



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission
Public Hearings

Calgary

Thursday, September 24, 2009
2:58 p.m.

Transcript No. 27-2-9

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission

Judge Ernest J.M. Walter, Chairman

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

Office of the Chief Electoral Officer

Acting Chief Electoral Officer

Lori McKee-Jeske

Participants

Moe Amery, MLA, and Rod MacKenzie, Calgary-East Progressive Conservative Constituency Association

Dave Fryett

Judy Heynen

Sandy Wilson, Calgary-Fort Constituency Office

Blair Yorke-Slader and Tim Corriveau, Calgary-West 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

Erin Norton

Communications Consultant

Melanie Friesacher

Consultant

Tom Forgrave

Managing Editor of *Alberta Hansard*

Liz Sim

2:58 p.m.

Thursday, September 24, 2009

[Judge Walter in the chair]

The Chair: Good afternoon to all of you. Thank you for taking the time to come out and, hopefully, share your views with us today. I know I speak for all of the members of the commission when I say that we're looking forward to hearing from you.

My name is Ernie Walter. I'm the chairman of the Alberta Electoral Boundaries Commission. I'd like to introduce to you the other members of the commission here 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 her, Brian Evans of Calgary.

We've been directed by legislation to make recommendations to the Legislative Assembly on the areas, boundaries, and names for 87 electoral divisions based on the latest census and population information. In other words, our job is to determine where to divide Alberta into 87 areas so that each Albertan receives effective representation by a Member of the Legislative Assembly. Over the next few months we will seek community input through province-wide consultation before developing our recommendations. Through public hearings such as the one here today we want to hear what you have to say about the representation you are receiving in your community.

In carrying out this work, we have to follow the provisions of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act. It says that we are to make proposals to the Legislative Assembly regarding the areas, boundaries, and names of 87 electoral divisions. You will recognize that that means we are mandated to propose four additional electoral divisions in Alberta, which will come into effect at the next provincial general election. This is the first time in 24 years, I believe, that there will be new ridings added to the province of Alberta.

Now a brief summary of the electoral boundaries law. As I've mentioned, our function is to make proposals to the Legislative Assembly for 87 electoral divisions. We have a limited time to accomplish this task. We are required, after consideration of representations made at the public hearings, to submit an interim report to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly by February of 2010 that sets out the areas, boundaries, and names of the 87 proposed electoral divisions and reasons for those proposed boundaries. Following the publication of the interim report a second round of public hearings will be held to receive input on the proposed 87 boundaries. After consideration of that input the commission must submit a final report to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly by July of 2010. Then it is up to the Legislative Assembly by resolution to approve or to approve with alterations the proposals of the commission and to introduce a bill to establish new electoral divisions for Alberta in accordance with the resolution. The law would then come into force when proclaimed, before the holding of the next general election.

One way to ensure effective representation is by developing electoral divisions with similar populations, especially where population density is similar. The law directs us to use the populations set out in the most recent census of Alberta as provided by Statistics Canada – that is, the 2006 census – but if the commission believes that there is population information that is more recent than the federal census compiled by Statistics Canada, then the commission may use this data in conjunction with the census information. I might say that we have received from the city of Calgary and the city of Edmonton and a number of other cities the updated censuses that they have for 2009, which does change the numbers. I also note

that we are required to add the population of Indian reserves that were not included in the census, as provided by the federal Department of Indian and Northern Affairs.

In dividing Alberta into 87 proposed electoral divisions, the commission will take into consideration any factors it considers appropriate, but it must and it shall take into consideration the following:

- (a) the requirement for effective representation as guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms,
- (b) sparsity and density of population,
- (c) common community interests and community organizations, including those of Indian reserves and Metis settlements,
- (d) wherever possible, the existing community boundaries within the cities of Edmonton and Calgary,
- (e) . . . the existing municipal boundaries,
- (f) the number of municipalities and other local authorities,
- (g) geographical features, including existing road systems, and
- (h) the desirability of understandable and clear boundaries.

3:05

The population rule in the act states that a proposed electoral division must not be more than 25 per cent above or below the average population for all 87 electoral divisions. There is one exception to that. Up to four proposed electoral divisions may have a population that is as much as 50 per cent below the average population of the electoral divisions if three of the following five criteria are met:

- (a) the area . . . exceeds 20 000 square kilometres or the total surveyed area of the proposed electoral division exceeds 15 000 square kilometres;
- (b) the distance from the Legislature Building in Edmonton to the nearest boundary of the proposed electoral division by the most direct highway route is more than 150 kilometres;
- (c) there is no town in the proposed electoral division that has a population exceeding 8000 people;
- (d) the area of the proposed electoral division contains a [First Nation] reserve or a Metis settlement;
- (e) the proposed electoral division has a portion of its boundary coterminous with a boundary of the Province of Alberta.

It then goes on to say that for these purposes the municipality of Crowsnest Pass is not a town.

That's a very general overview of the legislation, but the Alberta Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of Canada have also provided guidance. In rulings they have agreed that under the Charter the rights of Albertans include the right to vote; the right to have the political strength or value or force of the vote an elector casts not unduly diluted; the right to effective representation; and the right to have the parity of the votes of others diluted, but not unduly, in order to gain effective representation or as a matter of practical necessity. These rulings as well as the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act must guide our decisions and, ultimately, the proposals that we make to the Legislative Assembly.

Now that I've explained the law we are to be guided by, we want to receive what we consider is the most important input, namely 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.

Again, on behalf of the commission let me welcome you all here today. Those of you who will not be speaking can still make your views known in writing by mail, by fax, or by e-mail. We're very interested in hearing them.

With that background information our staff will be calling the first speaker. Each speaker will have 10 minutes to present and then five minutes for questions and answers with the commission. I should

tell you that the commission's public meetings are being recorded by *Alberta Hansard*, and the audio recordings will be posted on the commission website. Transcripts of these proceedings will also be available. If you have registered as a presenter or choose to participate in this afternoon's or this evening's meeting, we ask that you identify yourself for the record prior to starting your presentation.

Now, having said that, are we ready to proceed with the first presenter?

Ms Friesacher: The first presenter is Mr. Blair Yorke-Slader.

Blair Yorke-Slader and Tim Corriveau, Calgary-West Progressive Conservative Constituency Association

Mr. Yorke-Slader: Maybe I'll just take a moment if I can let you have a moment to read what I've handed out, because that will make me a lot shorter, which I expect you'll appreciate.

The Chair: Could you for the record just repeat your name?

Mr. Yorke-Slader: My name is Blair Yorke-Slader. I appear with the submission of the Calgary-West Progressive Conservative association. I'm a past president of that organization. With me is Tim Corriveau, who is the present president.

Our presentation is fairly narrow in scope, deals essentially with the southwest quadrant of Calgary, not really exploring the larger, sort of philosophical issues that Your Honour mentioned a minute ago. It's really intended to address the population growth in the quadrant, and my comments are essentially restricted to that. I've given you a short handout. At the back of the handout is a smaller map which just identifies Calgary-West and the immediately surrounding constituencies.

The Chair: That's very helpful.

Mr. Yorke-Slader: Perhaps I could just give you whatever time you'd like to review that briefly so that I'm not just repeating what I've said in the written piece.

The Chair: No. You go ahead.

Mr. Yorke-Slader: There's lots of time.

The Chair: There's lots of time, so you go ahead. We're here to listen.

Mr. Yorke-Slader: Well, thank you, sir. Calgary-West, of course, not surprisingly, is located at the far western boundary of Calgary. According to the 2006 census there were 55,500 people, which puts it 47 per cent over the average that prevailed in the province. That would be the third-greatest positive variance of any constituency in the province. I can tell you that if driving to work from there is any indication, there was clearly continued growth in that riding between 2006 and 2008. If there's a fall-off in home building in Calgary in 2009, it's not evident in Calgary-West. There's continued growth in a variety of communities there.

The northern boundary is essentially the escarpment south of Canada Olympic Park. There are communities like West Springs and Cougar Ridge and – I can't remember the name of the one immediately south of Cougar Ridge which is now under construction.

Mr. Evans: Is that Wentworth?

Mr. Yorke-Slader: It might be. Yes, Wentworth. I think that's right.

Then if we're going further south, we have Aspen and Richmond Hill. Then when you get south of Glenmore, you have all of the Elbow Valley development. It's continued since 2006 to be an area which is experiencing population growth and, one would expect, for the foreseeable future will continue to do that. There is plenty of appropriate land west and east of 85th Street stretching out until you get to the point where you run up against what will eventually be the south extension of Stoney Trail. With that introduction, what we have is a riding that was already bursting at the seams as of 2006. I expect you would find if you had the updated information, and maybe you do, that it's only gotten worse.

To be blunt, the assumption behind the proposal is that when you get to the end of your deliberations, it seems likely that Calgary would end up with two new ridings. If there's an operating assumption behind this presentation, it is that that's a reasonable expectation at the end of the day. One might reasonably expect that there'll be one in the north and one in the south. So operating very roughly from that kind of an assumption, the proposal is intended to alleviate the pressure that exists at the north end of the southwest quadrant, which is the Calgary-West constituency, and at the south end of the quadrant, which is the Calgary-Lougheed constituency. Lougheed, according to the 2006 census, was 26 per cent over, and it, too, is an area that's experiencing construction and growth.

The proposal essentially is this: that the existing Calgary-West riding – bordered on the north by the escarpment, on the west by 101st, which is the city limit, on the south by the Tsuu T'ina nation, and largely on the east by 37th Street – be divided in two latitudinally along 17th Avenue, which runs right through the constituency. So it's kind of the logical halfway point.

3:15

Again, we're guessing on what's happened since 2006, but reasonable to guess that if you did that today, then you have extra. So the proposal is: what do you do with the extra? Well, you can solve a bunch of the other problems that run to the south and a small piece to the north. There's a little piece of Calgary-Bow that comes over on the south side of the river. That could be taken by the northern half of Calgary-West, or it could move into one of the other constituencies in that area if you wished to normalize that. Then moving south, keeping in mind that you want to clear up an excess in Calgary-Lougheed at the far south, it's like taking the toothpaste tube from Calgary-Lougheed and squeezing it so that the toothpaste is going up; you're moving the boundaries essentially south and perhaps east. The proposal is that you take the east boundary of what would then be two Calgary-West constituencies and move it over to 37th.

The only piece of Calgary-West that is east of Sarcee at the moment is the community of Glenbrook, but you're going to have extra. So you could take it all the way over to 37th, and then you could start – because that's taking parts from other constituencies, you can relieve the pressure at the bottom. The pressure really isn't geographically in the middle. Elbow and Glenmore are more mature ridings. Elbow doesn't seem to need an adjustment for population reasons; Glenmore, arguably, but it would be a small one. I won't go through all the detail that I put in the writing there, but our proposal essentially is that by cutting us in half latitudinally and pushing the boundary out to the east, you will then be able to solve the pressure from Calgary-Lougheed by shifting other boundaries south and perhaps slightly east.

As to the detail of what those should be, it's really not, we think, our place to say. There is the anomaly that I'm sure you're aware of

that has Lakeview in Calgary-Elbow, and that can certainly be solved in the course of this sort of proposal.

The Chair: You didn't mention Calgary-North West, which is a riding that has grown considerably.

Mr. Yorke-Slader: As I said, the ambition of the proposal, really, is fairly small and essentially to try to solve the problem south of the river. You're right; I haven't, and we don't make any submission on that part of it. Globally, again, I think we'd expect that somehow others will have to make submissions to you, and you'll have to solve the problem in the north half. I'm really just trying to direct it to the south, so we have no submissions on that part of it.

The Chair: Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Thanks, Mr. Yorke-Slader. That's an interesting description, and it does make sense to me on 17th. But, again, the problem is that we've got a lot of other high-growth areas, including the southeast, with Calgary-Hays and Calgary-Shaw in particular. Do you see any way to deal with Calgary-Bow in a more effective way, given the location of the escarpment?

Mr. Yorke-Slader: Well, it seems like an anomaly to have part of it south of the river. I appreciate that we can try to be too geographically perfect here, and when people go to the polls, I'm not sure they care whether they're voting on one side of the river or the other. The integrity of the process to the ordinary voter, I think, seems better when it looks neat – right? – when you don't have funny little fingers going out over here and there, because people get the wrong idea or, if everyone wants to be cynical, the right idea. I mean, they get concerned when they see funny-looking ridings. There may be perfectly good reasons for those funny-looking ridings. But it is a bit of an anomaly that you have that piece of Bow south of the river.

As we say at the end, it's not fundamental to our proposal that you deal with that, but if you wanted to, we're expecting that by doing what we're doing, it should give you room to push population in a number of ridings in the area. I mean, I have to concede that when you get into the deep southeast, I'm not sure – well, it depends on how much you create in Lougheed, right? If you can create quite a lot in Lougheed, then you can push that to the east as well.

Mr. Evans: Just a comment more so than a question. You know, we've heard a lot of comments thus far about commonality of interest. In Edmonton, in particular, we heard about for the most part not dissecting constituencies with a river passing through it although Riverview in Edmonton is one contrary example of that. I suspect that in Calgary we would have people arguing that the commonality of interest is lost with the Bow if you bring a constituency from the south north or north south. Any comments on that?

Mr. Yorke-Slader: It doesn't naturally fit in Calgary-West, the piece that is there. I tend to agree with you on the sort of makeup of the constituencies. We were conscious of that in this proposal with 17th Avenue because we wanted to be conscious of whether you were dividing some community. By using that as what may seem to be an obvious geographic dividing line, well, are you somehow cutting a community in half? There's no obvious problem of that sort that we can see with that dividing line, so in that sense it's consistent with the idea of keeping commonality of interest within what people regard as their community.

Mr. Evans: Okay.

Mr. Yorke-Slader: I have no particular expertise on that piece of the Bow north or south, but intuitively I agree with that.

The Chair: Thank you.
Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Yes. Thank you very much for your presentation, sir. I just want to make sure I'm clear. You're looking at the dividing line as 17th. You would suggest actually adding a riding in there, not just sort of reconfiguring West, Buffalo, Curry, and Elbow in there with that existing population but actually, assuming that, you know, Calgary is looking at a new allocation, that an additional riding go in there. Am I correct about that? I'll just say that intuitively it seems, you know, that there are larger problems further to the north and, as I think Brian said, around Hays. So I just want to make sure I'm not misunderstanding it.

Mr. Yorke-Slader: Well, according to the census information Hays was 26 per cent over the average; West was 47 per cent over. In that sense it seems to be a larger problem. Now, North West is the biggest, right? North West is 60 per cent over . . .

Ms Jeffs: North West is 60. Yes.

Mr. Yorke-Slader: . . . and obviously that's a concern. The problem here is that you have all of these mature communities that are certainly not going to get any smaller. On the other hand, they're probably not going to get much bigger by comparison with the growth that you're going to see in the west. So the decapitation of the west, if you will, seemed like the place to – I know it seems odd that you'd have a constituency come to you and say: well, we'd like to be cut in half, please. I'm sure that doesn't happen very often.

Ms Jeffs: No, and that's why I wanted to be clear, because there does seem room to capture and to redistribute that population in sort of that central area. That's why I wanted to be clear. You know, you could maybe cut it in half and then reconfigure the other boundaries without your net increase there. Or do you think that wouldn't really solve the problem that you're trying to solve?

Mr. Yorke-Slader: Well, it's funny because Mr. Corriveau and I were talking about this on the way over and saying: what could conceivably be the other ways you could do this? You could create a long western finger and pull out the Elbow Valley piece. That's a growth area. I suppose you could make it an even more vertical riding and move the eastern boundary to 69th and take out Sienna and Signal Hill and Signature and Strathcona and Christie. That's too much, probably. I think it's almost certainly too much. That's probably the majority of the riding right there. Somewhere somebody is going to have to accept a serious cut here, and it seemed to us that that was likely to be in this area; it was likely to be either West or Lougheed.

3:25

Ms Jeffs: Well, thank you. As I say, that's not a criticism. I just wanted to make sure that I'm understanding. Obviously, there are a few problems to resolve in Calgary at this point.

Mr. Yorke-Slader: Really, all we're trying to do is to say, "Look, from the perspective of the riding association we're content and, in fact, advocate as a logical solution the splitting of the riding," so that at least you know that. In a generic way the benefit of that is simply that by pushing east, you can solve a bunch of other problems as you

move east. How you do that I'm afraid we're not here to offer comments on. You're going to have to start at one end or the other, probably the northwest or the southeast, and then start pushing population one way or the other, so here's ours.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. Well, I do appreciate that. I just have one other question. We have total updated census information for 2009, I think, for Calgary. We don't have it on the riding-by-riding basis. I'm just wondering: do you have that for those?

Mr. Yorke-Slader: I do not, no.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. We are waiting for that and anticipate having that at the time we're making our decisions.

Mr. Yorke-Slader: As I say, it's anecdotal only, but I'd be surprised if you don't see a proportionately similar kind of increase. The problem will have only got worse since '06.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you very much.

Dr. Archer: Well, Mr. Yorke-Slader, thanks a lot for the presentation. It's interesting that we're starting in Calgary-West because one's first inclination is probably to look at the north and northwest part of the city and see real pressures in those four constituencies. I think that starting in Calgary-North West and going all the way over to McCall, we have four constituencies that really are well above the quotient. Then in the far south, you know, looking both at Loughheed and at Hays, we have two more that are well above the quotient. Your presentation is a good reminder that that's not where the challenges end in Calgary, that the riding of Calgary-West also presents some important challenges for us and needs to have some changes taking place because you're so far over the electoral quotient at the moment.

As Allyson Jeffs was saying, at the moment we know that we've received the updated census data from the city of Calgary. We don't have it on a riding-by-riding basis, but you had made some comments about the nature of residential development in Calgary-West at present and perhaps over the next few years. Could you just elaborate a little bit on what the growth looks like within Calgary-West not only since 2006? Are there any big projects that are currently under way in the constituency that we need to be mindful of?

Mr. Yorke-Slader: I should first say that I'm not a builder, and I'm not a planner. I can only offer sort of the anecdotal observations of one that now lives one kilometre west of the riding and therefore drives through it every day on the way to work. There is significant development going on on the east side of 85th Street between Old Banff Coach Road and Bow Trail. There is the new community that Mr. Evans referred to that's going in south of Cougar Ridge on Old Banff Coach Road. There has been significant development in the last couple of years at the south end of the riding, sort of down 85th Street, both west and east of 85th and south of 17th Avenue. I mean, there's an entirely new community there on the southwest corner of 17th and 85th and on the northwest a major commercial development going in now at 17th Avenue and 85th Street to service all of that population that's going in all around that development.

Aspen is continuing to grow between 69th and 85th. I wish I knew the name of the development, but at the corner of 17th and 85th there's an entirely – brand new in the last two or three years would be my venture. Then as you move further south on 85th, between 85th and 77th there's more development there. Then we all know what's going on in Elbow Valley.

As one who can only sort of give that anecdotal information, there is a lot of land. There is a lot of grading. There appear to be plans for construction well up the track and people who continue to build homes and have continued to build homes over the last 12 months when, if one listened to the headlines, one might think that there was no home building going on. There's been a lot of home building going on in this particular community south of Cougar Ridge all the way through. And I'd say the only limit on that ultimately becomes the western boundary of 101st, which is really that south extension planned for Stoney Trail, which may be many years off. But largely between 69th and there, there's still an enormous amount of development land and people who seem to have plans for it.

Mr. Dobbie: And the LRT is expanding out there.

Mr. Yorke-Slader: Well, I mean, it's a fair point. We all know that the LRT comes out to 17th, and the city may have its own projections for that. Actually, it might be a good place to look.

Dr. Archer: The other question I have has to do with your view on the importance of the river as a dividing point between constituencies. You mentioned the fact that Calgary-Bow now comes across. I think it picks up Wildwood as part of it?

Mr. Yorke-Slader: Yeah.

Dr. Archer: We heard yesterday in one of the presentations in Edmonton the recommendation that to the extent possible we should try not to have electoral constituencies span across, you know, major rivers like the Bow and the Elbow. Do you have a view on that with respect to the impact on Calgary-West?

Mr. Yorke-Slader: From a Calgary-West perspective, I think, because we don't have a river running through it – it's the other side of the same coin that says, well, you want to try to avoid dividing natural communities. The flip side of that is that you want to avoid grafting onto a natural community something that's got nothing similar with it. I don't have any special knowledge and our constituency has no particular special knowledge about the piece of the Bow that's south of the river, but intuitively it just seems contrary to the sort of principled, logical, transparent allocation of population to ridings which is your mandate. While at some point there may have been good reasons for it, unless there's a good reason one would think that the inclination would be to go the other way.

Dr. Archer: Thanks.

Mr. Dobbie: We're over the time. Whoever goes fourth is always in trouble, but I have a couple of quick questions that I'd like you to answer.

Mr. Yorke-Slader: I got you when you're full of vim and vigour. I should have booked at 4 o'clock or maybe tomorrow.

Mr. Dobbie: Just from a fundamental principle question, Mr. Yorke-Slader, implicit in your presentation is that we should respect the municipal boundaries of Calgary and not reach outside at all. Is that correct?

Mr. Yorke-Slader: Well, that's an interesting point because, as you know, the city has grown west in the last number of years. There's

been recent annexation right sort of to the – the last proposal I saw had a little area west of 101 and up in towards Artists View becoming part of the city. There are – and I know because I live there – certainly communities immediately west of 101st which would be communities that have things in common with the other communities in the riding. I used to live in the riding and moved out there, and I feel like I'm part of that community. So there's some room to move to the west. I think that would only follow naturally with the annexation process by the city. But you're not actually going to pick up a lot of population that way. I mean, because of the East Springbank structure plan these are two-acre lots for now, and I don't know that it would have a material effect on the population to go, say, five kilometres out into East Springbank.

Mr. Dobbie: It's more just to get a sense of whether it's a starter or a nonstarter. Thank you.

Secondly, if you're proposing a new riding, before October 13 you can propose names as well? We'd be interested in hearing.

Finally, if we look at Calgary and its 2009 number as 1,065,155 and we're dividing Calgary up, what you're suggesting is that there should be some variation in population to account for future growth.

Mr. Yorke-Slader: You mean for Calgary generally?

Mr. Dobbie: For the ridings within Calgary.

3:35

Mr. Yorke-Slader: Again, Mr. Corriveau and I were talking about this on the way up. Forgetting about Calgary-West for the moment, as Calgarians do we have an interest in ensuring that our votes are as meaningful as the votes of other people in the province? You're going to hear it over and over again: well, obviously, yes. So, as I say, sort of the operating assumption we started with was that inevitably in this process there'll be a couple of ridings in the Calgary area, and it's a question of how you put them there. Certainly, we would advocate for that. I mean, as the third-largest positive variance it's starting to be a riding where our vote doesn't count as much.

Mr. Dobbie: Have you thought about a percentage variance within Calgary that's reasonable? Have you addressed your mind to that?

Mr. Yorke-Slader: Not to a specific number, no. I mean, it's a lot less than 40 per cent.

Mr. Dobbie: Well, 25 is the legal limit.

Mr. Yorke-Slader: Yeah. I was going to say that it begins with a two.

I have no mandate from the association on the naming question, but Calgary-Walter does appeal to me.

Mr. Dobbie: That's an interesting choice.

The Chair: I think I can live with that.

Thank you very much, Mr. Yorke-Slader and Mr. Corriveau. Very helpful. If you have any further input you'd like to have, please put it in writing and send it in, and we'll certainly be taking account of it. Again, thank you.

Mr. Yorke-Slader: Thank you very much.

Ms Friesacher: The next presenter is Rod MacKenzie.

Moe Amery, MLA, and Rod MacKenzie, Calgary-East Progressive Conservative Constituency Association

Mr. MacKenzie: Good afternoon. My name is Rod MacKenzie. We began with Calgary-West. Now we're going to the other extreme; I'm from Calgary-East. By way of background I'm a lawyer in east Calgary, and I am the president of a constituency association in the riding of Calgary-East. I'm accompanied today by Mr. Moe Amery, but he's not presenting.

The Chair: He's welcome to come up and be with you.

Mr. MacKenzie: Whatever he's comfortable with.

Mr. Amery: I'm fine.

Mr. MacKenzie: First of all, I want to thank the panel for the opportunity to come and speak. We appreciate that you have a difficult job ahead of you, and we do not envy you at all. It's going to be a difficult task. Rather than come today and try to advise you where you should draw the boundaries, I would rather just outline some basic principles that we hope will be observed when it comes to redrawing the provincial boundaries.

The most important principle we would like to see followed is that to the extent that it is possible the existing boundaries of the constituencies should be maintained. Now, we know it's not realistic to keep the existing boundaries for any of the ridings, even, but any changes made should be kept as minimal as possible. Try to keep communities that were together together after it to the extent possible.

We also suggest that communities not be split up so that you have part of a community in one riding and part of that same community in a different riding. To do otherwise creates problems from the perspective of the communities and their leaders as they want to have one messenger who is consistent and accessible. It also ends up being unfair to one of the MLAs as invariably in a split community it tends that all go to one MLA regardless of whether their street or house is on the right side of the boundary for that MLA or not. They naturally think, they assume that one MLA is their MLA even though the boundary has been drawn through the community. Invariably, one MLA or another picks up more work.

Where changes need to be made, we don't think it would be that bad of an idea to rejoin communities that are split, so we can look and say: "Well, these communities should be together, and they're not together now. Since we have to redraw the boundaries, let's try to bring them back together."

Also, attention should be paid to historical connections between communities. Because of how the city has developed, certain communities have become closely associated and integrated with certain neighbouring communities, particularly in some of the older areas of the city, including the older parts of east Calgary. These associations include mutual schools, religious institutions, and other social organizations as well as shared commercial areas. To group these communities that have a lot in common together is efficient, for it is better to have one MLA dealing with the issues faced by, say, a particular school, for example, than to have several MLAs duplicating each other's efforts or even possibly working at cross-purposes. So when we see areas or communities that share a lot in common, be it commercial areas or schools or whatever, we should try as much as possible to keep them together in a riding. That's just a principle that we think should be brought to the panel's attention.

Another important consideration that we think should be looked at is the demographics of different communities, including such

things as socioeconomic status. Communities with similar demographics should be grouped together. Communities with higher socioeconomic status might have interests that conflict dramatically with the interests of communities with lower socioeconomic circumstances. The end result of grouping these communities together is that when an MLA advances the interest of one, the other might be left feeling that the MLA does not represent their interests. It makes the art of representation much more challenging. By trying to keep communities with similar demographics or similar socioeconomic circumstances together, the MLA, in advocating one interest, is not seen as neglecting or working against the other.

Now, east Calgary as a whole is very much a high-needs area. Many of the people resident there are of limited economic circumstances. The area includes many immigrants or new Canadians, many seniors, people with disabilities, and so on. This is something that also should be taken into account for this reason.

We understand that it is obviously impractical to have every riding with the exact same population. You're working with a range. While the temptation might be to design ridings with smaller populations in newer, low-density areas that are high-growth areas and have ridings with populations on the high end of the range in more established or high-density areas, it is important also to recognize the high-needs nature of some of the more established and high-density areas. MLAs in these areas must serve people that need their help in finding and accessing government programs to a far greater extent than would be typical in newer suburban areas of the city. I think that it should be kept in mind that while a range is necessary, we shouldn't automatically assume that these older, more established areas should be, like, 25 per cent above the average and the newer suburban areas 25 per cent below because of the special needs that must be attended to in the high-density areas of the city.

Again, we recognize the challenging task before the panel. We know that it will be impossible to devise perfect divisions because in our free society the city grows organically. It's not a planned city where block by block everything is pieced together perfectly. You have to take the boundaries that you have, the city the way it has grown, and you have to divide that up. So we appreciate that there are not going to be perfect solutions that are going to leave everybody happy. However, by following these principles, we feel that the jobs of our elected MLAs will run more smoothly and efficiently and, as a result, we will have a populace that feels that it is being properly taken care of by its elected representatives.

Those are our basic submissions on this. We will follow this up, by the way, with written submissions and some documentation and whatnot in the future.

The Chair: That would be very much appreciated.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you, Mr. MacKenzie. In your particular riding you've given us an overall description of the nature of the constituency. Are there any suggestions that you have right now? Are there any obvious additions or deletions from that that you would suggest?

Mr. MacKenzie: Well, it's a touchy issue because, obviously, there are neighbours and stuff.

Mr. Dobbie: We're mindful of the fact that the existing MLA, of course, wants to represent all of the people in the existing riding, but just some suggestions if you have them.

Mr. MacKenzie: I can give you some personal observations. This is not the official policy of the board I'm on or anything. I would suggest that, for example, right now the way it's drawn, we have

Mayland Heights off on the west side of the riding, and Forest Lawn proper, the main Forest Lawn community, is part of Calgary-Fort. I think that there is a historical association of Southview, Albert Park, Forest Lawn, Forest Heights together, so it would make sense in my mind – and this is my own opinion; I'm not expressing the views of anyone else – to put Mayland Heights into another riding, maybe Mountain View or the one just north of that, and to add Forest Lawn back into Calgary-East. Historically it was actually part of the same riding as Albert Park and Southview, so I think it would make a lot of sense to put Forest Lawn back and to maybe put Mayland Heights into Mountain View or one of the ridings just north of that. When I looked at this and I tried to come up with how I would divide that part of the city, that's kind of what I thought I would do. That would be one idea.

3:45

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you.

The Chair: Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. MacKenzie. I had no idea that Mr. Amery was shy. All the years I've known him, I would never have thought he was shy.

Mr. Amery: I'm never shy, but I have a lot of trust in my presidents.

Mr. MacKenzie: Well, thank you. I appreciate that.

Mr. Evans: Trust well founded, no doubt.

A couple of comments on your presentation. This is kind of my own emerging theory about urban areas, and it goes to your comment about the added needs of the inner city and whether that should be a lower population or a higher population. I take from your comments that because of the needs and the diversity of interests it makes more sense to have a lower population in more traditional areas: inner city, where the needs of the community are greater, as opposed to the new areas, where there's much more of a commonality of interest. Notwithstanding that they're going to grow more rapidly than the inner city areas, the MLA's job, because of that commonality of interest, is not disserved by having more than the quotient. I'm assuming you would agree with that, and you can go into as much detail as you want in answering that.

Mr. MacKenzie: Well, to a large extent I do. I mean, we are realistic. We do recognize that there's going to be a lot of pressure on the panel to look at the high-growth areas. What I'm trying to suggest is a compromise. Please don't then assume that we can make the high-density, more inner-city areas with dramatically higher populations. Whereas the statute might provide a variance of 25 per cent either way for each riding, I think that within the city itself we should try to adhere to a smaller variance. I'm just suggesting that we don't go to an extreme where we assume that high-density, high-needs areas can have a much larger population than the high-growth suburban areas. I'm trying to suggest a compromise between the obvious pressures on the panel to accommodate those high-growth areas and our suggestion that high-needs areas have to be taken care of.

Mr. Evans: Well, thank you for that. You also spoke about in principle not splitting up communities, and you had mentioned Mayland Heights and Forest Lawn. Are there any other areas in the city that you're aware of that we should be conscious of that don't fit, that have been separated, that are causing issues for Mr. Amery or other MLAs because of that?

Mr. MacKenzie: I think to a small extent a lot of people in east Calgary do associate Marlborough and Marlborough Park. I mean, that would be an example. I don't think that's a problem per se as it is now, but that is another example as perhaps that is an area that is associated, that has a lot of interlinks between the two communities. Other than that, I do believe that there is a tendency to associate, for example, Erin Woods and Dover together. That's south of the Calgary-East riding. Certainly, I think the big one is that the greater Forest Lawn area ideally should be together in a riding. I think that's the one that really stands out, from what I've heard and seen.

Mr. Evans: Okay. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Yes. Thank you very much, and thank you for your presentation. It's very helpful. I just had a question. You talked about the variance up to 25 per cent, of course, as permitted by the statute but having a lower percentage in the cities. Did you have a thought as to what that should be, particularly in areas which, as you've described, are maybe more high needs than some of the newer subdivisions? In other words, should we be looking at some of the more established, maybe inner-city neighbourhoods? What kind of variance?

Mr. MacKenzie: Well, I think that for the city itself, between city ridings, a 10 per cent variance might be realistic. Of course, obviously it's not my job, but I do believe it is possible to try to keep it to, like, a 10 per cent variance. So yes.

Ms Jeffs: All right. Again, with respect to what we've already said about the data, that we don't have the sort of most up-to-date riding-by-riding analysis, our data sort of indicated that Calgary-East was very close to the average based on the 2006. Do you have a sense as to how much growth there's been in that area?

Mr. MacKenzie: I think that the panel actually touched on this earlier today. Calgary-McCall seems to have had some growth. I think that the population of the Calgary-East area, the riding that I'm speaking on behalf of, has been pretty stable. I believe that there was .8 per cent variance. What I was mentioning earlier, the Mayland Heights and Forest Lawn: there's a bit of a difference, but they're almost equal, so I think the population is pretty stable. I think that it's not a growing area. It's not a rapidly declining area either in terms of population. But Calgary-McCall, I understand, is growing quite a bit.

Ms Jeffs: Yeah. They're just a bit to the north of you. All right. Thank you very much.

Dr. Archer: Thanks for the presentation, Mr. MacKenzie, and your responses to the questions. You know, if we were starting the redistribution from this part of the city, the logical conclusion would be that we probably wouldn't change very much of anything. I suspect the pressures will come from the changes that need to come in other constituencies that are so much over the quotient that they're no longer tolerable. You've provided some really useful advice on where the constituency could grow. Just so I have it clear in my mind, I think the northern boundary of your riding at the moment – it changes in different parts of the riding – looks like it's 16th Avenue N.E., and the southern boundary is 17th Avenue for part of it. Is it Memorial Drive for another part?

Mr. MacKenzie: Okay. On the southern boundary, Southview is just south of 17th Avenue, and that's the southern boundary for part of it. On the other part it is 17th Avenue up until, I think, 36th. I think along the top – I wish I'd brought the map with me – it's mostly 16th Avenue. Yeah. Moe would actually know exactly.

Mr. Amery: The northern boundary is 32nd Avenue.

Mr. MacKenzie: Oh, 32nd Avenue. I apologize.

Mr. Amery: The southern boundary is 26th Avenue S.E., and it goes all the way to 36th Street S.E., then it goes north to 8th Avenue, and it goes east on 8th Avenue to 52nd.

Mr. Evans: Then back down to 17th.

Mr. Amery: Yes.

Mr. MacKenzie: I apologize.

Dr. Archer: So if there were pressures either from the north or from the south to kind of, you know, push ridings in their configuration in one direction or another – and I think there are going to be some pressures that we're going to experience – what would be the natural movement that you would recommend? Now, by bringing in Forest Lawn, I think you're suggesting a southeast part of the riding would be extended outwards.

Mr. MacKenzie: If you look at the map, that would make the riding rectangular. So that's right. It would add the southeast corner to the riding that looks like it's carved out of it now. Is your question which way would we have to move to accommodate population?

Dr. Archer: Which would be the preferred movement?

Mr. MacKenzie: Again, there are two possibilities, I would think. One would be to shift the ridings down, but another would be to shift the ridings up to pick up the population of Calgary-McCall. I mean, we don't really have a strong opinion on that one way or the other, but it might be necessary to shift the ridings up to address northern McCall or down. Calgary-Fort even might have to be shifted down to help with the growth in the south. But, certainly, we don't take any position on that.

Dr. Archer: Okay. Thank you.

3:55

The Chair: Well, thank you very much, Mr. MacKenzie. We look forward to receiving your written submission. I'm sure it's going to be very helpful to us. Again, thank you very much for coming and airing your views.

And thank you, Mr. Amery.

Ms Friesacher: The next presenter is Ms Sandy Wilson.

The Chair: Welcome, Ms Wilson.

Sandy Wilson
Calgary-Fort Constituency Office

Ms Wilson: Thank you, and thank you all for hearing us today. I know you've got a difficult job ahead of you. I'm presenting for Calgary-Fort. I actually work in the Calgary-Fort constituency office with Wayne and sit on his board.

My presentation is very much like it was several years ago at the last boundaries commission. I'd like to see us set a precedent, number one, in the directions of movement. In our priorities we would like you to do a quadrant of the city and from the centre of the city move towards the growth. This way we wouldn't be changing boundaries up and down each time. So while Calgary-Fort sits in the southeast completely, its direction should be east and south. Other ones that sit in different places would then move their directions, too. A standardized system of moving would prevent that back and forth each time the boundaries change, which is very hard for the constituents to understand when they frequently go back and forth.

We'd like to see the movement towards the largest area of growth, which you've identified as being in the north, the west, and the south, and expand the boundaries to the new city limits – ours would go east; the old city boundary has moved to the east – and leave growth in the areas under the average, allowing for future growth because we all know the 2006 stats are no longer factual.

Mr. Dobbie: We will be using the 2009, though. We will have it for each constituency.

Ms Wilson: Excellent.

Pick logical boundaries. Don't divide the communities. Rejoin the communities that are already split. Use natural boundaries where possible, like rivers and major highways. I wouldn't cross a river unless there's actually a road that crosses that river. In lots of places you can't get there from here. Align boundaries, if possible, with the municipal wards and the federal boundaries. For instance, when they fall along almost a similar line, try and line up the same as the other because that's very hard on different constituencies, to not understand: well, he's my MLA, but I'm across the street here. The line is just a little out.

Look at the nature of communities. There are the historical past connections of communities. In our constituency we have a very small area called South Hill. It was 100 years ago part of Ogden. They still consider themselves part of Ogden. They're included half in Riverbend and half in the industrial park, Shepard industrial. It's very misleading to them because they cannot drive to Riverbend from where they are. There's no connection of roads. It's a population of about 200 or 300, and they go to Ogden for everything. I get them in the office because they assume they're part of our constituency, but I have to redirect them all the time. It would make more sense to be combined with ours because of the history and the ties. They all use Ogden House seniors. They have direct ties to the community.

I'd like you to look at the city's indices of wellness. Before you mentioned that we should have the same needs in communities. I beg to differ slightly there. I think you shouldn't put all the highest needs communities together, which we have in our constituency. We're probably the highest-needs constituency in Alberta. There's one other in Edmonton that's a contender, and we go back and forth. In areas of Alberta Works, AISH, injured workers, and seniors' needs, we're all very high needs in ours, right up at the top. The indices of wellness do have the bottom 16 communities identified and the high-needs communities identified – I'll include that with my report to you – and right now we're all in the high needs, all of our communities. This puts incredible stress on the constituency as a whole because we're trying to develop community development in the area, and it's everywhere that we have to work.

Some neighbouring communities have close connections, and we should wherever possible try to keep those ties of schools, social organizations, seniors' organizations, youth programs, and resource centres working together under the same MLA, put the communities

with close ties together, if possible, and keep the changes to a minimum wherever possible also.

Calgary-Fort is composed of older communities with little chance of future growth within the boundaries. In fact, we're probably shrinking. Dover, Forest Lawn, and Ogden all have a high rate of need and a high rate of volume of people, so we have the highest needs of people in the city and the highest volume. Erin Woods and Inglewood have a high rate of need but not the volume. So they're all high-rate communities. All of these communities are actually shrinking in numbers as the households shrink with the aging population. They're all at a turnover. Erin Woods and Dover have reached a point where families are moving out, and as the communities turn over, the communities are shrinking in population. There's no place for growth. Dover has already grown in Valleyview as much as it will grow, and there aren't any lands available, really, for more growth.

So it would be consistent with our priorities to move the borders, any growth that we have, south. But that's up to you. Depending upon the number of new constituents in Calgary, our averages may need to be above the provincial average as well in overall Calgary. For instance, if we put two new constituencies, it's going to leave the average of Calgary well above. It would be nice to see those new areas of growth leave a little space for them to grow when there are communities already planned there that aren't built yet but are under construction. I don't know if you have a possibility of doing that.

That's it.

The Chair: Thank you very much. That was excellent.
Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Thanks very much, Ms Wilson. You heard Calgary-East talking about closing off that rectangle to take in more of Forest Lawn. Do you have any comments on that, firstly?

Ms Wilson: I think that's quite suitable, but that would mean we'd have to take on that much population and more somewhere else.

Mr. Evans: Somewhere else, yeah. That was going to be my next question.

Ms Wilson: We would indicate to the south.

Mr. Evans: Right. Is there a logical extension border, moving south from where you are now, that would recognize traditional boundaries, whether it's a street or any other geographic . . .

Ms Wilson: Well, both the wards and the federal take Riverbend and include it, and I've included their maps here. Riverbend has close ties. Douglasdale would also be logical since you're going to be able to drive straight down from Ogden on the new 24th to Douglasdale.

Mr. Evans: That's more of a mix of population, which is what you were talking about having more of.

Ms Wilson: Either one of those communities is more mixed.

Mr. Evans: Upscale, if you want to talk in that kind of terminology.

Ms Wilson: I don't want to go on the record as saying it.

Mr. Evans: Yeah. But they are. A spade a spade.

Really, from what I can see here, the only logical way to get a better mix is to move south. Has there been any discussion between anyone in Calgary-Fort and Calgary-Hays about that, or are we going to have people from Calgary-Hays complaining about it?

Ms Wilson: No. That's why I'm kind of loath to say which ones. I can't really pick a community here. I think there will be ongoing discussions about that, and they will be getting back to you on it, but I know Hays has to get rid of population somewhere.

Mr. Evans: Okay. All right. Well, thank you very much for that input.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Hi. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you very much, Ms Wilson. You mentioned off the top in your presentation the idea of having, I guess, at least a notional four-way division quadrant system in the city. Do you have sort of notional boundaries of what the north-south, east-west kind of axes would be?

Ms Wilson: I would pick the logical ones of Memorial Drive and Centre Street.

Ms Jeffs: Okay.

Ms Wilson: Just to be moving in that direction towards the growth would keep a consistent way of moving. Then next time when we're looking at boundaries again, if they could keep that consistent, it wouldn't be doing the back-and-forth shuffle in communities.

4:05

Ms Jeffs: Your hope would be that, you know, it'd be a bit of a sort of radiating towards the population rather than jumping here and jumping back, which is sometimes challenging when there's growth in areas.

Ms Wilson: Yes.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. Thank you for that. Then, having said that, you wouldn't necessarily be uncomfortable or have a problem with that southern boundary of Calgary-Fort moving partially into Hays?

Ms Wilson: No.

Ms Jeffs: Hays on the old data I think is about 26 per cent above, so that would be okay.

Are there communities of interest or is there any flexibility with the boundary with Egmont in your mind?

Ms Wilson: I hate to get into . . .

Ms Jeffs: I know.

Ms Wilson: There is a stronger tie between Riverbend and Ogden, both using all of the same organizations, and there are a lot of family ties. Most of the kids from Ogden moved to Riverbend because of the time Riverbend was formed, so there's a lot of crossover there. And it does cross a river from Egmont.

Ms Jeffs: Oh, okay. I apologize. It's been quite a while since I lived in Calgary, and I'm not remembering where Riverbend is.

Ms Wilson: I do know that Egmont has strong ties to that too and doesn't want to let go.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. So there might be a bit of a tug there. All right.

Ms Wilson: Yes. That's why I'm loath to say you should take a community.

Ms Jeffs: Right. But if we were looking at that, you're saying that that would be jumping the river.

Ms Wilson: For Egmont it has already jumped the river. It would not jump the river for us to take it.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. Thank you very much.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you, Ms Wilson. We're getting opinions and advice, and it's interesting to get the contrasts. The previous speaker was concerned about the challenge of an MLA representing significant disparities in populations in terms of people feeling like they're winning and losing with their own MLA. We don't know where this is going to end up, but I think that your suggestions in terms of some general principles have been very helpful in terms of radiating out.

Just for clarification, it may be that you're feeling that the population of the average constituency size in Calgary would be higher if only two ridings were added. I think you're using the new total population and the old average from the 2006 census. If you use the new average – certainly at this stage my intention is to look at Edmonton, Calgary, and the rest of Alberta. Unless there is some compelling reason, Calgary will get the relative average number of seats, Edmonton as well, and the rest of Alberta accordingly. So I'm not sure that I accept your proposition that two seats would mean that Calgary would be higher than the average. That's not my math. Again, it should be available on the website soon.

Ms Wilson: And that's with the 2009 stats?

Mr. Dobbie: That's correct.

Ms Wilson: Okay. That's not our math.

Mr. Dobbie: Well, 40,583 is the new quotient that we have based on all of the information to date.

In terms of the list of priorities that you gave us, were they in order of priority, the most important to the least, or were they a bullet point list?

Ms Wilson: They're just a bullet point list.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you.

Dr. Archer: Thanks, Ms Wilson. I thought your presentation was really thoughtful, and I'm sure it will generate some further discussion, I suspect, at some of the public hearings and in our subsequent conversations. One of the ideas that we have heard people talk about a few times is ensuring that there is a community of interest within constituencies. You're actually challenging that view to a certain extent by saying, you know, that if people are joined by their high-needs character, introducing greater diversity within a constituency may help serve all of the people within the community better. I think it's an interesting idea and one that we'll certainly want to give a full airing to because what you're suggesting

fundamentally, I think, is to join what you've described as a high-needs community in Fort with some newer, more affluent communities in the southern part that are currently part of Calgary-Hays.

Just so that I understand where the proposed boundary is, because I'm not sure that I know where the boundaries of all of the communities are, are you thinking about 114th Avenue being an obvious southern boundary of Calgary-Fort constituency? I think that at the moment it seems to be 85th Avenue that defines the southern border.

Ms Wilson: That's right. Glenmore Trail is the bottom.

Dr. Archer: It currently is the bottom.

Ms Wilson: Yeah, it currently is. The other two, both the ward and the federal, have 114th Avenue.

Dr. Archer: Okay. That's really helpful.

Then just to make sure that I understood your point about the South Hill community, are you saying that at the moment it is in your constituency and shouldn't be or that it isn't and should be?

Ms Wilson: It isn't and should be.

Dr. Archer: It isn't and should be. It's currently in Calgary-Egmont, did you say?

Ms Wilson: It's partly in Egmont, and I believe a little bit of it is in Hays.

Dr. Archer: I see. So it's really split up.

Ms Wilson: Yes. It basically was divided by the city into Shepard industrial, which has a mobile home park in it. There's a mobile home park and some homes in Riverbend, but you can't drive to Riverbend from it.

Dr. Archer: Right. If you're going to make a written submission, if you could highlight that point and indicate it on the map, that would be really helpful.

Ms Wilson: I do have it with a little X on a city services map attached here. This is the little piece in mind.

Dr. Archer: Okay. Yeah.

Ms Wilson: Both the ward and the federal have addressed it by putting the line further down. There's no other population out to the west on that line because it's all industrial park.

Dr. Archer: Right. Great. Thank you.

The Chair: Well, thank you very much, Ms Wilson. We appreciate what you've given us today. We will be getting a written submission? Oh, all right. That would be even better. If you would give it to the ladies at the back there, that would be most helpful. Again, thank you very much. This has been most helpful.

Ms Wilson: Thank you.

The Chair: I believe that is all the presenters we have for this afternoon that have registered. I think there was one that didn't come this afternoon. So we'll adjourn, then, until our evening hearings at 7 o'clock.

Mrs. Heynen: Excuse me.

The Chair: Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. Heynen: I was under the impression that even if we didn't register, if there was spare time, we could perhaps make a presentation.

The Chair: We'd be more than happy to hear you, ma'am.

Mrs. Heynen: Would that be okay?

The Chair: All right.

Judy Heynen

Mrs. Heynen: My name is Judy Heynen. I am just here as a voter. I do not represent any constituency. I realize that your mandate is to increase our jurisdictions, our districts, to 87, but I feel that it's important to have some venue to present back to the government the idea that at this time we do not need more constituencies; we need less. British Columbia has just redefined their boundaries, and they have 51,000 constituents per district, Ontario has 110,000 people per district, and we're suggesting that 39,000, now 40,000 is too many people for our MLAs to represent.

I would suggest that the direction we should be going is to decrease the number of ridings that we have and to move from 83 to 75 ridings, looking for an average population within the cities of 45,000 to 50,000 people, recognizing that the rural ridings will be smaller, but their interests are a larger land mass, so large ridings with fewer people and smaller ridings with greater people. Equal representation is not necessarily the only goal.

I would suggest that Calgary could afford to lose three ridings, that Edmonton could afford to lose two ridings, and that over the course of the rural ridings we could lose two to three ridings as well. This would push our representation up into the 45,000 to 46,000 people per MLA.

4:15

That's the summary. I will do a written presentation outlining, hoping to take into account some of the ideas here today about keeping neighbourhoods intact. I think that we have in Calgary, which I'm more familiar with than the rural ridings, a number of areas that are representing 35,000 to 40,000 people. If we redrew boundaries and took into account neighbourhoods and major roadways, we could probably bump that up to 45,000 to 47,000, still keeping neighbourhoods intact but lessening our government load.

The Chair: Thank you. You recognize, of course, that our jurisdiction is to draw the boundaries and the names for 87. That's the law, and it's only the Legislature that can change that.

Mrs. Heynen: Yes. But I also recognize that your request was for the input of the people of the province, so I wanted to take that opportunity to give you some input of one person, and I don't think I'm alone.

The Chair: Thank you. We look forward to receiving your written input.

Are there any questions?

Mr. Evans: No. As you said, Mr. Chairman, we are bound by the legislation. Mrs. Heynen, you're now on the record with your opinion, and that's important as well.

Mrs. Heynen: Thank you very much.

Mr. Evans: Thank you.

The Chair: Well, thank you very much.

Mr. Fryett: I'm registered to go tonight, but I could go now if you would allow. It would get you out of here earlier tonight.

The Chair: You're welcome both this afternoon and tonight, so come on up.

Dave Fryett

Mr. Fryett: Okay. My name is Dave Fryett. I'm a constituent of Calgary-Shaw. I made a presentation. I just found out at the last minute that you don't take PowerPoint presentations, so I will hand out copies and just very quickly go through it.

The Chair: For the record I knew David when he was a very – he's Garth Fryett's son. That was many years ago.
Go ahead, David.

Mr. Fryett: Okay. I'm going to go through this fairly quickly. You'll probably learn more than you ever wanted to about south Fish Creek. It's one of the fastest growing regions of Calgary, severe infrastructure pressures. I have to disagree with some of the earlier speakers that the outer ridings don't need more representation. We actually, I think, have the most problems, and I don't think this is helped by diluted representation.

If you look on page 3 of the south Fish Creek overview, if you're wondering what south Fish Creek is, it refers to those areas south of Fish Creek park outlined by the yellow oval. That is a very significant natural barrier. I bike to work, and if you go through there at 5 in the morning, it's quite dark and quite wide. It's a significant barrier. It's a wonderful park, but it does cause issues, not the least of which is transportation.

The next page just shows sort of a south Fish Creek population growth. We're rapidly growing. We grow about 4,000 to 5,000 people every year. We're currently at 86,000. By the time you release your report next year, we will be 90,000, and probably in 10 years, when the province goes at this again, we will be somewhere around 140,000, which, you know, would be the equivalent of one additional MLA.

There's always been rapid growth out here. Calgary-Shaw was split in the last review. Calgary-Hays came out of that. If you hadn't split it, I think Calgary-Shaw now would be well over 100,000 people, which I think would be unmanageable. I couldn't imagine an MLA door-knocking at that many houses.

Again, this next graph is south Calgary population. As I say, this is 150,000. My submission to the last boundaries commission was to create three MLAs for this area. They weren't too impressed with that; they kind of looked down on that request. I just want to show this here, that that's now 150,000 people, so it is more than the three. I'm a very forward-looking person. I like to plan for the future. I'm an engineer by background. I use the analogy, you know, in the current debate on the power. You have to engineer for future power demands. If we just engineered for the past, we'd constantly be having brownouts and blackouts, and that's not acceptable. I think the commission should be looking forward to where that future growth is going to be and trying to make sure that their representation is equal with the future growth.

If this growth isn't all enough, there's a south Macleod policy plan

area that got approved by council a couple of years ago. That's going to add another 70,000 people. As you know, we really need transportation improvements. South Calgary is the one area of Calgary or Edmonton that has no ring road in sight at this point, so, you know, we have issues.

We also have the southwest Providence area plan just to the west of our communities. Again, that plan was passed by council. It will add another 70,000 people although it is contingent upon a southwest ring road. I think there are two top jobs in politics around the world. One is Mideast peace, and the second is trying to solve the southwest Calgary ring road alignment.

Mr. Evans: Not necessarily in that order.

Mr. Fryett: Maybe not in that order, yeah.

Now, just again, this is from the city. The south has historically seen a lot of the growth. If you look in the middle there, 20 per cent in the south, 22 per cent in the southeast sector. The next graph shows that, you know, that's going to even rise to 50 per cent. Fifty per cent of Calgary's future growth is going to come in the south. I'm not looking into a crystal ball. I'm just looking at – trends are your friends. I showed you the population graph, and that's probably going to continue. They might go down or up a bit depending on how migration patterns change, but that's what's going to happen.

I realize that you probably aren't going to be able to do this, but if you were a forward-looking person, I'd suggest that you could split south Fish Creek up into three ridings, which I've shown on the next graph. You would need something significantly, probably, more than 83 MLAs to look at something like that, and I do understand that you're limited by the Legislature. But, you know, that's the band, and that's just how the future growth is going to go to this. Perhaps when I come to my fourth boundary commission in 10 years, we'll be at the point where we're doing three MLAs.

In the last slides I just talk about our infrastructure pressures, from the hospital to the roads to schools to rec centres and the things that we need. So rather than get into any of these in any detail, I just sort of thought I'd end now. Hopefully, if you have any questions, you could fire away at me, and I'd be happy to answer them to the best of my ability.

Thank you.

The Chair: Well, I'm sure we do have questions.
Brian.

Mr. Evans: Well, thanks, Mr. Chairman. Thanks, Mr. Fryett. The anticipated growth south: I guess you're talking about Calgary-Shaw as it now stands. Would that be correct?

Mr. Fryett: The south Calgary population graph is Lougheed, Shaw, and Hays. Yeah.

Mr. Evans: Right. And that'll require annexation into . . .

Mr. Fryett: No. That's just city of Calgary . . .

Mr. Evans: That's on existing boundaries.

Mr. Fryett: Yeah. There are no future annexation lands in here. You could look at things like adding in Heritage Pointe, which is still outside the city of Calgary boundaries, but they're very much what I would call an urban type of development. They would have a lot of commonality with the people in south Fish Creek.

Mr. Evans: The city will probably move in that direction anyway. I agree with you there.

Mr. Fryett: Yes.

Mr. Evans: Relative to the expansion in the northwest – and I think you heard the presentation by representatives from Calgary-West – can you give us your take on percentagewise how much more you feel the south Fish Creek area will grow than the west and northwest of Calgary relative to growth patterns in the last four or five years?

4:25

Mr. Fryett: I don't do this by profession; I do it as a volunteer.

Mr. Evans: That's much appreciated.

Mr. Fryett: I emphasize my work to the south mostly. I concur that it's probably going to be about 50-50: 50 per cent in the north, 50 per cent in the south. Those seem to be the areas that are getting the most growth in Calgary and have the least constraints.

Mr. Evans: Okay. I appreciate that it's anecdotal as well.

Mr. Fryett: That growth will continue without annexation or, like I say, constraints due to the lack of a southwest ring road.

Mr. Evans: Thanks very much. Those are my questions.

Dr. Archer: Thanks, Mr. Fryett. I'm just trying to understand your proposal as clearly as I can. Are you suggesting that there should be three ridings that have Fish Creek as a north boundary?

Mr. Fryett: Yes.

Dr. Archer: Have you indicated in the presentation where sort of the east-west divides for each of those should be? We could use that to determine what the population would be. I think what you're saying is that there is a commonality of interest of people living in that part of the city and that we should be mindful of that commonality when looking at electoral boundaries.

Mr. Fryett: The main dividers, again, once you get past physical things like river valleys – Fish Creek valley, Elbow valley, Bow valley – are things like major roadways. Macleod Trail is a common boundary: federal ridings, aldermanic ridings. I think that where you guys are going to push me is: well, we can't give you three MLAs, so how do I divide you up into two? Then that gets difficult. Because you can't honour completely something like a Macleod Trail boundary, you'll have to slice it up. I know that to do it, it's kind of like you almost need Solomon's wisdom: who do you leave out, and who do you leave in? The way it is sliced right now, kind of all the growth areas are in Calgary-Shaw, and Calgary-Lougheed is going to cap. Is my MLA here? I hope not. I think it would be better to put a growth community within each riding, and then they would grow equally, but that would probably mean shaking things up a bit.

Dr. Archer: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Dobbie: In your thinking about the growth in the southeast of Calgary, have you contrasted that with what you expect the growth in the province to be? For example, you've got the rates of growth down here, and if we are trying to be mindful of the averages and not

putting people over them within a year – I suspect you've done that analysis. Again, without binding you to it, what are your thoughts there? Will it be twice the pace or some sort of ratio compared to provincial growth?

Mr. Fryett: I've got a young boy in minor hockey, and we're really struggling with just two ice sheets for 90,000 people. You can imagine. I often compare us to Lethbridge and Red Deer. They are very similar in populations. Well, I've been working on this for about five years, and the populations seem to go up. It's about the same ratio. I can look at ours: oh, we're up 5,000 this year. Then I do the ratios. I update Red Deer and Lethbridge, and it's about the same. So I think, you know, we're with all the high-growth regions. Something like Fort McMurray might be worse – I haven't studied that – but with the tremendous economic growth of the oil sands, I can imagine their pressures are awfully high for infrastructure as well, and you have to feel for them.

Mr. Dobbie: You're saying a common-sense approach in your view is to have the clearly high-growth areas under the average for now so that they're not immediately over the average.

Mr. Fryett: Yeah. I'd say that I am diametrically opposite to what you heard before. I would rather see the inner-city ridings with more people per MLA, underrepresent the outer, knowing that the growth is going to bring them back up to the average over the next 10 years. That way for the period that you're setting the boundaries, the next 10 years, it will be more balanced. You look at Calgary-Shaw, you know, if we had left it alone: 120,000 people. That's silly.

Mr. Dobbie: Again, thank you because the input is very helpful. We're still at the stage of establishing principles, so this kind of input does help us. Thanks.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much for this presentation and for all the detail and work you've put into it. Just following up a little bit on what Keith Archer was saying, your vision is three ridings; the north boundary is Fish Creek. That would be redistributing Hays, Shaw, and Lougheed.

Mr. Fryett: No. Just Lougheed and Shaw. Hays is now just east of the Bow.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. That makes more sense to me. So there would be sort of a reconfiguration there, and everything has a bit of a domino effect. Any thoughts on what we do with Hays, which is a large riding on its own? Do you see us sort of maybe dealing with the north boundary and just leaving it to the east there?

Mr. Fryett: Hays is going to need some work because it even has a little bit higher growth than south Fish Creek. There are more growing communities over there. I'm praying that that hospital opens in 2011, but there are budget cuts, so we don't know what's going to happen. If it does open, I think that will be a magnet for a lot of growth, you know. People will say: well, if I'm going to work at that hospital, maybe I want to live by the hospital. I think you'll see a fair amount of growth there. You're going to have to do something. You're going to probably have to hive off some of the northern part of that. I don't know. Calgary-Egmont, Calgary-Fort: something will definitely have to be done down there. It's a significant growth area.

Ms Jeffs: All right. That's my only question. Thank you.

The Chair: Well, David, thank you very much for this. This is very helpful. Again, if you have any further information you wish to convey to us for our first round of public hearings, please e-mail it or . . .

Mr. Fryett: I can do that.

The Chair: Thank you.
It's very good to see you. Dave's father and I were partners in law

for 28 years before I became a judge. I had a good conversation with your father on Monday.

Mr. Fryett: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: All right. Does that, then, complete our afternoon? There being no one to suggest they want to present anything further, thank you all again. We will reconvene at 7 o'clock.

[The hearing adjourned at 4:32 p.m.]

