



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission
Public Hearings

Calgary

Tuesday, June 10, 2025
1:02 p.m.

Transcript No. 14

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission

Justice Dallas K. Miller, Chair

Greg Clark

John D. Evans, KC

Julian Martin

Susan Samson

Support Staff

Shannon Dean, KC

Philip Massolin

Aaron Roth

Rhonda Sorensen

Christina Steenberg

Amanda LeBlanc

Clerk

Clerk Assistant and Executive Director of
Parliamentary Services

Administrator

Manager of Corporate Communications

Supervisor of Communications Services

Managing Editor of *Alberta Hansard*

Electoral Boundaries Commission Public Hearings – Calgary

Public Participants

Kathleen Ganley, MLA, Calgary-Mountain View

Angela Grace

Tala Abu Hayyaneh, President, Students' Association of Mount Royal University

Marty Heeg

Bernadett Maxwell

Lorraine Moulding

Daniel Nelles, Chair, City of Airdrie Library Board, and Secretary, Airdrie Arts and Culture Council

Michael Parker

Julie Pithers

Jim Ridley

Irfan Sabir, MLA, Calgary-Bhullar-McCall

Mariana Mejia Salazar, Vice-president External, Students' Association of Mount Royal University

1:02 p.m.

Tuesday, June 10, 2025

[Justice Miller in the chair]

The Chair: Well, good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to the second session, the afternoon session, of the Electoral Boundaries Commission hearing in Calgary. By way of background, you can see the commission members, and I urge you to go to the website to see the bios of each of us.

Our practice has been to allow for a block of time, 7 to 10 minutes, for presentation, depending on how long the list is, and then engage in conversation. Sometimes there's a lot of dialogue between the commission members.

Just as a reminder, the presentations are recorded, and they will be on the website of the Electoral Boundaries Commission shortly. The presentations are also transcribed in written form, and the *Hansard* version will be on the website as well.

I'm going to go quickly through the timeline here. I've noticed that sometimes my introduction takes up way too much time, so that's why I've directed you to the website.

A couple of the main issues that are pushing the commission to do its work are, number one, the government has passed legislation to expand the number of seats in the provincial Legislature from 87 to 89, so we have two new ridings to deal with. And we've got a huge population surge to respond to, in terms of our task.

Before we get to our task, I wanted to show you a bit of our timeline. Our timeline is outlined on the screen. The commission itself was appointed by the Speaker of the Legislature in late March. That starts the commission's clock running, and we have then 12 months within which to come up with a final report. In the interim the commission met a couple of times in April as a commission to talk about procedures and schedules, and we started the public hearings in late May. We're going throughout all of June and hearing from the public in presentations just like this. This is our third week. We will conclude the first round of public hearings in late June, and we will deliberate, taking into consideration in our deliberations the presentations we hear throughout the province, the population numbers that we have before us, and the existing boundaries and proposed changes that we hear.

We will issue a report, which has come to be known as an interim report, by late October. That report will be filed with the Speaker of the Legislature and will become public. If you've presented here and you want to follow our journey, you can look at that report. After that report is made public, we will have a second round of public hearings. After that round we will be obligated by the legislation to come up with a final report, and that must be filed in late March 2026 with the Speaker of the Legislature. The Legislature will then take that report and pass appropriate enabling legislation as they see fit.

As you know, Alberta currently is divided into 87 constituencies – we'll be 89 at the next election – and each constituency, or riding, or electoral division, elects one member of the Legislature.

To give everyone a bit of perspective, we look back to the last commission, which issued its report in 2017. At that time the commission dealt with a population that was just slightly over 4 million people. You'll see the numbers here shortly as to how they distributed the constituencies. Our situation is that we are dealing with a population, based on the last decennial census of 2021 and regularly updated by Statistics Canada and the Alberta Treasury Board Office of Statistics and Information, such that we're at a population level of 4.88 million now.

Last time the commission used this formula based on the population of 4,062,609, it gave a mean average of population per

electoral division of 46,697. There's a target range that surrounds that average number of minus 25 and plus 25, and you can see the figures for the last EBC in that slide. Our situation is obviously different because of the increased population, and the increase in number of electoral divisions brings us to an average of almost 55,000 population per riding. A differential of minus 25 to plus 25, you can see, ranges from 41,000-plus to almost 69,000.

Our job as a commission is to deal with the fact that the population increase hasn't been spread out evenly across the province. Our task is to come up with a set of boundaries for 89 different electoral divisions that provides effective representation across the province. In doing so, we consider several factors, and these are factors right out of the legislation. We deal with the relative sparsity and density of population throughout the province. We take into consideration and we hear a lot about common community interests in places like Calgary. Organizations, industry, culture: those are very important factors in terms of keeping electoral divisions together. We also consider geographic features – those are probably more common in the areas outside of Calgary and Edmonton – as well as communication and transportation lines across the province. Those are factors we consider.

Our task, our goal as a commission is to come up with ridings that fit the definition of effective representation and provide understandable and clear boundaries. Part of that task is that we recommend names of constituencies as well.

Finally, the legislation allows the commission to consider other appropriate factors that we deem are important in coming up with our report. Many of those factors we will hear in the public hearings.

We come to the stage now that we want to hear from Albertans. We've spent all morning, a very productive, busy morning, in this very same room hearing from Calgarians and people from outside of Calgary about what they would like to see done. Now we are here to hear from probably 15 people this afternoon. Thank you for coming, and we appreciate your interest. These last several weeks have convinced all of us that democracy is robust and it's an important consideration of Albertans, and we thank you for coming out.

In light of that introduction, could I have the first presenter come. You'll notice that I do look at my watch every once in a while because we try to limit presentations to seven minutes. I was wildly out of whack this morning; I let some people go on and had to cut others off. But I will try to keep the presentations running along in that category. We have a gadget that, as I understand it, will turn green. If you see it turn yellow, maybe you should stop; maybe you can get through. But red: the floorboard doesn't make you disappear, but close. Aaron Roth will be controlling that, and it makes my job a little easier.

1:10

Daniel Nelles, you're the first presenter. Please come up. I did say that they are recorded. Actually, it might be helpful if you just spelled your last name when you present it. Please proceed, sir.

Mr. Nelles: Sure. Thank you. Dan Nelles.

Good afternoon, members of the commission. I want to begin by thanking you for the opportunity to speak with you today and stress the importance of these public hearings. The public input process is absolutely critical in the commission effectively fulfilling their duty under the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act as it provides members of communities from across Alberta opportunities to offer insight into the relevant considerations outlined in section 14 of the act.

By way of background, I want to offer you some insight into why I've come before you today. My name is Dan Nelles, and I've been a resident of Airdrie since I was four years old. My family moved to the city around 1985, and other than a brief four-year sojourn to Lethbridge for university, I've been a resident of Airdrie since that time, so around about 40 years all told. I chose to raise my family in Airdrie. I have five children, ranging in age from 20 years old all the way down to three years old. One attends a postsecondary institution, one attends a public high school, two attend a Catholic elementary school, and one is enrolled in private daycare. My wife and I are members of Airdrie's Roman Catholic church community.

I'm the chair of Airdrie's public library board of trustees and a member of the board of the Airdrie Arts and Culture Council. I have a bachelor's degree in education as well as a master's degree in philanthropy and nonprofit leadership. I feel very in tune with the pulse of my community and very well connected to a variety of people in Airdrie both through my voluntary endeavours as well as the activities of my family members.

I felt compelled to speak with you today because I'm concerned that certain redistricting decisions could imperil the ability of Airdrie residents to have effective representation in our provincial Legislature. As you can probably guess by this point, my comments today will largely centre around the factors impacting the electoral districts of Airdrie-East and Airdrie-Cochrane. The previous redistricting left many of us feeling confused and disconnected. A third of our community was excluded from the district in which most residents live, and it's my hope that this redistricting process will remedy previous missteps and ensure that residents achieve sensible, understandable electoral boundaries that respect communities within the municipality.

One of the first considerations I must emphasize is that municipal boundaries need to be respected in that process. As noted, one-third of our community is currently situated within the riding of Airdrie-Cochrane. Many of my friends within that district feel isolated and that their issues, which are in many ways unique to Airdrie, aren't heard as clearly as they are in Airdrie-East.

Moreover, there are significant concerns over the use of geographic features to draw our boundaries. Highway 2 is the major east-west division for the residents of our city, and highway 567 and Yankee Valley Boulevard have been our traditional north-south divisions, although this has now been joined by 40th Avenue southwest with the recent completion of the 40th Avenue overpass spanning over highway 2. In looking at the current map, you can see that those more sensible dividing lines won't help address our issues of isolation, so we need to look at other factors.

Airdrie residents have a strong affinity for and connection to their neighbourhoods within the community. These neighbourhood or community boundaries would be strong candidates for use in the redrawing of any electoral boundary. Any division that would split a neighbourhood apart would not be received well. It would be enormously confusing to residents.

In looking at neighbourhood maps, one thing that must be attended to is population growth. Population growth in Airdrie has been absolutely exponential during my four decades in the city, and it's only going to be exacerbated. In 1984 our population was a mere 10,431 while today it now exceeds 90,000 people within the municipal limits. Projections put the total municipal population at well over 100,000 people by 2027, when our next provincial election is scheduled, and over 135,000 people by 2035, the latest that another boundaries commission must be convened. And I would note that this population projection is a conservative estimate given the demonstrated real rate of growth in Airdrie in recent years.

This means that considering Airdrie's municipal population alone, two electoral divisions that are equally divided, with no rural components, would actually serve populations of approximately 50,000 people each right now, kind of within your sweet spot, and 67,000 people each by the time another commission is appointed in about 10 years or so. Coincidentally, these numbers are close to the census total population for these districts just a few years ago. This rapid growth must be taken into consideration to ensure effective representation not just today but for residents in the years to come.

I should point out that population growth is clustered in several areas of the city. Referring to the lot inventory map from 2023 and the building permit heat map from also 2023, there are several communities and neighbourhoods that are contributing disproportionately to our growth, and redistricting should consider this when drawing new boundary lines such that the rapid growth in these communities is accommodated.

Clearly, I'm arguing here for two electoral districts for Airdrie set out in a manner that's not dissimilar to the current philosophy behind the boundaries for Lethbridge-East and Lethbridge-West, whose present populations are actually smaller than those in the hypothetical Airdrie-East and Airdrie-West or Airdrie-North and Airdrie-South districts. Concentrating the electoral map divisions largely to municipal lines in Airdrie provides a much fairer representation for our population growth but also creates a more cohesive representation situation for our residents.

The current divisions act is more of a grab bag or catchment area for surrounding rural zones, and this is really not appropriate. Residents within the municipal boundaries in Airdrie have far more in common with each other than they do with residents in, say, Keoma. I urge you to use this opportunity to bring the people of Airdrie back together and draw boundaries that reflect the municipal limits. Airdrie has a unique political identity and unique values, and although I have nothing against our friends in Cochrane, it's far more appropriate for us to have Airdrie electoral districts that don't make a third of our residents feel like an afterthought. Our municipal issues should not be diluted by those of other major municipalities like Cochrane, who deserve effective representation in their own right.

What must not happen is the continued dilution of Airdrie's interests by using our residents as balancing figures for rural populations. This very much feels like what was done with residents in the southwestern part of the city last time. Cochrane just needed a few more thousand people, so let's just pull them out of Airdrie. This cannot continue. Airdrie electoral districts that represent municipal boundaries should be the primary consideration, concentrating our issues and interests to the greatest extent possible and intensifying the ability of our elected members to the Legislature to more effectively advocate for our residents' needs.

I want to thank you very kindly for your time and consideration and for attending to the needs of the residents of Airdrie.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Nelles, for a rapid presentation.

Mr. Nelles: There was a time limit.

The Chair: I'm not sure if you've reduced it to writing and submitted it to the commission, but if you can, please see Mr. Roth here, and a written copy would be appreciated.

I'll start on this end. Mr. Evans, any questions or comments?

Mr. Evans: Are you advocating for Airdrie being its own constituency, its own ED, or two EDs?

Mr. Nelles: Well, I mean, you wouldn't want to do a single electoral district for Airdrie with currently 90,000 people. So given the target division of population, it would make more sense for two electoral districts for the municipality.

Mr. Evans: They would be below the number necessary. What's your idea in terms of growth projection?

Mr. Nelles: The city of Airdrie has released population growth projections for the coming 10 years, and the current municipal census, which is due out within basically three weeks to city council, seems to be targeting or estimating about 91,000 people currently within the municipal district or municipal boundary. That number is set to rise again fairly exponentially over the coming years, with more than 100,000 people by 2027, when our election is to be held. So two electoral districts representing the municipal city of Airdrie would put your target population at about 50,000 each currently and, as noted earlier in my statement, at about 67,000 by the time 2034 rolled around.

1:20

The Chair: Okay. Mrs. Samson, any questions?

Mrs. Samson: I have a thought I'd like your opinion on. Airdrie-East is bigger than Airdrie-West. What if the dividing line was not highway 2? What if it was Main Street or something like that, and Airdrie-East became its own riding and Airdrie-West, unfortunately, would be a hybrid of some sort?

The reason why I'm wrapping my head around this is that we only, as you know, received two ridings, and the growth in population is greater than even what's happening with you. So I don't have two ridings to give to Airdrie. Well, you have two ridings.

Mr. Nelles: Well, you can redraw.

Mrs. Samson: Yeah. What do you think of that, though, if the border was moved over?

Mr. Nelles: It might be possible. Again, what I would urge the commission to consider is that in the drawing of electoral boundaries, you would want to have something that would not split up a community, so Main Street might be one of those things. Indeed, if you look at the map, it's a little bit more of a curvy boundary than what we would have with 8th Street, which is right now the division line between east and west.

It might work. Obviously, trying to balance those population figures would be vital. Main Street might work just as well as 8th Street, but again you would want to try and arrange electoral districts that as much as possible have a 50-50 division of the population of the municipality. If that was the case, I'm not sure Main Street would necessarily be the right one because we kind of have a heavier concentration in some of our southern communities. Kings Heights is probably the most populous community right now, followed closely by Bayside and Cooper's Crossing. So there may need to be some consideration for a north-south rather than necessarily an east-west.

Mrs. Samson: Thank you. That's good information.

The Chair: Dr. Martin?

Dr. Martin: Thank you very much for your presentation. I take it that these graphics are yours?

Mr. Nelles: These are drawn from the city of Airdrie website.

Dr. Martin: Oh. I wonder if you could arrange for copies of these to be given to Mr. Roth.

Mr. Nelles: Absolutely.

Dr. Martin: As always, these kinds of visual aids are very helpful.

I wanted to ask you as well about the two northern corners, northeast and northwest, that have colours on them. Am I to presume that these are within the current boundaries of the city of Airdrie?

Mr. Nelles: Yes. Sawgrass Park, Croxford Estates, Hamilton Greens: these are definitely within the municipal boundaries. Croxford Estates and Hamilton Greens are quite small from a population standpoint. They're more rural estates, if you wanted to style them that way. Same thing with Yankee Valley Estates, which is just cut in half by this particular graphic. You can see here the municipal boundaries are the purple, and we have all of those neighbourhood boundaries within that.

Dr. Martin: So you would anticipate, in your request, that all the municipal boundaries for this whole cordon sanitaire around the current neighbourhood, all of that would be held for one or two EDs, right? You're not going to abandon any of that? Your numbers are so high.

Mr. Nelles: Correct. We wouldn't want to hive off any of this. As I say, the focus would be on retaining the municipal boundaries as much as possible. In Airdrie, with its rapid growth, there are several new neighbourhoods coming every single year. Some of the ones that are brand new this year are Vantage Rise and Key Ranch. They're just brand new this year, but they're going to have a number of individuals moving in there very soon. Same thing with Southwinds. So there's lots of space to grow within the municipal limits. The electoral district should, hopefully, accommodate for that kind of growth and make sure that basically we stay together.

Dr. Martin: Can you move us to your heat map?

Mr. Nelles: Yes.

Mr. Clark: I've done a little quick googling, but I can't find this. Did you create this?

Mr. Nelles: This is drawn from the 2024 growth report by Airdrie Economic Development. I can also attach that for the committee.

Mr. Clark: That would be fabulous. Yeah, this is incredibly helpful. Thank you.

The Chair: So that's a feature in a report. It's not a computer program that you have access to.

Mr. Nelles: Right. It is a feature in a public report from the city of Airdrie.

The Chair: Okay.

Dr. Martin: If you could attach it, that would be very helpful.

The Chair: Mr. Clark, any questions?

Mr. Clark: I just found it, so I'll have a good look at that.

Part of what we talk about a lot on this panel is skating to where the puck is going to be. I think in the case of Airdrie the puck is a long way down the ice, and we need to skate pretty quick to catch up to it. The growth is fairly clustered but also quite clear. And

you're absolutely right, that even if that exponential curve flattens out a bit, it's still a lot and still big numbers.

Having said all that, if we were to take just the contiguous urban area of Airdrie and call it 90,000 roughly today, that still makes us two times 45,000, which is quite a ways below the 55,000. If we needed to make up some numbers in the short term, as in, for the purposes of this commission, the next couple of elections, are there specific areas in and around Airdrie that you feel we could logically include?

Mr. Nelles: As the chair of the library board I would note that there are some maps from the county of Rocky View that represent kind of where those residents receive library service. There's kind of a small rural doughnut around Airdrie that we see a lot of clients in the library from, that rural doughnut. So that would make sense in terms of retaining those community members into our population because they still receive service from the municipality.

Mr. Clark: That's great. That's helpful. Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Nelles. Your presentation was very, very good and much appreciated for this niche area that we have to focus on.

Mr. Nelles: Thank you kindly for your time.

Mrs. Samson: Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Lorraine Moulding. Excuse me, ma'am, do you mind sitting at that chair? If we have to have control of the PowerPoint, then that allows Mr. Roth to have access to that laptop.

Ms Moulding: Thank you, and thank you for the opportunity. I do want to follow up on the...

The Chair: Please introduce yourself and maybe spell your last name.

Ms Moulding: Oh, sorry. Lorraine Moulding.

Thank you for the opportunity. I just want to follow up on the gentleman from Airdrie because I think he has raised a really basic, fundamental principle of representation, which is that we need to be represented by our communities, and as much as possible that needs to be supported. I think people need to trust that politicians are working in their best interests and in the best interest of their communities, and I think having opportunities like that helps to ensure that.

I've been thinking a lot about the places and times I've lived and the difference that has made to me. I've spent the last 50 years in large urban areas, but before that, I grew up in a rural area. It's a very different environment, and I think it's really important that people's environments get represented.

1:30

I remember growing up in a rural area and there certainly was a lot of suspicion of urban interests not being in alignment with what was happening in rural areas and what people's needs were. I think we all have the same objectives in mind. We want our children and grandchildren to grow up with opportunities, to have health care, education, good transportation, all those kinds of things, and that's what we depend on our governments for. But how that happens is different in different areas, and it's different for different kinds of populations.

For me, that's a key fundamental value in terms of: how do I get represented? I know that you have a difficult job ahead of you. You know, the gentleman from Airdrie certainly outlined that. Maybe

dividing it into two doesn't quite get you at your magic numbers. But I think there's something really important about those principles that we do our democracy on. We think about infrastructure. It's different in urban areas, and it's different in rural areas, and if we start mixing up our ridings, how then does one lone person represent those voices? If I'm the MLA, how do I advocate for my rural needs and my urban needs if it's all that we're just sort of doing this as: how do we get these numbers lined up right? You have a hard job in front of you. I recognize that.

Then there are other differences. I graduated from high school in 1967, and I wanted to be an engineer. When I applied for engineering, they told me I had to take an extra year of study just to prove I wanted to be an engineer. I won't tell you what I said, but that's not what I did. There are those kind of differences as well that our MLAs have to represent.

I had some principles. I think these are things that you need to think about really hard when you're thinking about: how do we divide these things up? I think population is important. You know, we've had a tremendous population growth in Calgary. It's probably the largest population growth in the province, so that needs to be taken into consideration.

New seats should also represent both the current and future population growth. Municipalities should be kept intact as much as possible so that their unique needs are represented. Communities who have things in common, whether that's cultural, economic, geographic should be kept in intact. Those are things that I think are really important.

I'm done, if you have any questions.

The Chair: Okay. Sorry. I may have missed it in the beginning. Do you reside in Airdrie?

Ms Moulding: No, I reside in Calgary, but I'm just saying that I think he gave a really good representation of why municipalities need to be represented.

The Chair: What electoral division are you in?

Ms Moulding: I'm in Calgary-Klein, so I may or may not be affected by the boundary.

The Chair: We had a couple of presenters from Calgary-Klein, and I think their bottom line was, "Leave us alone; don't touch our boundaries," as I recall.

I'll let the other commissioners engage. Mr. Evans, any questions or comments or questions?

Mr. Evans: No, no questions. Thank you.

Mrs. Samson: Thank you for coming. I don't have any questions.

Mr. Clark: I appreciate your comments, and I think you make a good and compelling case for not blending constituencies. While we're talking about Airdrie, I just happened to look at a note from this morning, a presenter from Cochrane: we like Airdrie; we don't like being part of Airdrie. It sort of builds on what you're talking about.

Anyway, thank you very much for coming.

Ms Moulding: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

That then takes us to Ross Lennox. Not here? Okay.
Jim Ridley.

Mr. Ridley: Thank you. Good afternoon.

The Chair: Good afternoon. Have a seat, and just spell your last name.

Mr. Ridley: Sure. It's Ridley. First name is Jim.

I reside in the Banff-Kananaskis constituency district. I was brought up in Calgary. I have three university degrees, one of which is a graduate degree. I worked for the province for a number of years as a park ranger out in the Kananaskis and served three terms on the Canmore town council. I'm not presently on that council.

Thank you for the opportunity to describe what I feel are unique aspects of the Banff-Kananaskis electoral district, which I will refer to as the riding. I begin by referring to dynamics of population change I've noticed, then present characteristics of that demographic, and last I would like to offer recommendations. Sources of my information are attached, and I can provide a copy of that.

It appears that your work is based largely on a reasonable and fair comparison of population numbers throughout the province. You're looking at the 2021 census of Canada, which under calculation established an average of roughly 55,000 constituents per riding. Banff-Kananaskis is currently just under that average. I would point out, however, that while we have observed reductions in rural populations elsewhere, our riding has, since '21, experienced an increase in residential development with concurrent increase in population numbers. The trend, looking at the 2016 census: the Banff-Kananaskis riding increased from 46,000-plus to 52,000-plus in the '21 census, or 11.5 per cent. While I cannot provide you with '25 riding population numbers, Canmore similarly increased 12 per cent from 2019 to 2024. Based on development approvals by various land-use authorities throughout the riding, I think it logical to extrapolate that, with future development, populations will continue to increase in the foreseeable future.

In addition to comparing numbers of constituents, you are charged with applying various regulations, guidelines, and other demographic considerations that may result in adjusting the legislative representation of each riding. Let us now look at characteristics of some select communities throughout the riding. Banff and Lake Louise utilize the need-to-reside clause under the federal parks act and regulations, resulting in limits to physical townsite growth and a stable permanent population. Banff's limit to permanent population is set at the current 10,000, resulting, as an aside, in over 600 adult workers commuting from Canmore to Banff daily.

The riding's largest municipality is the town of Canmore: in March of '25, a population count of 17,200 in 2024, and this is from the provincial Office of Statistics and Information of the Alberta Treasury Board and Finance. So in '24 Canmore had 17,200. A detailed report in the *Calgary Herald* explained the approved area structure plans on the Three Sisters development lands and was headlined as: New Developments will Double Canmore's Population in 20 Years. That would result in 34,400. In addition to the Three Sisters development, the areas of Silvertip and Palliser have received area structure plan approvals for resort development, the former, and affordable housing, the latter. In summary, although development takes time, it may be prudent to factor limited but certain growth into planning for what legislative representation is needed in this town, soon to be a city.

Other areas of the riding offer insights where we can and cannot expect growth. One, a sizeable and measurable number of property owners do not actually live in the Bow Valley, rather own holiday property there and vote elsewhere. This is a very unique situation in the province. Nonetheless, the MLA for the area is responsible to provide cost-effective services through provincial supports to

everyone in this community, whether they reside there permanently or not.

1:40

Two, 350 homeowners in the townsite of Redwood Meadows are located on Indigenous land through long-term leaseholds. No further development of this area is anticipated beyond the roughly 875 persons there now. Not governed under Municipal Government Act like other municipalities, this community still needs representation.

Three, the Springbank area structure plan in Rocky View county received final approval on March 25 of this year, planning a total of 20,145 persons in the Springbank area. Much of this will be accommodated through the subdivision of what is now farmland and/or acreages, and I do have a breakdown of that number based on who is there now, what is planned for infill development, and what is planned for new development, which is attached to my submission.

The Harmony community west of Springbank Airport is planned not under an ASP but rather an approved conceptual scheme and is only at 6 per cent build-out, expected to have approximately 4,480 residences. At 2.5 people per residence, that's roughly another 10,000 people.

Five, the Millarville area is split among two ridings, B-K and Highwood, and should be amalgamated in B-K.

Now, to understand the characteristics of some population numbers in the riding, I would like to highlight the following geographic and cultural factors. The families located in the eastern part of the riding – Morley, Harmony, Springbank, Redwood Meadows, Bragg Creek, Millarville, Tsuut'ina, and Priddis – possess a huge respect for the natural environment, many living adjacent to the wonderful Kananaskis Country park system and who prioritize natural environment protections. You may know that this 1,600-square-kilometre provincial park area is largely within the Banff-Kananaskis riding and is immediately adjacent to two provincial parks in B.C. plus adjoins to Banff and Jasper national parks, together comprising the largest contiguous protected parklands in the world. I would respectfully ask that the similar needs, interests, and lifestyles of these smaller eastern communities continue to be included in the Banff-Kananaskis electoral division.

My recommendations to the commission are as follows. One, anticipating change and indeed growth in this riding is an important determination to how the riding is structured. Planning for growth is, in my view, an important factor in assigning where boundaries ought to and ought not to be adjusted. The data from the next federal census is released with a two-year lag, meaning the results from the 2026 census will not be available to us till 2028, but the work of the commission will inform riding boundaries for the next scheduled election in 2027.

Two, the importance of this riding to the economic well-being of the province could be an important consideration in your determination of what legislative representation is needed in this riding. Currently 4 million visitors travel to the Bow Valley annually. The province of Alberta has forecasted and has goals to move this number to 10 million visitors within 10 years. While permanent populations need to be serviced everywhere, so do the countless numbers of visitors. It is now and will increasingly become a challenge for whoever the legislative representative is for Banff-Kananaskis to work hard to provide provincial government support to municipalities, residents, and visitors in terms of ancillary programs and services, i.e., hospitals, affordable housing, sustainable transportation, utility infrastructure, social services, recreation, policing, et cetera.

Three, and my final recommendation, the boundaries of the riding are, in my view, currently acceptable and, other than Millarville, should remain the same. It has only been since 2015 that Banff-Kananaskis existed as an ED, and legislative representatives since that time have tried to meld the interests and characteristics into a manageable whole. They have succeeded, I believe, and continue to not only respect the differences that citizens throughout the riding may exhibit but also find commonalities in the management of this all-important natural area we call Banff-Kananaskis.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Clark, any questions?

Mr. Clark: Two things. If you could just reiterate your views on Millarville. You know, I was just looking it up and trying to find it on a map while you were talking about that, so if you can just tell me again. I know a previous presenter had indicated a sort of split.

Jim Ridley: Yes. They've used a highway road allowance to divide the boundary. There are some folks that live on the south side of that highway that are in the Highwood constituency. It's a very small area, very few number of people, but it would seem sensible to perhaps have a representative in Edmonton that's looking after the whole community.

Mr. Clark: And would you rather that in Banff-Kananaskis . . .

Jim Ridley: Yes.

Mr. Clark: . . . or Highwood? Okay.

And then you mentioned the Springbank ASP. Is that north or south of highway 1 or both?

Jim Ridley: Both.

Mr. Clark: Both. Okay.

Jim Ridley: Yeah. It's part of Rocky View county, of course, but they have done an area structure plan just for Springbank, and that received third reading and is in effect now. I can give you the numbers here briefly: 4,200 population in existing built-out areas – these are population, not residences – they plan to add 5,749 folks through infill residential, and 10,172 folks through new residential. That adds up to, as I mentioned earlier, a huge number of folks just in Springbank.

Mr. Clark: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Dr. Martin.

Dr. Martin: Thank you. You're absolutely right about how important this area is and just how much car traffic and tourist traffic comes through it, but you, in your presentation, walked us through a lot of other areas that are in the current district boundaries; you have rural country estates, you have a lot of the whole range of housing forms, it would seem to me. I want to ask you if they all get along together.

Jim Ridley: My sense is that they likely have specific interests for specific areas, but the commonality that I was speaking to is a respect for the natural environment, whether it's rangeland, whether it's recreational acreage properties, horse riding, the hiking, the fishing, the outdoor pursuits that folks find throughout the whole riding, whether it's a more rural residential setting or whether it's in a town in the mountains.

Dr. Martin: Do you also have some cattle ranching?

Jim Ridley: I don't personally, but there is some cattle ranching, yes, both on the Morley settlement . . .

Dr. Martin: The reason I'm pressing on this is that we have heard from time to time in our deliberations people say with horror, "Oh my, we couldn't have people with that kind of housing configuration because they don't share our community of interests." What do you say to that? Obviously, you're not as fierce as others about the presence of these many different forms of lifestyle.

Jim Ridley: I think we've come to accommodate the area as a more natural environment than you would find perhaps in the city of Calgary. If one is looking at expropriating rangeland or rural property into Calgary, I think it would be better to keep it as it is, as part of a more rural, geographically contiguous area.

Dr. Martin: Thank you.

Jim Ridley: That answers your question?

Dr. Martin: It does.

The Chair: Mrs. Samson.

Mrs. Samson: Thank you. Thank you for coming out today. Did you want to make any comments on the Indigenous population found in that riding? Do you see any growth changes, anything that would affect our decisions? Are the boundaries representing them and their needs adequately?

Jim Ridley: It's an interesting question because many of the policies that affect our Indigenous population are federal policies although some services, of course, are provided through the province and by the province.

It would seem that the inclusion of the two reserves in our riding right now are complementary. There are portions of the Morley area that are north of our riding that could be considered to be part for an administrative purpose from their perspective. I do know that the populations have increased in these settlements. I don't have the data on that, but there is a general growth, so it's not a reduction in numbers of constituents in both those areas that I am familiar with.

1:50

Mrs. Samson: Good. Thank you.

Mr. Evans: Can you give me the numbers of your projected growth again, your calculations on Canmore?

Jim Ridley: Well, we're at 17,200 right now. Now, I did see one report that suggested that there was a smaller number of nonresident property owners. Then when I was on council, the municipal census pointed to 25 per cent of the population being nonresident.

But they are speaking about, through the approved area structure plans right now, doubling that plus. The Three Sisters land has approval to double from roughly 18,000 or 17,000 to 34,000 plus the Silvertip area, which is to be and is a resort community, and the Palliser lands, which have been dedicated by both the province and the town for affordable housing, accommodating between a thousand and 2,000 individuals down on the valley bottom.

Mr. Evans: Okay.

And then you mentioned some projected growth for Springbank. What were those numbers?

Jim Ridley: Yes. That comes straight from their area structure plan of 20,145 at build-out.

Mr. Evans: That would be the increase.

Jim Ridley: No.

Mr. Evans: Total.

Jim Ridley: There is 4,233 in the Springbank area currently, so that would be adding another 16,000 population as approved.

Mr. Evans: Okay.

And then I think there was one more area.

Jim Ridley: Harmony.

Mr. Evans: And what was that one?

Jim Ridley: Sure. At build-out they were 4,480, and they're at 6 per cent build-out right now.

Mr. Evans: You said 4,480?

Jim Ridley: Yup. Residences.

Mr. Evans: And then we would multiply that by 2.5?

Jim Ridley: Yes.

Mr. Evans: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Ridley, thank you very much for your very well-researched presentation.

Jim Ridley: Thank you. I'm sorry to run a little over time there.

The Chair: Oh, here. Our next presenter, Marty Heeg.

[interjection] Oh, okay. Is there any other presenter here that may be further down the list?

Dr. Martin: Do you want to make a presentation?

The Chair: Yeah, a commentary on the presentations made.

Miss Abu Hayyaneh: Can we speak?

The Chair: Sure can. Come forward.

Miss Abu Hayyaneh: Okay. We'll just sit while each of us is doing their presentation. We'll introduce ourselves, too. My name is Tala Abu Hayyaneh. I am the president of the students' association of Mount Royal University. I'm joined here with ...

Miss Mejia Salazar: Mariana Mejia Salazar, the vice-president external of the students' association of Mount Royal University.

Miss Abu Hayyaneh: We sent in a written submission before the deadline in May, but we just wanted to highlight a few more things today just to kind of go over where Mount Royal right now is situated. The students of Mount Royal are spread across the city, and they even live in other areas outside of the city like in Airdrie. As well, we have students that commute into Calgary from all over the place, even in Chestermere and Strathmore as well. Even Cochrane, too.

We will always like to highlight how important it is to consider where students are situated within the city and how Mount Royal at the moment is at the edge of a riding. If we were to be included more within a specific boundary, it would make more sense.

The Chair: Are you in Calgary-Currie right now?

Miss Abu Hayyaneh: I think we are. I don't know.

Miss Mejia Salazar: I thought we were Calgary-Elbow.

Miss Abu Hayyaneh: Calgary-Elbow. Sorry.

The Chair: Okay. The campus is in Calgary-Elbow.

Miss Abu Hayyaneh: Calgary-Elbow, yeah. But we are closer to the Currie area, and right now we are just at the edge of our riding. Thank you so much for pulling that up. Just right there by Sarcee and Richardson; we're just below that.

Yeah. A lot of our students live, actually, just above that area, like they live in Glamorgan, which is still within Elbow. They live above the area closer to Westbrook, the more affordable areas to live within.

Right now we are coupled in an area where there are a lot more affluent neighbourhoods that also sometimes underrepresent the interests of our students who live in that area as well. In the past it has prevented our campus from being reached by the Blue Line that was initially built in the city because the interests of folks that lived in the neighbourhood did not align with public transportation, you know, bringing down the value of their properties. We just want to make sure that our students no matter where they live in the city, whether it's around Elbow, whether it's around Currie and beyond, are considered in a lot of those decisions that make sense to them, especially when it comes to the municipal issues. I know there's a lot of crossover with that. Transit is always a municipal/provincial thing to consider.

I'll just pass on to Mariana for some more thoughts.

Miss Mejia Salazar: Yeah. As Tala was speaking on, we have neighbourhoods such as Bel-Aire and the Upper Mount Royal as part of our district, which have a median average of home prices being from \$2.5 million upwards to \$3 million, which is not something that students can afford. What we're truly asking is for the student body to be recognized as an entire community rather than just citizens of the area so that we can work on different things like transit and affordability for housing and other aspects for student life that, unfortunately, are just not things that we could currently work on with the mentioned neighbourhoods that we are a part of. Thinking maybe being part of the Currie electoral district would be something that would be greatly beneficial to all students, not just the Mount Royal students but other neighbourhoods around as well. There are various different institutions that are around that area that are not necessarily just postsecondary.

Miss Abu Hayyaneh: Yeah. We're happy to take any questions that you might have about the specific Mount Royal situation, and if there's any data, any more information that we can provide, then we can definitely submit that to you in addition to what we've already submitted.

The Chair: I'm curious to know – maybe it's public knowledge and I should know – what's the student population of Mount Royal?

Miss Abu Hayyaneh: Including credit and noncredit students, we have just above 15,000 students at the moment; 75 per cent of them are Calgary local residents, so that is a huge population that Mount Royal serves in the Calgary community in terms of supplying postsecondary to that community. We have local Calgarians that attend Mount Royal, 75 per cent of them. Then we expand beyond Calgary, so the outside community, and then within Alberta as well. Then our international student population is just under 5 per cent,

and then we have students that come from all across Canada as well in the other 25 per cent.

The Chair: You could be classified as the city's university.

Miss Abu Hayyaneh: You know, we are in the northwest, so we'll be respectful of our U of C folks.

The Chair: Okay.

Other questions or comments?

Dr. Martin: Well, thank you for that. As I told the presenter from the student union at the University of Calgary, I'm on the Board of Governors at MacEwan University, so I understand about the important effects on a town of having this population of students and the difficulty of finding adequate housing units.

I wanted, though, to ask you something about your assertion of the student numbers. Is that full-time learning equivalent numbers?

Miss Abu Hayyaneh: Yes. That is the data that we received from MRU. This is the most recent data that we received for 2024, but our population is constantly growing, so we can always come back with more updated numbers if need be.

I appreciate the context that you're providing for being at MacEwan. MacEwan is a very similar-sized institution to us, and similar-sized institutions in Alberta, like Mount Royal and MacEwan, sometimes tend to be overlooked compared to the other bigger universities in the province in terms of the funding that we receive, in terms of the community service that we provide.

We serve a larger population of Alberta residents as in comparison to bigger universities, and in terms of provincial representation when it comes to the Ministry of Advanced Education and how we are funded, we're actually not being funded adequately, and I think that is a big part of how we would want our electoral districts to really reflect the university situation as well in terms of grant funding.

2:00

Dr. Martin: Well, I won't comment on any of that, but I was startled by your remark about perhaps moving into Calgary-Currie. Is that a function of grand disappointment, or is the grass just greener over there?

Miss Abu Hayyaneh: We can always come back with that. We can always come back to you with more information about that. That is something that we started to look into, actually, after we submitted our document to you in May. We kind of started looking into more research in case we got more questions about our submission, but I can always come back to you with that.

Dr. Martin: Well, in practice you would have to come back to the commission more generally than to me in particular, but perhaps Mr. Roth would be able to give you the contact information you need. Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Clark.

Mr. Clark: Just remind me, and apologies if it was in your written submission, more residences being developed on campus: is that something that you see happening?

Miss Abu Hayyaneh: I can't speak specifically to the Mount Royal situation, because as far as I know Mount Royal is still paying off the mortgage on the previous residence that was built 10 years ago for west residences. Until that is paid off and if we receive more funding, there could be a possibility, but right now MRU is . . .

Mr. Clark: There's nothing imminent to open.

Miss Abu Hayyaneh: Not at the moment. Yeah.

Mr. Clark: Okay. That's helpful. Thank you.

Miss Abu Hayyaneh: But our east residences are in need of reconstruction, and that is an opportunity for us to build more on-campus housing.

Mr. Clark: They certainly are. Yeah. Thank you.

The Chair: Mrs. Sampson.

Mrs. Samson: Thank you for coming out and stepping up. I just wanted to let you know that, when we were in Edmonton, both Grant MacEwan and the University of Alberta made a presentation on behalf of the student population, so I must say that you are all jointly heard. Thank you for that.

Miss Abu Hayyaneh: Thank you. That's what we do.

The Chair: Mr. Evans?

Mr. Evans: Nothing. No questions. Thank you.

The Chair: Maybe you said it, and maybe it's in your written presentation, but any idea what the resident population is on MRU's campus?

Miss Abu Hayyaneh: I believe that our west residence has over 1,000 beds, so there is that student population that resides on campus, and we are actually at capacity with our residence every semester now, every year. For the last two years we've actually had a wait list of above 100 students also needing housing. We also do have Indigenous housing on campus that specifically supports Indigenous families and mature students. That is also a population to be considered.

The Chair: Okay. Well, thank you very much, and thank you for spontaneously coming up as we ask questions.

Miss Abu Hayyaneh: Thank you for your time, and we'll follow up with the other information that we've been requested.

Mrs. Samson: Perfect. Thank you.

The Chair: Marty Heeg? Please proceed.

Mr. Heeg: Okay. Well, thank you very much. As you know, my name is Marty Heeg. I'm from Calgary-Glenmore, live in the Lakeview neighbourhood in Calgary-Glenmore with my wife, Jane. I have three children, two stepkids and a daughter, and I've lived in Alberta for 45 years. I've been very fortunate to have a couple of good careers in Alberta. Initially, for the first 15 years of my professional life I was a sportscaster back in the heyday when Alberta won six Stanley Cups in seven years. That was primarily with CBC. Also, the last 30 years I've been a clinical social worker. The last 15 years a lot of my clinical social work hasn't been so much counselling but more in the areas of organizational development, leadership development, and a lot with universities, the University of Calgary and the University of Saskatchewan.

I give you this background because I think that it certainly impacts my lens as I share with you today about my perceptions of Calgary-Glenmore. I'm very interested in young people. That's another element of my discussion I think today.

With Calgary-Glenmore I would see it at this point in time as a very credible riding. It makes sense to me. There's a lot of connectedness among neighbourhoods. I have friends and acquaintances in Woodbine and in Oakridge and throughout our riding, you know, Haysboro. It's a riding I think where there's a lot of connectedness with needs and, at the same time, unique needs. I'm not an expert in electoral boundaries, but what I'm saying I guess is that it seems to be a credible way of having things put together.

What I observe is that there's a big difference between where I live and my experience and the friends I have in Springbank and the friends and family I have in rural Alberta. I guess this is kind of obvious, but in some sense I think that's a, you know, pretty basic fundamental consideration at this point in time. Again, I see unique needs. I see connectedness, and I see that we're different from other jurisdictions. To me, it seems like at this point in time our provincial electoral boundaries are kind of lined up as far as our riding goes with our municipal boundaries.

I think that the piece that I wanted to touch on with you folks today in some ways relates to credibility and the credibility of the Calgary-Glenmore riding. Really, what I come to you with today – and I know you folks understand this, and I say this very respectfully – is as a 69-year-old guy who's really concerned about young people. I guess, more than anything what I try to focus on in my discussions is supporting voter engagement and decisions that make sense, that create folks having interest. I think about my daughter and my niece and nephew, who are younger people, and: how do we keep them aligned with our process?

When I look at what we're dealing with today, I see that Calgary-Glenmore is credible. When I was a leadership trainer at university, the primary paradigm in the curriculum lots of times – and you folks have practised this or you wouldn't be as successful as you are – was credibility. Does it make sense? Am I believable? I think that also another key component today – and this kind of comes from my other career – is competitiveness. I think lots of times competitiveness really impacts credibility.

I talk about this stuff with my kids, and where I'm going with that is that I think that competition lots of times is very good for credibility. You know, we make our case, we see what happens, and the best case wins. I think that where things get difficult is when competition gets a little bit too intense, and there's temptation to push it too hard.

I go back to my sports life, and I'll give you a recent example. I think that the Canadian soccer program was very credible. I think that they lost some credibility last year before the Olympics because the temptation to win got to be too extreme, and we had that drone issue. My heart sank when that happened, and that's what I don't want to see my kids experience in the political system. I think that it already probably has to some degree. I know that you folks understand this, and I just say it respectfully, but I think that's, you know, the piece that I kind of have my eye on: credibility, competition. Is there a balance?

It's easy to rationalize, and I think the Oilers did a bit of this last night. You know, the other guys are doing it, right? I think that's a tricky point in all of this.

Really, I mean, I'm a person who worked as a leadership consultant and a therapist and challenged myself about my awareness and my blind spots, and this is what I just try to talk to people about today. No matter what their political stripe or no matter what the conversation is, if it's appropriate, I try to raise this idea of, you know: are we rationalizing? Are we being honest with ourselves? Are we trying to create a fair game?

2:10

I really thank you for your time and your efforts. I really respect your contribution here. Again, I'm, you know, grateful just to be with you today, so thank you.

On television I always came out on time. Seven minutes.

The Chair: And now we'll have the sports.

Thank you very much, Mr. Heeg.

Any questions, Mr. Evans, or comments?

Mr. Evans: I'm interested in looking at – when you look at the current electoral district, is there really connectivity within that electoral district with the northern part, which is on the other side of the Glenmore reservoir, as compared with those that are on the south side?

Mr. Heeg: Yeah. That's a great question. I mean, I haven't tried to develop any data to support that, but my sense is, knowing folks in those neighbourhoods, there seems to be a good connectiveness. As you point out, like, we're on the north side. We're in Lakeview there. I have a good friend in Oakridge. It seems like we have common things, unique needs. That's what it seems like to me.

Mr. Evans: Is there something that draws Lakeview south, that's on the south side of Glenmore, that you drive over there to shop, to go to church, whatever you do?

Mr. Heeg: Yeah. Well, I mean, we do those sorts of things over there, certainly, you know, shopping and visiting people and playing sports and that kind of thing. Other than that, in terms of natural connections, again it's more just my experience than anything else that informs me of that.

Mr. Evans: Isn't it difficult to drive there?

Mr. Heeg: Not particularly, no. It's interesting for me. My wife and I moved from Edgemont about three years ago. It's really interesting just how much time we spend in those southern areas now because it's fairly accessible. You know, it probably takes me, at the most, 12, 14 minutes to get to the very south part of our area there.

Mr. Evans: Thank you.

Mr. Heeg: Thank you.

The Chair: Ms Samson, any questions?

Mrs. Samson: Thank you.

Thank you for the different approach of your presentation to us, and I really appreciate that.

Mr. Heeg: Thank you.

Mrs. Samson: All of us around the table here are new to this work. I believe that the boundaries – that is, the start, the grassroots – is really the foundation of democracy that we're going to build on and that we're going to showcase to the rest of Albertans. This is not a question. I can guarantee you that from myself. I will do the job, and when it does not align with the things I have heard here, it will be in the report. We're opening it up for a second look after we write it. I had no idea it was going to be this complex or difficult. We're going to please some of the people some of the time, and we're going to try really hard.

Mr. Heeg: Thank you very much. I really respect that.

Mrs. Samson: Thank you.

Dr. Martin: I'm struggling to find a way to exclude the Earl Grey golf course. He's a member. I don't think I'll succeed.

I'm really interested in your point of view as a clinical social worker. My mother was a medical social worker, so I understand the heroic work that gets involved. Do you feel that you have built out a robust infrastructure for children and youths to provide the opportunities and the training that goes along with soccer programs and swimming programs and whatever particular program is devised? Do you think your ED is rich in these kind of cultural infrastructure activities?

Mr. Heeg: What a great question. I think there's a tremendous amount of growth that could happen and building in those areas. I mean, I look at counselling and clinical social work in a very broad sense in that every opportunity is a learning opportunity, and there can be so much that could be built into sports in a more formal way where people can, you know, learn how to work through their feelings of failure or their feelings of grandiosity, in my case, those sorts of things where you can have a growth opportunity. I think that's a great idea, and I think there's a lot of potential for that. So the answer would be no, I don't think it's been really built up.

Dr. Martin: Okay. This was my way, actually, of trying to see if the areas south of the reservoir cohere.

Mr. Heeg: That's a good question. I mean, I'm just not that familiar at this point in my career with how things are connected there. I don't have any, you know, formal role in that way. Yeah.

Dr. Martin: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Heeg: Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Clark.

Mr. Clark: Yeah. Thanks. One of the nice benefits we get in this job is that you get to go around the province and see different places. For my fellow commissioners: this feels a lot like Edmonton-Riverview to me, where you've got two sides, so a recognition. Go ahead and look at the map and you'll see it's similar; it's on two sides of the North Saskatchewan in Edmonton.

I think your point is right. You come out of Glenmore Trail, and you make a right-hand turn. You make a right-hand turn on 14th Street, and you're down to the shopping areas down there. So, yeah, I can see how this all hangs together.

I did want to ask a bigger or kind of general question based on one of your opening comments. Maybe you can kind of bring it back full circle to that. You talked about: Calgary-Glenmore, Springbank, and rural Alberta are all kind of different things. Can you maybe quantify that or just speak to what that means and what that looks like to you?

Mr. Heeg: Well, I mean, I think that a lot of it is based on kind of a vibe. You know, when I talk to people about their needs, their interests, some of it is observable. When I'm out in Oyen, visiting with my cousin, it's obviously different. I think it's structurally different in terms of the residences. I'm sure there's lots of socioeconomic data.

You know, I grew up in Saskatchewan, and I had a keen sense of community there. I went to school in one little community and I played ball and hockey over here at another community, that were 20 miles apart, and it was just different. It was just a gut feeling. Now, I know now that if I were to go back and look at the data, that was mixed farming. They didn't have the kind of quality of land

that we had over here, and they were just different. I mean, I think those are the kinds of things that we are trying to represent because there's a unique need, and I think the same thing would be happening between Springbank and what's happening in Calgary-Glenmore.

Mr. Clark: All right. That's helpful. Thank you very much.

Mr. Heeg: Thank you.

The Chair: What part of Saskatchewan did you grow up in?

Mr. Heeg: A farming area just east of Rosetown.

The Chair: Okay. I'm from Saskatchewan as well. Thanks for the shout-out there.

Mr. Heeg: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Heeg. You're excused.

I believe that takes care of all of the presenters before our break, so why not make use of the time. We'll have our break now. There's no one else in the room that is scheduled to present that hasn't presented, I assume. Okay. We'll take our 10-minute break now, and then when we return at about 2:35 – I'll be generous, for 10 minutes – then hopefully we can continue the list.

[The hearing adjourned from 2:20 p.m. to 2:44 p.m.]

The Chair: Our first presenter is Ms Bernadett Maxwell. Normally we have seven minutes for presentation. Then we have three or four minutes for questions and dialogue from the commissioners. Please proceed.

Ms Maxwell: Okay. I haven't done this before. Anyways, good afternoon, and thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Bernadett Maxwell. I live in South Calgary. I'm here to respectfully request adjustments to the Calgary-Elbow electoral district to ensure fair representation and help address what I and many residents see as a case of modern gerrymandering in this electoral district. The current boundaries carve up some of the communities in ways that dilute their voice and misalign with the realities of how people live, work, and connect.

First, I urge the commission to include the community of Richmond-Knob Hill within the Calgary-Elbow electoral area. The Richmond-Knob Hill community is closely aligned with the other Marda Loop communities of Altadore, River park, Garrison Woods in South Calgary, which are all part of the Marda Loop Communities Association. These neighbourhoods are tightly knit, with shared schools, parks, and the Marda Loop business district. These two community associations also work together on various development and planning matters with the city related to the development in Marda Loop. I'll go back to the map in a minute.

Second, I propose that the Lakeview community in its entirety be included in Calgary-Elbow. It makes no sense to split part of a community across multiple electoral districts. Glamorgan could be removed and Lakeview included, which also fits more naturally within the Calgary-Elbow district as it lies directly south of existing Calgary-Elbow communities and shares similar demographic, economic, and social characteristics. In contrast, Glamorgan is much further west, with a distinct community profile, and should be grouped accordingly.

Third, I recommend removing Lower Mount Royal from Calgary-Elbow and including it in Calgary-Buffalo. Lower Mount Royal is a highly urban neighbourhood very near the 17th avenue

entertainment area with very different needs and priorities than the largely residential, mixed-density communities to the south and west of it. Its inclusion in Calgary-Elbow skews representation and doesn't reflect community cohesion.

Fourth, when considering the amount of development and growth within the Marda Loop area communities projected to add 3,000 new residents in the next two years, it may be necessary to shift Lincoln Park to Calgary-Currie to get the correct projected numbers within each area. I don't know what number targets you're working at, but I have some numbers on growth and development that we're projecting in Marda Loop.

In summary, the boundaries for Calgary-Elbow should more naturally include the communities between Macleod Trail and Crowchild Trail from east to west and between Glenmore Trail and 26th Avenue, Prospect Avenue from south to north, and if additional numbers are still needed in the district once you consider the expected growth, then you might want to look at a couple of communities west of Crowchild Trail towards 37th Street like Rutland Park and Lincoln Park, which are currently included. This grouping would better respect the historical, social, and geographic realities and strengthen democratic representation.

Thank you for your time and your efforts to ensure Alberta's electoral map is fair, functional, and community focused. I'm just going to take a minute and kind of point out on the map what I'm saying.

The Chair: Please. Yeah, step forward and do that.

Ms Maxwell: Okay. Basically, what I'm saying is that I think this area here is good. I'm not sure why Lakeview is split. Half of Lakeview is here and half of Lakeview is there, so I'm saying that rather than having Glamorgan included, you should include Lakeview. Then I'm also saying – up here is Richmond, and we live in south Calgary. We work closely with the Richmond community association. There's a lot of development in Marda Loop, so the community associations are working together. That's why I was saying that should be included as well. Lower Mount Royal, so up here in that area: you could split that off on Prospect Avenue because, again, that's more urban; that's more downtown. Then this would kind of just create this nice little square.

What I'm not sure of is your numbers. You may want to include these two communities of Rutland Park and Lincoln Park, but I've got some numbers that I can give you. I'm on the development committee for the Marda Loop Communities Association, and we did kind of a presentation on the growth that we're experiencing in Marda Loop. Basically, there are 1,894 residential units between development stage, recently completed, under construction development, rezoning, or coming soon, so about 2,000 units.

The Chair: In Marda Loop alone?

Ms Maxwell: In Marda Loop. Yeah. That's the communities of Altadore, Garrison Woods, and South Calgary. They're projected somewhere either between low, medium, or high. You know, the medium amount is about 3,000 new residents in the next two years, so you need to consider that when you're looking at the boundaries as well because otherwise your numbers will be out very quickly.

Mr. Evans: Did you say 3,000?

Ms Maxwell: Three thousand. Yeah.
That's all I've got.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you, and you're in the amber zone. Thank you. Did you say you've never done this before?

Ms Maxwell: No.

The Chair: Well, you're a pro by all appearances.

I'm sure there will be some questions. Mr. Clark?

2:50

Mr. Clark: Yeah. I'm just looking back here. I've gone back as far as 2003, so Calgary-Elbow, at least dated to 2003 – I'm just frantically flipping to 1996, but Calgary-Elbow has fundamentally looked the same since at least 2003. Like I say, I'm trying to find the maps from 1996 so I can kind of get back to that. It hasn't changed a lot. It's sort of been a little bit – that little bottom bit there, I agree, is a bit odd. Glenmore Trail is obviously your natural boundary. We've looked at this. It's technically North Glenmore Park. That's where the community hall is. Glenmore Trail has historically been the boundary.

Part of our struggle is that we've got constituencies that are about average on number, Calgary-Elbow being one of them. It has basically tracked the average. We're trying to not have changes that are going to cascade. So is Calgary-Currie, and kind of so are the adjacent constituencies.

I don't really know if I necessarily have a question. More just in response to some of your submission, I think part of the rationale for why it is what it is is the population. I would really be interested in if you have that development data and details.

Ms Maxwell: I do.

Mr. Clark: If you can give that to Aaron, that would be fantastic. We'll get that uploaded to our portal. That's really helpful.

Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Julian, any questions?

Dr. Martin: Yes. Thank you. We had the MLA in earlier this morning.

Ms Maxwell: Oh, okay.

Dr. Martin: He suggested, yes, growth but very incremental. He characterized it largely as basement suites going legal and things of that sort. Do you see that kind of activity in the neighbourhoods you have been speaking of this afternoon?

Ms Maxwell: There is some of that, but I'm on the development committee for Marda Loop. You know, they're proposing two 19-storey towers on 33rd. They're proposing an 18-storey on 34th, and all along 33rd everything is going six storeys. There are two or three land-use amendments coming up on 33rd for six-storey, 50-unit buildings, I think three of them.

In the information that I passed out, we were kind of looking at, you know, trying to understand how much – there's a lot of housing development, and there's no green space. That's kind of the analysis that we were doing to come up with it. That's where we came up with the 3,000 people. That's a 25 per cent increase of what Marda Loop is right now. Again, just those three communities, South Calgary, Garrison, and Altadore. That 25 per cent in two years is based on the development permits that are under way or in progress.

Dr. Martin: Well, thank you for that. You know, people do talk to us about growth in very general terms, and who can deny that that is happening in a general sort of way? But for our purposes it's valuable to know that there is growth that's imminent and tangible. They've scraped the dirt. They're starting to put in the girders. I call it the Tyvek test. We can't project too far in the future, can we?

What you've suggested, then, is that you are convinced that the planning permits and permissions that have been given out signalled the beginning of construction.

Ms Maxwell: Yes. Yes. It's kind of detailed more on those slides. There were five categories: recently completed, they've applied for land use, they've applied for development permits, they're in progress. But those are pretty imminent stages. Like, within a couple of years even the ones that are in planning will be under development if not completed.

Dr. Martin: Thank you.

Mrs. Samson: I was just going to say that the number we're working at for our purposes is 55,000 approximately, plus or minus 25 per cent. That doesn't mean that Calgary-Elbow is sitting perfect – there is always room for change – but that's the number we're going to work around.

Ms Maxwell: Okay. That's good. Yeah. I'm not sure, again, what the numbers are in Glamorgan versus Lakeview. I was just basically trying to draw a more or less perfect square so it doesn't look quite as gerrymandered as it does right now.

Mrs. Samson: Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Evans?

Mr. Evans: No questions. Thank you.

Ms Maxwell: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Well, thank you very much, Ms Maxwell. You're excused.

Okay. Julie Pithers. Good afternoon.

Ms Pithers: Good afternoon. Sorry. I was hoping to hear more people before I came up. I haven't done this before. Thank you for the opportunity. Let's see. I guess I'll just fire away.

The Chair: Yeah. Just introduce yourself. Tell us what electoral division you're from.

Ms Pithers: All right. Julie Pithers. I'm from Banff-Kananaskis.

Well, as you have just found out, I'm from what would be considered a rural riding. We have lots of small towns in it. It's a big, big riding and goes all the way up to Jasper. But I don't feel that I'm owed any more of a vote than anybody in the city here. I have the feeling that – and I should have looked this up beforehand. Certainly, the vast majority of our population is in the cities, but I would imagine the second most is surrounding the cities. I, like most of those people, will commute into the city, will use the city's many, many services and products and not pay the municipal taxes that the people in the city pay. I pay lower taxes than people who have the same kind of house that I have and the same amount of property I have. I believe that is my benefit of living in the country, where I also get peace and quiet. Yes, I don't have a library right beside me, but we live in 2025, so I can download library books all day long and phone Cochrane and update my library card should I need to.

I think that having large cities is important, and I think people who live in large cities put up with an awful lot that I don't have to put up with between sirens and road closures and everything else that, you know, often benefits me. I might be the one in the ambulance with the siren going. They shouldn't have a lesser vote than I have. I don't know too much about my own district, if I have

1.5 votes or 1 to 1 almost, but I do know that lots of rural ridings have – each person's vote is worth much more than somebody who lives downtown here.

I've been reading some stories about people who believe that they should have more of a say in government because they live in an area where raw materials are brought to bear given, you know, royalties and so on to our province, and it's worth a lot. Sure. But that's saying that people who are rich should have more of a vote than people who are poor, and money and business shouldn't have anything to do with democracy. To that logic, are we saying that the lumber producer brings more value than the construction company; therefore, the lumber person should have more say in what goes on every single day of our lives?

One of the other things was that somebody said that it was really important for them to see their MLA face to face, and they have to drive hundreds of kilometres to see them. Well, I've seen my MLA once, and she came pretty close to my house, and I went out and saw her, and it was no big deal. Again, we live in 2025. We can phone or Facetime or Zoom or whatever we want with our MLA.

But if we were going to do something for this province, it would be massive broadband for everybody in the rural ridings as well, that would allow them to have this face to face that is so valuable.

3:00

Finally, I think, just for the sake of making things straightforward, our democracy of just counting people, where your vote is worth this much and your vote is worth this much, is the easiest way for us to be a proper democracy and not have many, many people condensed into one place where they don't have as much say over something that's so important to us all and they're putting up with an awful lot that we in the country don't have to put up with.

My feeling about this is that it should be 1 to 1 as much as possible and more ridings should be in the big cities because a big part of the power of this province is there.

Thank you very much.

The Chair: Well, thank you, Ms Pithers. The commissioners will have, I'm sure, some questions starting with Mr. Evans.

Mr. Evans: No questions, but thank you for your submission.

The Chair: Mrs. Samson?

Mrs. Samson: Thanks. No. That was good, but I don't have any questions.

Ms Pithers: Thank you.

The Chair: Can I ask you what part of B-K do you live in?

Ms Pithers: I'm Elbow Valley, so just out of highway 8, almost on the border of the city these days, especially with the Stoney Trail.

The Chair: Okay. Dr. Martin?

Dr. Martin: No, but thank you.

Mr. Clark: I will just thank you very much for your presentation. That was great.

Ms Pithers: All right. Well, thank you very much for the opportunity.

Mr. Clark: Thank you.

The Chair: And just so you know, Banff-Cochrane has been fairly represented today. It must be some tourism thing.

Mr. Clark: Exactly.

Ms Pithers: I grew up in the area, too. I came from Springbank, so Cochrane is my arch enemy.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Ms Pithers: Thank you.

The Chair: Michael Parker.

Mr. Parker: Yeah, you don't need to change the map.

Thanks. My name is Mike Parker. I appreciate the time to talk to you today. I'm very fortunate to live in the summer village of Waiparous, which is actually in the riding of Banff-Kananaskis.

I do think it is a unique riding. It is a blend of First Nations, tourism, agriculture, and ranching. As far as my personal experience, I've worked in the oil and gas industry for 40 years; also currently a member of our volunteer fire department. Of the last 23 years most of them have been in Alberta. I've lived 10 years in Calgary before. In 2016 I moved out to Waiparous, which is in the Ghost River valley. I think that gives me a unique perspective on kind of the differences of what – as the prior speaker said, there definitely is a difference of what's important to people living in the city. I lived in the inner city of Calgary, and what was important to me then is definitely different than what's important to me now living in the Ghost valley.

I've got about four key requests that I'd like to ask the commission to consider as you move forward with your work. I'll summarize them, and then I'll go over a little bit more detail.

First is that the ridings be fair and logical. I'll get to that more in a minute. I think communities within an area that have the same issues, same concerns should be grouped within a riding. I also think, because the ridings are going to be in effect for 10 years, that not only the current population but the future population, any growth, should be considered when you're looking at the boundaries. And then the last one is, for a couple of reasons I'll point out, that Banff-Kananaskis probably should stay close. The boundaries should not be changed much.

As far as a fair and logical riding – as you probably noticed from my accent, I'm not originally from Canada. Up until 2002 I lived in the U.S. One of the things I noticed when I moved to Canada was that the ridings actually kind of looked very logical. The ones within the cities were within the cities. You know, they had kind of a logical shape, and it appeared that most of the communities that were in the riding had similar likes, interests, and stuff. This is very different than I was used to in the States, where due to gerrymandering a lot of the ridings look completely ridiculous, all for the explicit purpose of trying to marginalize one party's votes.

Like I said, I think Alberta has done a great job up to now. I just ask that you continue that policy of coming up with logical ridings. Communities with similar interests being in the same riding kind of ties back to my first point. I think that as much as possible, to allow the MLA to accurately and effectively represent their riding, it helps if most of the people within the communities have similar interests, likes, concerns, you know, economic issues, geographic commonalities.

If you look at Banff-Kananaskis, we've got Lake Louise, Banff, Canmore, Bow Valley, the Ghost River valley. Then on the west side we do have several. We have a community, Springbank, west side of Calgary. We have Springbank, Bragg Creek, and while at first glance there are definitely differences between them, one of the things that is common within our riding is that the environment, tourism, wildlife preservation is very important to those that live in the riding. I can say that as someone that has lived both in Calgary

and in the Ghost River valley, our issues are definitely different than people that live in Cochrane or Calgary, and I think it would be a disservice to both groups to lump them together or to mix them. I think we both need MLAs that can represent our concerns.

Next one. As far as future growth I think my understanding is that the current population is 52,000. Actually, I think we are close to 1 to 1. So we're a little bit below the average. I know that you all are shooting for the 55,000. However, Banff-Kananaskis has shown significant growth in the last few years, unlike other rural ridings. Actually, because of the recent approval of several development projects in Canmore, within the next 10 years Canmore is going to be probably adding about 14,000, almost doubling in size due to the new housing developments. That in itself, without considering the other growth happening in Bragg Creek and up where I live, would add probably almost 30 per cent to the riding.

Again, you know, I know you all are based on your numbers today, but I do think there will be – by the time you come around the next time, there will be significant growth. So I think it would be better if we're close to that 55,000 now and not up around that plus 25 per cent that you all are allowed.

Then the last item. You know, as far as my reasoning for why Banff-Kananaskis boundaries shouldn't be changed, besides the reason I just said, it's actually only been a riding since 2015. In the last redraw it used to be that Cochrane was in with Banff. Significant redraw on the last time, and it is growing, continues to grow. I think, while it is a diverse riding, we do have a commonality of love of the environment and love for the place we live. So I think our desire would be for the most part – I understand there will be tweaks – to try to keep the riding as it is just because it is fairly new.

With that, I'd just like to close by saying that, again, you know, I think Banff-Kananaskis is unique and also because of tourism and other things offers a lot to the Alberta economy and just ask that you consider my request in your work as you move forward.

The Chair: Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Clark, any questions?

3:10

Mr. Clark: Yeah. First, thank you very much for your presentation. The context you've provided and your unique background, having chosen to move to Canada and having had that experience in the U.S., is really not something that we've heard yet, and I find that really compelling.

Also, a reminder that part of our role here is about clear and understandable boundaries. What I've heard is that you've talked about a couple of aspects of that, just the natural communities of interest, but also that it's only been around for a couple of elections. The numbers are sort of right around the midpoint, and you've got some predictable growth. Sort of a bunch of things I'm hearing, that are fairly compelling to say, you know, that probably this is one, at least in my estimation, that may not be worth, that we want to be careful, I guess, about. In some of the previous presentations I've talked about putting the Stoney Nakoda nations perhaps together, adding on pieces, which wouldn't have a massive impact kind of population-wise. I guess maybe I would ask: if we do need to make some of those sorts of tweaks, are there particular parts of the constituency that you feel don't fit in terms of like with like?

Mr. Parker: I would say that the one that doesn't fit is Elbow Valley.

Mr. Clark: Okay.

Mr. Parker: Unlike Springbank, most of – I mean they are close to town. They do use it. But it's more acreages typically in Springbank.

I mean, Elbow Valley, for the most part, is a subdivision. It just happens to be outside of the city limits of Calgary.

Mr. Clark: Right.

Mr. Parker: That would be my one.

Mr. Clark: Yeah. That's helpful. Thank you.

The Chair: Dr. Martin.

Dr. Martin: I've got to ask: what part of the U.S. did you come from?

Mr. Parker: Texas. Yeah. My wife and I are both graduates from UT.

Dr. Martin: We're bonded.

I wanted to press you further on your growth assertions, which I've heard about from other people today who are in your riding, so I'm not disputing the fact. I just want, first of all, to get the number again. You had suggested that in the coming decade, as the various known development permits convert themselves into buildings . . .

Mr. Parker: Right.

Dr. Martin: . . . that you might have as many as 20,000 added. Was that the number?

Mr. Parker: Fourteen thousand is one number that I've seen just for the Three Sisters development.

Dr. Martin: Yeah.

Mr. Parker: I think there are a couple other smaller developments. I think Silver Creek is adding some, and there's another that I've seen up to 17,000 potential. But, yeah, I was quoting the Three Sisters, which is the one that had been in – I'm expecting it's going to go very fast because it's the one that's been planned for 20 years. It's been in dispute and then, finally, just this last year, was approved. I think, yeah, it's going to be, I would expect, fairly quick that they start building on it. Now, the 14,000 would be, obviously, over a long period of time.

Dr. Martin: Okay. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Correct me if I'm wrong though, sir. Isn't that Three Sisters still in litigation?

Mr. Parker: No.

The Chair: It's been concluded?

Mr. Parker: It's been concluded, yes.

The Chair: Okay. So it is not a contingent.

Mr. Parker: No. It has been approved. I think last summer, if I remember right, or late in the year.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Parker: Yeah.

Mrs. Samson: Thank you. We had other people present on Banff-Kananaskis, and it was brought to our attention that for things

coming in, we should look at Eden Valley and the Bighorn reserve, and we should take Millarville out because Millarville is split. Do you have any comments on those? Or are you familiar with those areas where they are residing?

Mr. Parker: Millarville, I am. The other two, the Bighorn . . .

Mrs. Samson: Bighorn reserve and Eden Valley. They're both Indigenous areas.

The Chair: In other districts right now.

Mrs. Samson: They're not in, but they're all part of the same.

Mr. Parker: Okay. Yeah. I would say that bringing them in probably would make sense then. Like you said, I think, if it is the First Nations, you know, it would make sense to pull them together.

Millarville. I would say that, unlike Elbow Valley that's very distinct, Millarville is not much different than Priddis or even – you know, we have ranchers and agriculture up where I am in the Ghost valley. So there's not a reason, I would say, to particularly move it out. However, if Millarville is split, then I would say yeah. I mean, I think moving it out would probably make sense. If I was Millarville, I would not want to be split.

It is also very, if you look at it – as the prior speaker mentioned, she had met with her MLA, and that's because our MLA actually goes around every month because our riding is so big, actually has sessions, like, all over the county.

Mrs. Samson: All the communities. Nice.

Mr. Parker: Yeah. Basically, to get to Millarville, she's doing an hour and a half drive to get down to Millarville, so it is on the far end of the riding. I mean, I think that would be an area, if it was split, that would logically stay.

Mrs. Samson: Okay. And just for clarification, you said that it would be a better fit with Elbow Valley out? Did I understand you correctly?

Mr. Parker: Yeah. Whereas Millarville, I wouldn't say there's a reason to move it except for if it's split; then I understand. Elbow Valley: I would say that if you look at it, the people there are people that are working in Calgary. I think it is a different – it is a neighbourhood. There's really nothing different about Elbow Valley other than, you know, a subdivision in Calgary.

Mrs. Samson: Okay. Great. Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Evans, any questions?

Mr. Evans: Yeah. You live in the summer village of . . .

Mr. Parker: Waiparous.

Mr. Evans: Okay. And if I've got it right, it's about 50 people.

Mr. Parker: Yeah. I think there are 70 homes. It was initially developed in the early '60s as a summer village, and I think about 50 per cent of the houses now are full-time residents. So, yeah, that 50 sounds right.

Mr. Evans: Actually, it says 64, and then Ghost Lake is 75. How close are the two together?

Mr. Parker: Ghost is about, as the crow flies, 10 kilometres. Driving, it's about a 25-minute drive.

Mr. Evans: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Parker: If I can point it out, this is Ghost Lake. Actually, that little white area you can see right between the lake and the reserve: that's Ghost Lake right there.

Mr. Evans: Oh, okay.

Mr. Parker: This is highway 40. This is Waiparous Creek, this is Ghost River, and the summer village of Waiparous is right there at the intersection.

Mr. Evans: So how far are you from Canmore?

Mr. Parker: Thirty kilometres. We go to Canmore for groceries and stuff.

Mr. Evans: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Parker. Much appreciated. Your insights are valuable. I'll excuse you, but feel free to stay and hear the rest of the presentations.

Mr. Parker: Yeah. Thanks a lot.

The Chair: Our next two don't appear to be here, so Kathleen Ganley, half an hour early.

Ms Ganley: That's exciting. Okay. Well, thank you very much, and thanks for having me early. I'll wait till the riding is up. Oh, there it is.

Good afternoon. Thanks for having me here. I'm Kathleen Ganley. I'm the MLA for Calgary-Mountain View, and I've had the incredible privilege of serving in that role since 2019. I was first elected to the Legislative Assembly in 2015, representing Calgary-Buffalo. I served as the Minister of Justice and Solicitor General for four years and the minister of then aboriginal relations, now Indigenous Relations, for eight months. I'm here today to make representations for the people in my community but also to speak to the larger issues of maintaining a fair system that respects the votes of Albertans and maintains faith in our institutions.

I'd like to thank the commission, to begin with, for your service. I think the work you're here today to do is incredibly important, and it'll affect the right to representation of the people of this province. I'm partisan, obviously, but I'm also a big believer in democracy, and the work you do today will set the process for institutions. That is more important than the aims of any political party.

Calgary-Mountain View is an inner-city riding. Many of the communities I represent have been around for half a century and many for considerably more than that. They're amazing places. One of both the main stresses and opportunities in our communities is growth. Many neighbourhoods are revitalizing and densifying. There's a tension between those who want to preserve the communities they love as they always have been and those who need more housing supply in order to afford to live there.

3:20

Community schools are bursting at the seams, including the elementary school my own daughter attends, which is currently a K to 5 school instead of K to 6, to accommodate so many students. The communities in Calgary-Mountain View, I would say, share a lot in common with the immediate adjoining communities. There is a natural boundary, as you can see, on the south there. That is the Bow River that lies between Mountain View and Buffalo, but in terms of the other divisions, like, the communities are similar to one

another, but they're also similar, I would say, to the immediately adjoining communities in some ways. I would say that, you know, those immediately adjoining communities all sort of share a certain community of interest.

What I would say are probably the top concerns: shortage of housing supply, high costs, stagnating wages, overcrowded schools and hospitals are some of the most common concerns in the communities I represent but also, I would say, in the immediately adjoining communities. These inner-city communities I do think need to be kept together because they share a commonality of interest, but I'm not going to argue for sort of specific boundaries one way or the other, because those inner-city neighbourhoods tend to share quite a lot in common and, because my riding is in the middle of all of them in the north, there's a lot of commonality.

What is relevant, I think, is that these concerns differ from concerns in rural areas, and I'd like to highlight some of the ways in which they do so. For instance, schools in Calgary are overutilized. Libraries and gym stages have been used as classrooms. By contrast, communities where schools are underutilized in rural areas struggle to cover the basic costs associated with infrastructure. While students in Calgary may struggle due to overcrowded classrooms, in rural communities fewer students means that there may not be enough teachers to have specialists in different subject areas such as computer science or even physics.

My constituents in Calgary generally face hospitals bursting at the seams while those in rural Alberta face closed ERs. Both are significant challenges, but they're different. Calgary is a community that is growing rapidly, putting strain on services. That presents different challenges than communities that are shrinking or struggling to stay afloat as a result.

Those concerns deserve to be represented – all of them – but they're different, and it's the job of this commission to recognize that and to keep those communities of interest together per section 14 of the act. I believe the municipalities are communities of interest. This seems like an obvious point, but I think it's also critical. Municipalities have historically been communities of interest, and that has been respected by this commission, with very limited exceptions. And I would argue that this should continue to be the case. Those who argue otherwise, in my opinion, bear the onus of proving it. The burden of proof should rest with them, because they are the ones arguing for a change, and I truly struggle to see how they could possibly prove that diluting different interests would better represent anyone.

The point of representative democracy is for communities to have their different interests represented. This is still reflected in the act today. Section 14(b) references "communities of interest, including municipalities, regional and rural communities, Indian reserves and Metis settlements." In addition, section 14(e) references the desirability of clear boundaries, and municipalities represent a clear boundary. Calgarians identify as just that, Calgarians.

Calgary is growing rapidly, as are many mid-sized cities and their surrounding areas. Section 14(a) deals with sparsity, density, and the rate of population growth, and section 15 explicitly deals with limiting variance in size. I would argue this strongly argues for more ridings in Calgary, particularly in areas that are growing rapidly. This is also reflected in our constitution, the Supreme Court's interpretation of it.

I would add that rapid growth should not be used to argue that municipal boundaries shouldn't be respected. In fact, keeping those communities of interest together and ensuring representation is precisely what the Supreme Court relied on in allowing variance in size in the 1991 Saskatchewan provincial boundaries case. The

commission will determine rules that are critical to preserving our democracy.

We find ourselves, I would say, in very interesting times. Faith in our basic institutions, our system of justice, our democracy are waning. I could write an entire novel on why, but the critical point is that we must do everything we can to keep these institutions just and to preserve public confidence.

Growing cynicism about democracy is a problem we should all address, and this commission can do that by ensuring that we are empowering people to choose for themselves, not to try to choose for them by forcing different interests together.

I come before this committee to argue for the obvious, that rural communities, mid-size cities, and large urban centres all deserve a voice. I think I've outlined the specific concerns in sufficient detail in terms of the differences between my city and the rural areas. I think to maintain faith in democracy, we should respect those boundaries and ensure that all of those voices are heard, and this commission has the power to do so.

Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms Ganley.

Mr. Evans, any questions or comments?

Mr. Evans: Yeah. You premise your argument on the fact that you have defined Calgary-Mountain View to be a community of interest, but in looking at the legislation, you'll agree with me that it doesn't have its own municipal boundary. It doesn't have a regional or rural community. It's not an Indian reserve, and it's not a Métis settlement. So explain to me how that's a community of interest. That's part one. Part two is: what is the connection with everything above 16th Avenue N.W. to what's below it?

Ms Ganley: Yeah. Absolutely. Just to be clear, what I'm arguing is that inner-city Calgary communities generally have a community of interest.

Mr. Evans: What are they, though? What is it? Define it for me.

Ms Ganley: Sure. It's really what I was outlining, that the people in those communities are experiencing similar things. Growth pressures in neighbourhoods are creating a tension between those who want more development and those who would like to keep their communities as they always were. There's significant pressure on things like schools and hospitals because of the growth. There's also pressure on the infrastructure in the inner city generated both by people living in sort of more suburban communities and by those kind of driving in.

I'm not saying that you need to maintain these boundaries specifically; I want to be very clear about that. I think that these communities mostly share a community of interest with each other, but they also share that community of interest with, say, Calgary-Klein, which is immediately to the north or Calgary-Varsity, which is immediately to the west.

Inner-city communities in Calgary are very similar. I think they should be kept together as much as possible, but I'm not arguing for any specific line on this map. I do know that community associations generally prefer to be in one riding if that can be accommodated.

Mr. Evans: That's my next question. How many community associations are within this group? Because I think those could be characterized as communities of interest.

Ms Ganley: Oh, gosh. How many community associations? West Hillhurst, Hillhurst, Sunnyside, Bridgeland, Crescent Heights – I'm going to say like fewer than 10. There's actually one in the west end there . . .

Mr. Evans: Are there any that are split by the boundaries?

Ms Ganley: Yes. Parkdale is split between Calgary-Mountain View and Calgary-Varsity. Do you want me to show you?

Mr. Evans: If you wouldn't mind, if we have time.

Ms Ganley: Right over here on the far end of the riding, this is a community that's split. Generally they actually just get two MLAs that show up to their events. I haven't heard any sort of specific complaints, but, yes, communities do generally, in my experience, prefer to be kept together.

Over here communities tend to work together. You have kind of Capitol Hill working with Banff Trail community centre. They're very close. They often work together. But I think the challenge that this commission faces, in my opinion, is that a lot of those communities sort of work together with one another, right?

3:30

Arguably, depending on the sort of size of the population, which is, I guess, somewhat over what you would expect, it used to be – the previous changes were to kind of grow it north of 16th Avenue, if you will, so that those communities could go back to where they were before. I mean, you could carve it in several ways. Other than the Bow River sort of there to the south and Deerfoot Trail to the east, there are no really obvious natural boundaries, I would say, which, I guess, makes your work difficult and easy.

Mr. Evans: The 16th doesn't work as a boundary.

Ms Ganley: The 16th could absolutely be seen as a natural boundary. Most of the communities themselves sort of divide off there north and south of 16th. Like, honestly, the commonality, the sort of services relied on in terms of school districts, in terms of people shopping for their groceries, just the stuff of everyday life often crosses 16th Avenue one way or the other.

Mr. Evans: Thank you.

The Chair: Mrs. Samson.

Mrs. Samson: I have a question for you. Did you have a robust discussion in the Legislature about why only two ridings were required for the change, like, going from 87 to 89?

Ms Ganley: I'll admit that I wasn't in there every moment. We do tend to come and go in shifts. There was some discussion, but it was the proposal that came in with the government's legislation. This was done when we were in government in 2017. We kept the same number of seats because we don't really feel like additional MLAs are necessarily a net benefit. I don't know how else to say it. It doesn't seem like more representation is necessarily needed; it keeps the costs down for the people of Alberta. So that was the decision we made at the time.

Two isn't a huge increase. My recollection from the last time we did this exercise is that some of the northern ridings are significantly under in population but they're really, really big, so obviously there's going to need to be more ridings in the city to sort of keep within that 25 per cent variance, right? I imagine that was done in order to protect those from getting too big,

although, honestly, with the advancement of technology, the size of a riding actually isn't, I would say, as relevant as it was even 10 years ago. Right? I guess that's me speculating. Sorry.

Mrs. Samson: Okay. No, that's good. Thanks.

The Chair: You had mentioned that definitely Calgary should get more electoral divisions. How many?

Ms Ganley: Oh. You know, I hadn't contemplated the specific numbers. I would need to see the math. I know my riding is a little bit over, but some of my colleagues, particularly in the northeast: their ridings are massively over the normal number. At a certain point it does become quite difficult to represent those communities, because you're trying to be in so many places at once. Right? It makes it a little bit harder to be there for everyone. I'd have to run the math, but my suggestion would be – the committee has suggested a number that would sort of divide the province up roughly equally. I would suggest that you divide the number of folks in Calgary by that and that's the number of ridings that need to go in.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you. Dr. Martin.

Dr. Martin: Thank you. One of the things that we have found by being on this commission – well, several of them. First, we have people thanking us in sort of a sorrowful fashion, like: what's coming at us? But, you know, your riding is over. You're an inner-city riding. I understand the kind of issues that animate discussions among the community. I expect as well that there are going to be infill and basements that are going legal, and there'll be lots of pressure to increase the number of housing units by one means or another. I fully expect that you'll have more housing, and you will have more population. Your characterization of your riding suggests that you're very much like some of the ridings on the inner south side of the river, so we can expect that the population will continue to grow for some time.

Here's our problem, obviously. We're a 62,000, and you're a 62,500. Our mean is 55,000. There's some variation that we can play with, but you're too big, and you're growing. We're going to have to decide how best to alter ridings that have these kinds of features, and instantly we have ripple effects all across the city. To make a crude example, if I took everything north of 16th Ave., instantly there would be a tidal wave moving north. So we have a lot of balls to juggle.

But if I could get down to brass tacks: if you had to shrink it – can you clarify what you did at the map? – would you try to nibble at the western end?

Ms Ganley: You could nibble at the western edge. You could also – previously it ended at 16th Avenue, which is also a possibility. Those neighbourhoods were in Calgary-Klein in the 2015 election. So if you're carving off on the west, it goes into Calgary-Varsity, on the north, it probably goes into Calgary-Klein. Both of those ridings: most of the communities they have share a pretty significant amount in common with Calgary-Mountain View. I don't think people would find themselves ill-represented by either of those moves, if that helps you at all.

Dr. Martin: Well, I think it does because we are concerned about effective representation and about the relationship between the population and the MLA. If you feel that that could be accommodated, we'll probably look at those kinds of scenarios pretty closely.

Ms Ganley: Yeah. I mean, because of the way Calgary-Klein kind of sticks down on the south side of Deerfoot Trail there, you could also look at the eastern edge.

Honestly, like, that's why it's difficult for me to make a recommendation to you, because they all share a community of interest but also with those immediately around them. There are a lot of different number scenarios. I don't want to – how to put it? – suggest how you have to do it because I don't think that any of those are super bad options.

Dr. Martin: Okay. I don't want to press you. You love all your people.

Ms Ganley: I do. I love all my constituents.

Dr. Martin: You can see from where we sit, you think: "Oh; 65,000. Yeah. How's the growth pattern going to go? I think we're bumping up on our ceiling." The next thing you do is think: where can we nibble?

Ms Ganley: Yeah. That's totally legitimate.

Dr. Martin: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Mr. Clark?

Mr. Clark: Yeah. Thank you. Yes, and *Hansard* is forever, so you have to be careful what you say in terms of which community you might recommend.

Well, I wanted to come back to the beginning of your presentation. I found it quite compelling, your discussion around what anchors us as a commission: section 3 of the Constitution, the Supreme Court reference cases, the act. Now here we are. Maybe I'll just sort of ask you to kind of complete that thought in just maybe 90 seconds or less. What aspects of the constitutional/legal framework do you feel it's important for us to remember?

Ms Ganley: Yeah. I would say that probably the most important thing is to work to keep those communities of interest together and to make sure that people feel represented. I think we have seen south of the border – admittedly that was sort of spun up, shall we say? – what can happen if people don't feel appropriately represented. I think we do see an erosion of faith in our institutions. My concern is that we respect natural boundaries, and municipal boundaries are in my view such natural boundaries. I think allowing those interests to have a representative is critical.

Mr. Clark: Thank you.

3:40

The Chair: Well, thank you, Ms Ganley. All presenters are equal, but we are particularly gratified when an MLA comes and talks to us because we know that you know your riding very well.

I have one more question.

Ms Ganley: Absolutely.

The Chair: Because I'm the chair, I can go over time.

You have the unique position of having served two electoral divisions in Calgary. Any comments, in 30 seconds or less, about Calgary-Buffalo?

Ms Ganley: Oh, boy. Yeah. Calgary-Buffalo is a fantastic riding. It's much more urban. It has, again, a natural sort of boundary, I would say, to the north on it. It's got a similar thing on the southern

portion, sort of where Deerfoot comes through and Blackfoot comes through, some more clear, natural boundaries, and then it abuts – I actually always felt like the lines between Calgary-Elbow and Calgary-Buffalo were in interesting places, much like the lines between Calgary-Mountain View and Calgary-Varsity are. Those communities share a lot in common, I would say, in terms of their kind of densification and general experience of life.

The Chair: Yeah. Okay. Well, thank you very much. You're excused, but please stay if you can to hear the rest of the presentations.

Ms Ganley: Excellent. Well, thanks so much.

Mrs. Samson: Thank you.

The Chair: Is Dr. Angela Grace present? Please come forward and have a seat.

Dr. Grace: Thank you. Thanks for the opportunity to share my perspective on the upcoming changes to Alberta's electoral boundaries. I will not be as well spoken as a two-time MLA, but I'm happy to share my experiences and perspective.

I do have a unique Albertan perspective having lived and worked in various rural and urban communities in Alberta. I had the privilege of growing up on a farm in the Drumheller-Stettler electoral division and have since lived in Red Deer-South, Lethbridge-West, Taber-Warner, Brooks-Medicine Hat, and now Calgary-Varsity. I've had the opportunity to experience the unique identity and pride of each community and how the elected officials interact with the community and represent us in the Legislature.

Even though I now live in the largest city in Alberta, I can't help but keep my rural roots of wanting to know and trust my elected representative, shopping locally, and honestly not wanting to drive more than 20 minutes for any of my services. Community pride is one of the core values of each community I've lived and worked in. Each rural community I lived in prided itself on its unique identity, ranging from their unique geographical landmarks, from the rolling wheat fields of the Alberta prairies to the trees in Cypress Hills and the big bridge and of course the wind in Lethbridge. Each community I lived in shows their own distinguishing landmarks, ranging from the world's largest teepee in the city of Medicine Hat, to the world's largest poppy in the village of Veteran, Alberta. There's a seasonal flow of community events in rural Alberta with high school graduations, rodeos, and curling bonspiels. The sense of community pride is strong.

The urban communities I have lived in have prided themselves on educational excellence, Red Deer College, the University of Lethbridge, the University of Calgary. Although there is a different seasonal flow in the urban areas with community events, the identity of each community is still unique. For example, Calgary-Varsity has a different sense of community than Calgary-North and Calgary-North East due to their unique and expanding population characteristics based on the history of the community, age, culture, and socioeconomic factors.

Unfortunately, I have also experienced how this sense of individual community identity and pride has also led to distrust in other communities. We have to acknowledge that the rural-urban divide in Alberta is strong and seems to be increasing with community identity, individualism, and partisanship placing itself over shared human values and collaboration.

Unfortunately, this rural-urban divide and increasing partisanship has increased tensions and shaken Albertans' sense of democracy. I contend that the recreation of electoral boundaries is

a nonpartisan opportunity to re-establish shared human values and strengthen a sense of democracy across our province. You, as a committee appointed to work on required changes to electoral boundaries, have an obligation to all Albertans to be nonpartisan and to respect community boundaries, pride, identity, and the foundations of democracy in your upcoming proposed changes. There needs to be a clear intention to focus on collaboration and fair representation rather than risk fostering increasing rural-urban division and mistrust. I contend that the nonpartisan and interactive process of maintaining respect for geography, community identity, and population changes be the foundation for electoral boundary decision-making.

Arbitrarily breaking up communities to change electoral boundaries does not make sense. It also does not make sense to shift electoral boundaries to a pie-shaped inclusion of both rural and urban in each electoral district, as I understood has been proposed. From my perspective combining rural and urban in the same electoral district would instigate increased confusion and mistrust within already established geographical boundaries, decrease a sense of community identity, increase a sense of disenfranchisement, and significantly muddy the waters for effective community representation. With distinct rural and urban electoral districts there's a clear sense of representation for each of the needs of each area. Within mixed districts it would be unclear whose needs and voices the elected official would actually represent in the community.

First, I firmly believe it is important that geography be preserved as its existing foundation for deciding on changes to electoral boundaries. Existing geographical boundaries provide a sense of identity based on the land in which people live. It only makes sense to maintain as much as possible already established geographical boundaries as a first step in examining the need to change the electoral boundaries. That being said, of course, there are population shifts within each of these boundaries.

Second, I believe that community identity needs to be preserved as the second priority in the upcoming changes to electoral boundaries. It makes logical sense to keep like-minded and like-experience communities together for identity, ease, efficiency, and local representation. There's a shared sense of identity, culture, and infrastructure needs that need to be respected and preserved. Within these geographical boundaries are already established rural and urban and cultural and socioeconomic communities with their own characteristics, needs, and sense of community pride. For example, in the rural Drumheller-Stettler district, where I grew up, it makes sense to maintain the rural identity with local representation. In the same sense, it makes sense to maintain current urban district identities, with a focus on already established community boundaries set by urban planning and new community development. It is important that elected officials understand and seek to represent their unique characteristics.

Third, I believe that once already established geographical boundaries and communities have been identified, it then makes sense to look at Alberta's population data to make decisions about expanding, shrinking, or adding new electoral districts. This is where you have the responsibility to make logical, nonpartisan decisions. Based on current and future population growth to me it makes the most sense to add north Calgary and south Edmonton as new electoral districts.

Thank you so much.

Mr. Clark: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you. Thank you for the punch line.

Mr. Clark, any questions?

Mr. Clark: Thank you, Dr. Grace. I'll just say thank you for your thoughtful presentation. You clearly put some time into that, and it is really very helpful. Thank you so much.

Dr. Grace: You're so welcome.

Dr. Martin: I'll echo my colleague's thought. Thank you again.

The Chair: Susan.

Mrs. Samson: I do, too. Thank you for coming out.

The Chair: Mr. Evans.

Mr. Evans: Now all the pressure. Like, we've got to have one question.

The Chair: I have one in reserve.

Mr. Evans: Oh, thank goodness. Okay. Well, then, we'll defer to the commissioner.

The Chair: You touched on an issue that could be described as philosophical but intensely practical and pragmatic as well. I think I quoted you directly.

Dr. Grace: That's exactly how I strive to be.

The Chair: Okay. Well, it came through loud and clear.

But I want to put to you another case. You said that the rural/urban divide is as strong as it's ever been in Alberta. Now, we have heard from presenters already that say, "you know what," and I'm paraphrasing, "the way to address the divide is to lump some people together so they learn how to get along." After all, our federal cousins, whoever the members of parliament are, many of them, maybe even 50 per cent of them, have mixed urban/rural ridings, and they get by. What do you say to that?

3:50

Dr. Grace: Well, first, lumping people together and seeing how they get along isn't a great way to increase collaboration. Like, there's got to be some structure for that.

The Chair: Outside of parenting, it doesn't work? Is that what you're saying?

Dr. Grace: Yeah, and outside of teaching grade 1 it doesn't work so well, you know.

Mr. Evans: Outside of multiculturalism, the foundation of our country.

Dr. Grace: I do think that, in these very challenging political times, people need a reprieve. They need a rest, and they need to know that they're going to be really represented. As people are bringing up their concerns to their elected representative, they need to be able to trust that things aren't going to change so much that it causes so much disruption. It's been in my observation and experience that when you lump people together, it actually increases a sense of mistrust. It increases a sense of butting heads, and there's not enough listening, so if people are able to stay within their own geographical and like-minded boundaries with, of course, you know, some political, philosophical changes on how to have that representation, it's going to make people feel safer and calmer and more relaxed that they actually are being heard.

The Chair: Okay. Anything arising out of that question I posed?

Mrs. Samson: Good answer.

Mr. Evans: Philosophically, isn't there an incongruence with the concept of multiculturalism and everything that we espouse to be beneficial in that regard? Yet, at the same time, you're talking about – well, it almost seems a bit xenophobic to me in terms of the, "keep like with like." Explain to me the incongruence.

Dr. Grace: Well, the incongruence is – if we go down to the roots of what a lot of the divide is, we have to talk about racism, and until the issue of racism and people's willingness to address their internalized sense of racism and white supremacy in this province, it's going to be really hard for people to collaborate on these very differences in each of the geographical and community areas that we need to address.

Mr. Evans: Well, let's assume that premise is correct – okay? – for argument's sake. How is what you've proposed in terms of your philosophy in solving this problem and, you know, the guidance you provided the commission, how does any of what you've said today ameliorate that concern? It doesn't. You actually have talked about separating.

Dr. Grace: You're right. It doesn't address that concern.

Mr. Evans: Okay. I just want to make sure I understood.

Dr. Grace: But what it does do is that it can help settle people down that there's not going to be so many drastic changes and political changes all at once. It says: "Okay. We're going to take a very logical, nonpartisan, sensible way of addressing the population changes and the geographical changes." Well, not so much geographical, but population changes like rural communities shrinking, urban communities growing: we're going to try to make it as even as possible so that people can have the representation that they need. That's all it's doing is saying: let's slow things down and be really logical about it.

Mr. Evans: Would it be correct that the proper way to solve this would be to identify and group communities of interest based on race and culture? Is that what you're suggesting?

Dr. Grace: No, I'm not. Well, I'm saying they've already – my observation and understanding is a lot of these communities are grouping themselves.

Mr. Evans: Okay. I think that's a fair comment.

Dr. Grace: Like, we don't need to group them; they're grouping themselves.

Mr. Evans: And if we look at Calgary-Varsity, what we've talked about, is any of that applicable to this particular electoral district in terms of: are there portions here where you could say, "well, this neighbourhood, for example, they're like-minded in many different ways" and be able to identify that as compared to, say, another neighbourhood within that ED?

Dr. Grace: I mean, I liked what Kathleen said and you guys alluded to as well on communities working together. In my area there's Charleswood, Triwood, Varsity that tend to work together. Then there's the other side of Crowchild with Varsity over there, Varsity Estates.

Mr. Evans: Right. Dalhousie, Brentwood.

Dr. Grace: Yeah. Dalhousie. There are the different communities that tend to lump themselves together. I would contend that the university district is a special district on its own because of the more transient, ever-changing student population that's there. So there are unique characteristics, but I would say that as a whole that area has high education as one of its foundations.

Mr. Evans: Thank you very much. Appreciate our fulsome discussion.

Dr. Grace: Yeah. Thanks for putting me on the spot. That was fun.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Dr. Grace. Much appreciated.

Mr. Evans: Will make for great *Hansard* reading later on.

The Chair: Okay, our next presenter and, I believe, our final presenter of the afternoon is Mr. Irfan Sabir.

Mr. Sabir: Thank you, and good afternoon.

The Chair: Now, I've said that we limit people to seven minutes with three minutes of questions. Well, we're a little bit flexible. You're the last presenter of the day, so please proceed. Identify yourself and what electoral division you're from.

Mr. Sabir: Well, thank you and good afternoon. I'm Irfan Sabir, and I'm the MLA for Calgary-Bhullar-McCall. It's an electoral district in the northeast quadrant of Calgary that I have the honour of representing since 2015. It has changed since, but that's the name. I would add that I'm also a long-term resident of northeast Calgary, moved there first in 2007. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak to you this afternoon.

I want to start by thanking all of you for your commitment to this important work. Certainly it's a challenging task to create a map that is fair and acceptable for all communities while ensuring effective representation for all Albertans as guaranteed by the Charter and elaborated upon by the Supreme Court of Canada's jurisprudence. I'm confident that you will take this task very seriously and do your best, and my best wishes are with all of you.

Last year, the government introduced Bill 31, Justice Statutes Amendment Act, which amended the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, and I want to speak specifically to those changes. One change was that the legislation added two new electoral divisions, and I'm very pleased to see that since Alberta's population has grown significantly since the last review of electoral boundaries.

Personally, there has been a huge growth in the constituency in the quadrant I represent. My riding stands around 28 per cent above the average population of current electoral districts. It's also the case for other neighbouring northeast ridings in northeast Calgary. Based on this, I would strongly urge the commission to consider allocating one of the new electoral division in northeast Calgary to accommodate the growing population and to ensure effective representation for all residents.

Secondly, the Justice Statutes Amendment Act also amended section 14 of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, which sets out the relevant considerations for the commission while creating a new electoral map.

4:00

I note that prior to this change, among other things, the commission was required to take into account common community interests and community organizations and keep existing communities and municipal boundaries intact wherever possible.

With this change, while similar criteria exist, it is now in the discretion of the commission to consider this.

Having said that, I would submit that how the commission exercises its discretion will have a huge impact on what the future electoral map of Alberta looks like. It will also have huge implications for people's right to effective and fair representation and for the institution of democracy as a whole. It's against this backdrop that I would urge the commission to make sure that common interests of communities are represented and respected and existing municipal boundaries are respected as much as possible.

For instance, in northeast Calgary it's a community of its own. It has people from many different backgrounds, cultures who have come together for decades to create their own organizations, community halls, ethnic restaurants, prayer places, and so much more. It took them decades, as I said. Their lives revolve around their communities. For example, annexing any northeast community with the neighbouring towns of Airdrie or Chestermere may not make any sense at all.

Over the last few months I have had the opportunity to talk to northeast Calgary residents, their organizations and with my colleagues across the province about this boundary review, and I can say that they would very much want their communities to be kept together. These communities have a significant racialized population, and it's also important from the standpoint of fair representation for racialized communities. As I said earlier, people come from many different backgrounds and talents, and many of them are first-generation or second-generation immigrants. They have issues that are fairly unique to their communities, they have issues that are common with all Albertans, but any future map must ensure that they are able to maintain effective representation of their interests and their communities.

Lastly, I want to submit that the communities that have more things in common need to be kept intact. For instance, in the last boundaries review my riding was created in a way that surrounds a community hub there called Genesis Centre. It's one of the hubs in the northeast along with the leisure centre and Vivo Centre. In the case of Calgary-Bhullar-McCall Genesis as a go-to place in a riding change works well. However, the neighbouring riding of Calgary-North East was divided in a way that one-half of its population is on the east side of the Deerfoot, and the other half is on the west side of the Deerfoot. Based on my observations people on the east side of the Deerfoot have more things in common with my riding – Genesis Centre, prayer places, restaurants, and all those things – than on the other side of the Deerfoot while people on the other side of the Deerfoot will have their own community which will use and utilize the Vivo Centre, for instance, way more than people on the east side of the Deerfoot will use it.

So I think that's also an opportunity to learn from the previous review and make amends that will work for our communities. I'm sure that my colleagues and many other Albertans will make submissions that will help guide the commission's important work.

With that, I thank you for your time, and I'm happy to take any questions.

The Chair: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Sabir. Just a clarification question in terms of the history of your representation. You were first elected in 2015?

Mr. Sabir: Yes.

The Chair: Is this constituency largely what you represented that first term? The name has changed, I believe.

Mr. Sabir: Yes and no. In 2015 it included the neighbourhoods of Falconridge and Castleridge and also . . .

The Chair: Which are south. Are they?

Mr. Sabir: They are on the south side.

On the north side it included Skyview and those neighbourhoods. Since then the north side has grown exponentially. Like, there are so many other new neighbourhoods, Redstone, Cityscape. Even on the north side of my riding there's a new neighbourhood, Savanna, in Saddle Ridge. In 2019 it only had maybe 600, 700 people; now it's a fully grown neighbourhood.

The Chair: Okay. Mr. Evans, any questions, comments?

Mr. Evans: We see a large chunk of your riding is the airport, but it would appear that where the people are living, it's incredibly dense and growing quickly. The numbers are currently 70,000, a 28.6 per cent growth. But what's more interesting are Calgary-North East, Calgary-Falconridge, Calgary-Cross. Those are all growing at an extremely rapid rate. Calgary-North East is a 55 per cent increase; Calgary-Falconridge, 18 per cent; and Calgary-Cross, 11 per cent.

Have you hit saturation here, or are there still – I can see some areas that could be developed when I look at an aerial map. Are there more developments going on in your particular riding?

Mr. Sabir: I think that for the most part the room for new development is that Savanna area.

Mr. Evans: So above Airport Trail northeast?

Mr. Sabir: Yeah. Right by Airport Trail. It will be on the south side of Airport Trail.

Mr. Evans: Okay. There's still some open ground there.

Mr. Sabir: There is still some open ground. Saddle Ridge has very little space on the east side. I think Saddle Ridge, in that sense, doesn't have much room. This other area has a lot of businesses, but there is no residential population in this; hence, my suggestion that this area has grown significantly and the population is very dense and that the commission consider adding one of the new ridings.

Mr. Evans: I'm more interested to know: is there more significant growth that's going to happen within that electoral district, or are we moving towards a point of saturation? Is there more growth, from your perspective, that's going to happen in Calgary-Falconridge and Calgary-Cross, for example, or is it going to be north of Airport Trail northeast?

Mr. Sabir: Calgary-Falconridge and Calgary-Cross consist of more mature neighbourhoods, in my opinion. They do have their own representatives that could make those presentations. But I would say that there's not much room in Calgary-Falconridge or Calgary-Cross as they exist now. In Calgary-Bhullar-McCall the only room will be around Savanna, and most of the development is on the north of the Airport Trail, so it's in Calgary-North East.

Mr. Evans: Okay. You heard the discussion with the last presenter in terms of the community interest. If we're going to go into, you know, the communities of interest in your riding, what would they be?

Mr. Sabir: I think they have their own organizations. They have their own community halls or community-based organizations. They have the Genesis Centre, which is more a community hub which has a soccer field, which has event places, which has a library and all that. In those areas people also have their, as I mentioned, restaurants, for instance. People do tend to stick together in these areas.

Mr. Evans: Okay. Thank you so much. Appreciate that.

Mrs. Samson: Your riding of Calgary-Bhullar-McCall is well over the variance, and I wonder if you could give us some suggestions about those districts that are all humped together to the east, if there is something that would fit nicely with the neighbouring riding or anything like that. If you could advise us since I don't know that neighbourhood.

4:10

Mr. Sabir: I think, as was mentioned by the chair, once you move one riding, that starts the effect that the next riding will have an issue.

Mrs. Samson: Like, the Calgary airport area: am I looking at that correctly in that there is minimal residential in that on the left-hand side of the riding?

Mr. Sabir: At the airport there is no residential.

Mrs. Samson: No residential. It just falls really in those four quarters.

Mr. Sabir: Yeah. I'm digressing a bit, but the last time – I think Greg will remember – when they were changing and reviewing it, they tried to name this riding as Calgary-Airport, so I hope the commission doesn't take that route.

Mr. Clark: Do you want us to right that wrong?

Mr. Sabir: No.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Dr. Martin.

Dr. Martin: Thank you. You are squished in behind the airport, and it leads to me asking: are there many airport workers who live in this riding?

Mr. Sabir: Yes, there are, but at the same time it's the airport for Calgary, so people from all over Calgary do work there. There are many businesses in this area that people in the northeast quadrant own and run.

Dr. Martin: Where I'm going with this is about housing types. Do you anticipate three- or four-storey apartment units?

Mr. Sabir: There are some zoning restrictions as well, because of the vicinity of the airport, on what can be built and what cannot be built. For instance, if you are building – literally, along Metis Trail you need special permissions. In some cases, depending on which zone you are in, the city has to have a resolution, and then cabinet has to give the approval to build something that is . . .

The Chair: More than four storeys probably.

Mr. Sabir: Four storeys or something. Yeah.

Also, there are issues with the noise as well, so what can go there. For instance, in '16-17 there was a proposal for a school, and there

were a lot of issues with respect to how high it can go and how they will manage the noise, so that project didn't go ahead. But there are restrictions.

Dr. Martin: So what you're suggesting, then, is that the area between Metis Trail and 52nd Street is going to stay very low density.

Mr. Sabir: This area is likely to stay low density, the one that surrounds the airport.

Dr. Martin: Thank you.

The Chair: I drive through there to get to the airport a lot. It just struck me now that there are very few high-rises there, which the rest of the city has lots of.

Sorry. Mr. Clark.

Mr. Clark: You know, it's so important for us to hear from MLAs and local community representatives. You just live in the community, right? These sorts of things. I keep talking about it, but skating to where the puck is going to be. A lot of the growth we've seen: clearly, in the northeast. But it's really helpful to get some context on, specifically, Calgary-Bhullar-McCall.

Let me ask you about community associations. You mentioned Genesis Centre as a centre of gravity. How important are those actual community associations, you know, Martindale, Taradale, those sorts of places, if an electoral boundary had to cut one in half, for example, to make up numbers? There's some significant density, and it can be a challenge to get the numbers exactly right. Just give me your thoughts on: is that a viable option, or is that a terrible idea?

Mr. Sabir: Since there is huge diversity within those ridings, there are people who will associate themselves very strongly with that neighbourhood association. They will volunteer for years for the same association, fund raise to put a skating rink there. At the same time, there will be, for instance, in any community a Pakistan community association or Council of Sikh Organizations, Kashmir community association. Those are associations that may use those facilities, but they do have their own structure as well, and for their bigger events they may go to either Falconridge Castleridge Community Association hall or to Genesis Centre. There are a lot of intersections within those communities. I don't know that I can fully answer this question.

Mr. Clark: What I'm hearing is: try really hard not to, but if it's sort of an absolutely kind of no other choice – part of the grand challenge is that especially in northeast Calgary, even with an extra constituency or two, there's still a lot of deliberation and consideration in terms of how we're going to square this circle. You know, in fact, I was working on it last night, and I didn't realize that, oh, Deerfoot Trail is the boundary, obviously, of Calgary-North East. No. Oh, wait a minute. There are 40,000 people in Calgary-North East plus on the west side of Deerfoot Trail. That's almost a constituency all to itself, but then you start to cascade out, and it just all gets to be a little bit challenging and messy.

We want to do our best to respect those boundaries as best they can, but if it absolutely comes down to it, it would not – I mean, "Are you going to come back in January and yell at us?" I guess is the real question.

Mr. Sabir: I think I will talk to my constituents, and if they want me to yell at you, I won't hesitate.

Mr. Clark: Good answer. And we'll deserve it.

The Chair: Spoken like a true MLA.

Mr. Clark: That's helpful. I'm asking a difficult question, because it is also deeply hypothetical. It depends on which community, what line, how many people. There are too many what-ifs, I understand, to get a definitive answer, but I think I've got what I need. Yeah. It's a real pickle, but thank you. That's really helpful.

The Chair: You've got four quarters that make up the whole. Let's just do the rough math. That's 17,000 people per quarter if it's 70,000 now; 17,500, probably. It would be really hard to take a quarter out of your electoral division, wouldn't it?

Mr. Sabir: Mainly there are three neighbourhoods.

The Chair: Oh, okay. I look at it geographically to see four quarters.

Mr. Sabir: Yeah, four quarters but three neighbourhoods. The top two quarters . . .

The Chair: Do you want to go up to the map and show us where the neighbourhoods meet? Take the microphone with you.

Mr. Sabir: These top two quarters: that's all Saddle Ridge. It even comes down to this area as well. Savanna is included in Saddle Ridge. It's a new development, like, very recent, in the last, you can say, four or five years. The sign at Savanna will say: Savanna in Saddle Ridge. It's a broader part of that same Saddle Ridge range. That's in Saddle Ridge.

And then Taradale is fairly saturated. There is not much room for development in Taradale.

The Chair: That's the bottom right quarter.

Mr. Sabir: Yeah. That would be closer to the Stoney Trail on the east side. I don't know how this map is laid.

And then Martindale is among the, I guess, oldest neighbourhoods in this area. This one is a bit smaller than Taradale and Saddle Ridge; Saddle Ridge being the biggest, then Taradale, then Martindale.

The Chair: Okay. Well, that's helpful. It doesn't make it easier, but it's helpful.

Mr. Clark: No, it makes it no easier at all.

One last question. Sorry. Cityscape, I guess, the one just north of Airport Trail: it's not in your constituency. Is Airport Trail a really big natural boundary, or is there some cross-pollination there between those neighbourhoods?

4:20

Mr. Sabir: Like I said, there are no walkways that people use to get into the other side towards Cityscape or Skyview. Airport Trail is a fairly busy and big artery that connects Stoney with the airport. Although it's not in your mandate, they should put another land there.

Mr. Clark: Okay. That was good. Thank you.

The Chair: Yeah. Talk to us about schools in your constituency.

Mr. Sabir: In Calgary-Bhullar-McCall there is one high school. That's the Nelson Mandela high school. On the outskirts in Falconridge there's Bishop McNally. All the schools are at capacity and kids are being bused to different quadrants, like 45

minutes, in some cases one hour – a huge, huge issue – because of the population growth. On the other side towards the north – Cityscape, Redstone, Skyview – like, all these neighbourhoods are still looking for new schools, in particular a high school.

The Chair: Okay. Well, thank you very much. As Mr. Clark has said, it's always beneficial to hear from individuals who take to heart the people that live day in, day out. Your job is to represent them in the Legislature, and, yeah, your contributions are very

much appreciated. I'm not sure that our job is any easier after this, but thank you so much.

Mr. Sabir: Thank you so much. Again, I do understand that it's a very difficult job. Thank you for your commitment.

Mrs. Samson: Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. We'll adjourn the hearing now till 6:30.

[The hearing adjourned at 4:22 p.m.]

