot but that Calgary-Lougheed may in fact be growing a lot between now and the next boundary redistribution.

Your proposal would bring the two constituencies quite close, actually, to the provincial average. I guess the risk in doing that or the trade-off that we would be considering is: what would you expect to be the growth pattern in Calgary-Lougheed between now and, oh, let's say 2016 or 2017, for example, and is the expectation that the growth in that constituency will be so large that if we don't make this split now within this community, the next commission may have to do that next go-round? Do you have any sense as to what the growth projections are like in Calgary-Lougheed?

Mr. Barg: Well, I'm certainly not an authority on the subject, but I guess in the past the city has restricted growth due to the transportation issues, and we don't see those transportation issues being resolved. Probably five or six years is as soon as they'd be resolved.

Certainly, there is lots of area for growth, and I understand your concerns. I guess I'm speaking from the perspective that having the community split between two constituencies would make it more difficult to deal with the provincial government.

Dr. Archer: Sure. Well, actually, that's an important thing for us to bear in mind. You're suggesting that until the western part of the ring road is done, there's not likely to be a lot of rapid development on the area just south of the Tsuu-T'ina?

Mr. Barg: Well, I can't say that for sure. That's sort of a general sense that I have, that there's some hesitation to build out those communities until there's a better transportation link.

Dr. Archer: Yeah. Great. Thank you.
That's all I have.

The Chair: Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, sir. You mentioned that there's a golf course on the proposed eastern boundary if we move the boundary as you suggest. I see that 14th Street is the demarcation line above. Is it 14th Street that would extend south, or is there an actual street that would be . . .

Mr. Barg: The golf course is west of 14th Street, so between our community and 14th Street is essentially the golf course. That's all that's there.

Mr. Dobbie: Is it material to you whether the golf course forms part of the constituency or not?

Mr. Barg: I don't think that's material because there are no residents within the golf course. It's not a golf course where there are residences located on the golf course.

Mr. Dobbie: I take it you live in one or the other of the communities?

Mr. Barg: That's correct.

Mr. Dobbie: Which?

Mr. Barg: I live in Woodlands, so I live in the part that would be in Calgary-Fish Creek.

Mr. Dobbie: I take it that you've had some opportunity to canvass your fellow citizens.

Mr. Barg: Yeah. I've spoken to a number of people. We had a discussion at our community association board, and I've spoken to other people that generally support the view that it should be part of one constituency.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you, sir.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you very much for coming. If I'm reading this correctly, in Woodlands our information is that there are about 6,300 people who would be moved over.

Mr. Barg: That sounds right, yeah.

11:30

Ms Jeffs: That sounds about right. All right. Then, obviously, we would be looking at the impact.

I don't have any other questions. I think you've been very clear about it. I'm glad to hear that you've talked to your fellow residents in the community about this. You know, it certainly seems like a reasonable request. Our only issue is really to make sure that the numbers – we had left a little more space in Calgary-Lougheed, I think, as Dr. Archer said, for growth, but your sense is that . . .

Mr. Barg: I guess I'm not fully versed on, say – to the north is Calgary-Glenmore. I'm not sure what the status of that is. I think that's Calgary-Glenmore to the north.

Ms Jeffs: I think it is.

Mr. Barg: I'm not sure if there's a better fit there.

Ms Jeffs: Yeah. They're about 5 per cent over.
Certainly, the two communities would prefer to be in one riding?

Mr. Barg: That's correct.

Ms Jeffs: Your preference would be that it is Calgary-Lougheed?

Mr. Barg: I guess that's just a preference from a fairly cursory look at the map. In general, the city seems to be organized in quadrants. So to be part of Calgary-Fish Creek – it's a very sort of southeastern quadrant oriented constituency, even though Canyon Meadows is in there. A lot of the issues run – the school boards are set up by quadrant, and the city aldermen are set up, you know, not crossing the quadrants very much.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. All right.
I don't have any other questions, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: Thank you.
Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. And thanks, Mr. Barg. If our numbers are correct, Woodbine is about 9,500 people, so that would make a more significant impact on Calgary-Fish Creek if we were to move in that direction. I understand that your presentation is made as the president of the Woodcreek Community Association, as opposed to a resident?

Mr. Barg: That's correct.

Mr. Evans: Okay. So you brought it before your board, and it has been reviewed?

Mr. Barg: Yes.

Mr. Evans: Okay. That's an important point for clarification.
Thanks very much. Appreciate your presentation.

The Chair: The population that you would propose would go from the Calgary-Fish Creek riding into Calgary-Lougheed was – how much did you say?

Mr. Barg: I think we just said it was 6,000 and something.

Mr. Evans: It was 6,354.

Mr. Barg: I think I said 3,000 residences roughly, but that's just the number of households as opposed to the population.

The Chair: That's what I was wondering about. All right.

Are there any other questions of Mr. Barg?

Well, thank you very much, sir. We appreciate your presentation, and we'll certainly look at it and see if we can accommodate it. Again, thank you for coming.

Mr. Barg: Thanks for your time.

The Chair: Have we anything further at this point?

Mrs. Sawchuk: Not scheduled, no.

The Chair: All right.

[The hearing adjourned at 11:34 a.m.]

