



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission
Public Hearings

Calgary

Monday, January 12, 2026
5:30 p.m.

Transcript No. 31

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 Steenbergen
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

Andrew Bos
David Cloutier
Keira Gunn
Lindsay McLaren
Robert Miller
Kris Moen
Denys Robinson
Tiffany Saxton
Jean Stewart
Inam Teja
Jenny Yermiy

5:30 p.m.

Monday, January 12, 2026

[Justice Miller in the chair]

The Chair: Okay. Good evening, everyone, and welcome to our first evening presentation of the second round of public hearings for the Electoral Boundaries Commission of Alberta. By way of introduction you'll see all of our commission nameplates, and for bio data please go to the website.

Our task here as a commission is to deal with two issues. One is the expansion of the number of electoral districts in the province from 87 to 89, and the second one is to deal with a significant population increase in this province over the last several years, particularly since the 2017 Electoral Boundaries Commission.

A rough approximation of the population increases: over 800,000 new people, as of 2024, since the 2017 report. The commission that reported back in 2017 dealt with these figures: a population of just over 4 million people divided by 87 electoral districts. That left an average population per riding of 46,697. That's what the commission in 2017 based their report on, with a variance of between 35,000 to just over 58,000 per electoral division.

Fast-forwarding to our Electoral Boundaries Commission, the change in population results in an average of 54,000, just under 55,000, based on a 4.8 million population in the province, divided by 89 electoral divisions. That variance, then, is obviously from 41,000 to as high as almost 69,000. That's the targeted range of population per electoral division in order to meet the test of effective representation.

If you've had a chance to read our interim report, we spent a lot of time talking about effective representation and distinguishing that as a Canadian concept versus the American concept of one person, one vote. We do not have one person, one vote in Canada or Alberta. In fact, no jurisdiction has ever operated on that principle. Rather, we as Canadians operate under the term of "effective representation."

Our commission was established back in late March, early April of last year, and we spent our time doing these four things, basically. We spent a lot of time discussing the basis for the population assessment of the province, and you can read about that in our report as to how we arrived at the figures we did. We also spent a lot of time reviewing hundreds of written submissions that came in to us in terms of suggestions, ideas, and proposals. Then throughout May and June we had the privilege – and we all would say it was a privilege – to travel across Alberta and hear in person from Albertans from north to south ideas and suggestions and proposals for the future electoral map of 89 electoral divisions.

After we did those things, we spent an awful lot of time with the staff at Elections Alberta, the map people there, dealing with drawing proposed boundaries that allowed for effective representation across the province. That then resulted in our report that was submitted to the Speaker of the Legislature in late October. We have produced some printed copies of the report, and if you're interested in receiving a copy, unfortunately we don't have any here, but just see Aaron Roth, who will wave so you can identify him. If you want a written copy, he will ensure that one is mailed to you. It is online on our website, so you can read it there as well.

As we went through the process, we considered all the factors that are enumerated in the legislation, and our goal was to take those factors into account, make sure that there was effective representation throughout the province, and come up with 89 electoral districts that provided understandable and clear boundaries. After we submitted our report to the Speaker and that was tabled in the Legislature, we then opened up a portal on our website for the public to respond to our interim report. From early

November to December 19 we received more than 1,100 written submissions.

That was the first several months of our tenure as a commission. Now we go into the second round of submissions. If you noticed, we said: round 2. It sounds like a bit of a boxing match. We are here in round 2 hearing responses to this interim report. Today is our first day in Calgary. We had a busy morning and a very full afternoon – we just grabbed a bite to eat – and we're here for a very full evening session.

Given that background, we've got a list of about eight people presenting this evening. I don't believe the first two people are here. I'm going to call on Dr. Jean Stewart – is Dr. Jean Stewart here? – to come up and present. Take a seat at the table, make yourself comfortable, and please identify yourself and tell us what area of the province you're from and what electoral division you're commenting on.

Dr. Stewart: Okay. Can you hear me? Have I got this right?

The Chair: Yes.

Dr. Stewart: I'm Dr. Jean Stewart. I'm a psychologist. I am going to talk about the hybrid urban-rural ridings, and I will address these boundaries first from a personal perspective and then from a professional perspective. I grew up on the Klondike Ranch east of Crossfield. In our rural community we relied on our neighbours to share natural resources such as water. When the beavers dammed our creek, restricting the water to our neighbours, my father shot the beavers and blew up the dam. We share and we help each other out. When the party line rang constantly with no break, we would run to listen, and we would rescue whoever had been injured. Rural communities have common values and rely on mutual assistance.

I also lived in Rosedale, in Calgary, where urban communities value privacy and independence, with many more services. When our garage was robbed of expensive equipment, no one came forward with any information. That was a big surprise.

In my professional life as a psychologist I worked for 30 years in a rural area. Families who chose to raise their children in the country had advantages such as room to roam, fresh water, large gardens, animals, and quiet. They struggled with transportation; power outages, when their water pumps wouldn't work; and limited services, but their taxes were very low.

Urban and rural communities have little in common, in my opinion. The urban-rural hybrid model proposed cannot fairly represent south Calgary or the riding I live in, which is Calgary-Shaw. Your report suggested that the area of Foothills, Okotoks, and south Calgary be considered a rural electoral division. However, urban life is very different, especially in a city of 1.5 million, like Calgary. We choose urban life, with transportation via the C-Train and buses, employment opportunities, colleges and universities, hospitals and specialist clinics, theatres, and restaurants. Rural areas do not have any of those or very few of those. Urban and rural cultures are not even similar. When my rural cousins attend concerts with me, they must arrive and leave quickly in order to feed the cows and the horses.

5:40

The commission report emphasizes the importance of "the availability and means of communication and transportation" on pages 9 and 23. An urban-rural hybrid riding that spans two municipalities such as Calgary and Okotoks as well as Foothills hinders effective representation and accessibility, and I'm thinking about accessibility to our elected representatives. Those municipal boundaries are crossed, and the maps as they were presented ignore natural dividers. That's counterintuitive and confusing. I'll just

point out that one of your maps suggested that Calgary-Shaw extend over the Bow River and east into what is now Calgary-East. We don't go that way. We would have to get out on Stoney Trail and drive 100 kilometres an hour. I don't know. Maybe you're used to it, but it's quite a big deal for us, so that's why I'm raising this.

I'm saying that Calgary-Shaw's boundaries should be Stoney Trail on the north; Spruce Meadows Way on the west; 222nd Avenue on the south, which is the Calgary city limit; and the Bow River on the east, which is the major boundary that you had mentioned in your report. This ensures that the riding is compact and geographically coherent. As it stands now, Calgary-Shaw includes Somerset and Shaughnessy. I'm suggesting that they be moved to Calgary-Lougheed, which will bring down the increase in population in Calgary-Shaw. So the Calgary-Shaw that I am suggesting would be, if you can see this with my dreadful pen, a coherent, compact space that I think people would be able to recognize and we would have access to our MLAs.

That's it. Questions?

The Chair: Okay. Yeah. Can you tell me on your proposal for changes to Calgary-Shaw what the population of that electoral division would be?

Dr. Stewart: Do you know? I'm sorry. I don't.

Mr. Clark: If you leave it with us, I can do some drawings on that.

Dr. Stewart: Okay. Part of the reason that I'm mentioning this is that it makes sense geographically, because this up here is the area that is Somerset and Shaughnessy. The other reason that I'm mentioning this . . .

The Chair: Actually, while you're talking, I'm wondering if that could be presented to Mr. Clark and he can manipulate the map.

Dr. Stewart: You can have this. Thank you. I'm sorry; it looks like I drew it with crayon.

Mr. Clark: That's okay. I'll do my best. I may ask some questions along the way.

Dr. Stewart: What I was going to point out is that in preparation for the first round we formed a little committee in my area. One of the members of that committee is an active realtor, and she provided a really deep-down look into those communities. One of the things that she pointed out is that in Somerset and Shaughnessy there may be – what did I say? – eight houses to a block or something, but she said that in many of those houses those are immigrant families, and there may be 10 to 12 people living there. That is a very dense area. Part of the reason those people move to that area is that they have access to the C-Train so they can get on the train and go to whatever employment.

Thinking that way, I think it makes sense, not just me but the little committee that we had decided that it would make sense, that we suggested that Somerset and Shaughnessy be removed, which would bring us back down, because our population in Calgary-Shaw was increasing. So we tried to take care of that by suggesting that those areas be moved. We also suggested very briefly that they be added to Calgary-Lougheed because they're adjacent to Calgary-Lougheed. They're next door to Calgary-Lougheed.

Now, more questions?

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

Mr. Evans: No, but thank you, Dr. Stewart.

The Chair: Okay. Mrs. Samson.

Mrs. Samson: No. I'm good, but thank you for coming out. I appreciate that.

The Chair: I heard you say that you are very – were you commenting on the Calgary-Okotoks riding?

Dr. Stewart: Yes, I am, sir.

The Chair: So you'd be much more in favour of option 2 that we presented in our report.

Dr. Stewart: Yes. I think, if I had it correct in my mind, it was called option B in the report, but yeah, that's what I'm trying to say.

The Chair: Yeah. You're right. Thank you.

Okay. Dr. Martin.

Dr. Martin: Well, that's really what I was going to ask about. Thanks for that. So the blended riding, so to speak, is a no go for the reasons you suggested. Also, your preferred Calgary-Shaw footprint is the old footprint less the Shawnessy component?

Dr. Stewart: Shawnessy and Somerset.

Dr. Martin: Quite. Everything that's north . . .

Dr. Stewart: Of Stoney Trail.

Dr. Martin: . . . of the Spruce Meadows Trail would go somewhere else.

Dr. Stewart: Yeah. I didn't ask this: do you want a copy of my presentation today? It's all written down here.

The Chair: Sure. Yeah. Leave it with Mr. Roth here, and he'll make sure we all get a copy.

Dr. Stewart: Any more questions?

Mr. Clark: If I'd done what I think you want me to do, the numbers would work: 58,158, which is pretty much the same, so that's really helpful. Yeah. That's good. Thank you. I'll give this back to you.

Dr. Stewart: Well, I can't take sole credit. There was a little committee. Thank you for listening. I really appreciate your time.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Sorry, Mr. Clark. That was 58,000?

Mr. Clark: According to our magic map, 58,158, so call it 58,200 for round numbers.

The Chair: Okay. Our next presenter: Mr. Inam Teja. Good evening. Please identify yourself, make yourself comfortable, and tell us what electoral division you're in.

Mr. Teja: I'm Inam Teja, and I'm speaking to the proposed Calgary-West-Elbow Valley.

Good evening, commissioners. Thank you for the opportunity to appear today. My name is Inam Teja, and I'm here to speak about the proposed boundaries for Calgary-West-Elbow Valley, where I currently reside. I'm participating because I care deeply about fair representation in my city and province and because my own experience running for city council has given me a very practical understanding of how electoral boundaries shape whose voices are heard and how effectively.

I want to begin by sincerely thanking the commission for the work reflected in this report. I recognize the difficulty of balancing population growth, geography, legal principles, and competing regional needs. Overall, I want to be clear that I view the proposed map as thoughtful and well reasoned. The population of Calgary-West-Elbow Valley is extremely close to the provincial average, which aligns strongly with the principle of effective representation as articulated in the Carter decision. I also appreciate that the commission has acknowledged Calgary's rapid growth and has already taken steps to add additional seats in the city. I think that recognition matters.

That said, I want to focus my comments on one specific concern, the move toward hybrid urban-rural districts and why I respectfully believe that, where possible, Alberta should instead prioritize adding seats rather than blending fundamentally different communities of interest. In the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act you are directed to consider both communities of interest and effective representation. Those concepts are closely linked in practice. Communities of interest are not just lines on a map. They reflect how people live, work, move through their city or region, and engage with government.

Running for city council taught me how difficult it is to represent even a single urban constituency well. Within a city, constituents can already have vastly different priorities: transit, housing, affordability, the opioid crisis, public safety, or infrastructure investment. These issues require constant engagement, policy fluency, and importantly, proximity. These issues are at least all connected by an urban fibre. Many of the most pressing issues for the residents of the current Calgary-West are things like investment in public transit, inner-city housing supply, and urban infrastructure, and these are not especially relevant to rural or acreage communities. Conversely, rural residents quite reasonably expect their representatives to understand land use, access to services, transportation distances, and the realities of lower density living.

5:50

Hybrid districts risk placing MLAs in an impossible position. An MLA may feel pressured to allocate time based on geography rather than population or based on population rather than geography. Either way, someone can lose out. There's also a real risk that smaller rural populations of a hybrid district could feel deprioritized, while urban voters may feel their concerns are diluted by issues that fall largely outside of the provincial role in cities. This is not a criticism of rural communities; it's quite the opposite. I think rural MLAs already face significant demands due to travel distances and dispersed populations. Combining rural and urban areas may unintentionally weaken the representation for both.

I really appreciated the commission's candour when they were outlining the three options identified by the Alberta Court of Appeal – increasing the number of seats, redistributing rural seats, or creating hybrid seats – when trying to deal with the decline in the relative rural population. Of those options I want to state clearly and respectfully that the first option, increasing the number of seats, is the approach that I most strongly support. I think adding seats recognizes Alberta's population growth without asking representatives to stretch themselves across communities with fundamentally different needs. I also believe that it is most effective at maintaining relative parity of voting power while protecting access to representatives who can meaningfully serve their constituents.

Calgary continues to grow rapidly, and that growth has real consequences for schools, roads, transit, emergency services, and housing. Electoral representation influences how effectively those

needs are raised and addressed at the provincial level. While the commission has already taken important steps in this direction, I would encourage you to go further when feasible. I also want to emphasize that keeping communities of interest intact strengthens democratic engagement. People are more likely to vote, participate, and bring forward concerns when they feel their districts reflect who they are and how they live. When boundaries feel arbitrary or complex, trust and engagement suffer.

In closing, I want to reiterate my appreciation for your professionalism and public service. I understand that no map will ever be perfect and that trade-offs are unavoidable. My comments are offered in the spirit of supporting your work and strengthening effective representation in Alberta, especially as it continues to change. Thank you for your time, for listening carefully to public input, and for the seriousness with which you've approached this responsibility.

I'd be happy to answer any questions.

The Chair: Thank you.

Susan, questions?

Mrs. Samson: Thanks.

Thanks for your comments. I want you to know that we have heard a lot about hybrids, and I would have to say that if we were counting numbers, more people are concerned or unsure of them than they are supportive of the ones that you particularly refer to where it's joining onto an urban centre. So I thank you for those comments. You said you lived in Elbow Valley?

Mr. Teja: I live in Calgary-West. I live in the community of Springbank Hill.

Mrs. Samson: Yeah. So you saw that that is considered a hybrid now.

Mr. Teja: Yes.

Mrs. Samson: What are your thoughts on that? Has that changed at all, if you look specifically at what we joined in to Calgary-West?

Mr. Teja: Yeah. If you look at what's added to Calgary-West, I feel like it's quite a different – I don't know – for lack of a better term, vibe from what currently exists in Calgary-West. My concern is that the issue sets that an MLA would have to navigate are quite different. You know, hearing about some of the challenges in Calgary-West when I was running for city council in that area, a lot of them are what I would consider more urban issues whereas I suspect that's a very different mix of issues for folks who live a more rural lifestyle there.

Mrs. Samson: Okay. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Mr. Evans, any questions?

Mr. Evans: I'm wondering what your thoughts are on – you know, one of the factors under 14(b) of the legislation is of course communities of interest, and it identifies "including municipalities, regional and rural communities, Indian reserves and Metis settlements." Would you agree that when we're looking at the dichotomy between rural and urban issues and how that would interplay in a hybrid constituency, are we just balancing community interests? Isn't that exactly what an MLA does all the time in every riding that you have an MLA?

Mr. Teja: Yeah. I think the job requires you to balance a lot of issues. Speaking from my experience of running for city council,

that's really hard to do. It's one of those things that I think – you know, you hear such different issues just from different doors on the same street, and you have to balance those. But I think we do our public servants a disservice by making that job even harder. Just thinking about how much reading I would have to do to just understand two issues that are both very linked in an urban context, like transit and infrastructure planning, having to consider that now in a rural context where the water system is completely different and you have to learn about water licensing and some of the other challenges there, I think, demands a lot more of an MLA than I would want demanded of my MLA.

Mr. Evans: I mean, are we not really deluding ourselves pretending that we can create an electoral district that's homogeneous in Canada? It's impossible.

Mr. Teja: Sure. I don't think you're ever going to have a homogeneous district, but I think there is a divide there.

Mr. Evans: You can have competing interests, whether they're religious or race based or whatever the case is. Whether it's a community-identifiable community interest like rural versus urban or one religious group versus another religious group or a cultural identity versus another cultural identity, these are all things that have to be balanced by an elected representative who understands that when they run for office.

Mr. Teja: Yeah. I agree. I think that that balance is something that elected officials do sign up for. I think the point I'm trying to make is that we should be making it easier for the elected officials as much as possible considering how difficult it is. I think balancing, you know, different factors such as maybe the income of a community might be split along certain lines and stuff is tough, but when you look at different jurisdictions, you add what I would call a significant level of complexity. When you're talking about the issues that are within the boundaries of Calgary versus boundaries elsewhere, to me, I would say that adds a level of complexity, and that just makes it easier for things to slip between the cracks.

Mr. Evans: You would say that that was more complex than religious dichotomy and cultural distinguishing factors? I mean, we say in Canada that multiculturalism makes us stronger, but it also makes it more complex. Why is it not the same in this instance?

Mr. Teja: I think the difference I would say there is the jurisdictional challenges in working with different governments, right? If you're a city councillor, you work with an MLA, who works with your MP, but when you're now looking at, "Okay; I have to work with a mayor and a reeve," and because you're crossing a jurisdictional boundary, you don't have that same easy access to a counterpart that you understand that framework. You have to learn all these different frameworks.

Mr. Evans: Thank you.

The Chair: Dr. Martin.

Dr. Martin: Thank you. I'm just pondering this. First of all, both you, sir, and a previous speaker allude to a dichotomy between urban and rural in precisely this sense, but I want to put the case to you that it's not a dichotomy. There is a range of exurban forms of life from out here at the farm, classic rural, if you will, right through to skyscraper world in the middle of a city. There's a huge range of communities and forms of life, and to think merely in terms of a dichotomy is an injustice to the reality on the ground.

Now, you know, there are lots of places on the fringe of Calgary – always have been, I think – as well as around Edmonton and other places that are small acreage plots, and they are not rural.

Mr. Teja: Yeah. It is a spectrum. Sure.

Dr. Martin: You know, they live in these plots. They have the luxury of a large chunk of land, and they have lots of toys to play around on it, but really they work in an urban environment. They share the same issues about local budgeting priorities, infrastructure issues, representation issues, access to services, and so on. There's not much different going on, and so the notion that one can make an easy dichotomy is, I feel, false. Some of your remarks are perfectly sound, yet they don't encompass the reality on the ground, which is like a city like Calgary, which has grown so spectacularly within its boundaries. It's now like a fat man wearing a small belt. What are you going to do? You're just going to continue to have the bulge, or are you going to loosen your belt? Hybrids are like loosening the belt.

6:00

Mr. Teja: Yeah, I mean, I certainly appreciate that it's not just a one or the other, urban or rural, and there's a whole spectrum of communities. I think maybe one way of looking at this is to look at land slated for annexation, and I think that that's maybe a good predictor of where the city boundaries may overlap that belt, as you put it.

Dr. Martin: I'm sorry. It's a bit of a crude metaphor, but it's late at night.

Mr. Teja: Yeah. I totally understand that there is this mix, you know, an acreage community. I know that in this new map, I think, it includes the Pineridge golf course and all the houses there. I know that a number of folks who live on that golf course do work in downtown Calgary, and so there is this blending, and you have the tough job of making those distinctions and cuts, but I do think that we ask a lot to have a whole bunch of different priorities with the same voice. I don't think it's easy to say, "There's a clean cut here; there's a clean cut there," but I do think that having a sense of the city boundaries and also where the city might expand as a guiding principle is helpful.

Dr. Martin: Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Mr. Clark.

Mr. Clark: Yeah, thank you very much. It's a really interesting discussion. I mean, as we get into, you know, how we define communities of interest in the legislation, it makes me think a little of the old saying of: I can't clearly define it, but I know it when I see it. Like, I know what it is and I know what it isn't, and I choose to live in Calgary, or I choose to live in Springbank because it's not Calgary. Right? And so it may actually be no more complicated than that.

What I wanted to ask you about, though, is what – the first presenter today, actually, earlier this morning, was from Elbow Valley. It has made me think a bit about: well, are there certain situations where a hybrid actually makes sense? Right? I think, clearly, around the province there are areas where we've traditionally had hybrids, but they tend to be the kind of mid-sized urban areas where the math just doesn't really work if you don't have some sort of rural-urban, but this is the first time that we're able to do it with the big cities.

I look at somewhere like Elbow Valley, and her perspective was like yours. She doesn't like the idea of too many hybrids. However,

as a resident of Elbow Valley sharing underground infrastructure – so a sanitary sewer comes to Calgary – the urban forum is quite dense. It's really nowhere else to be. There are no stores. Everybody comes to Calgary. So it really may not technically be Calgary, but, boy, it sure feels like it compared to a Springbank or a Bears paw or other places. Would you agree with that, that that's maybe one example where it makes sense to have a hybrid?

Mr. Teja: I guess I question the inevitability of hybrids a little bit. My alternative would be to just add more seats, and I know that that's a challenge for you folks to debate and comes with its own challenges to make that happen. I think in an ideal world, for me, that's how I would do it, is actually to say: "Yeah. You know what? You have a community or a set of communities that sort of use a lot of the services of Calgary but don't really consider themselves Calgary and have different jurisdictional challenges. Great. Let's have that be represented separately from the issues of a bunch of university students who live in Calgary and have a different issue set." Noting that can't always happen, I think you have a lot of tough options, and if you have to do the hybrids, you know, eat, shop, and play in Calgary makes sense, but that only makes sense if you have to do the hybrids.

Mr. Clark: Great. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Mr. Teja, it's obvious that you read the report and you know the three options we have. Unfortunately, we were not given a legislative pen to say: no, we don't want 89; we want 97 ridings. We're stuck with the 89, so that one option is very, very limited. Then we're stuck with the two other options, take more seats out of the sparsely populated rural areas and just give them to the city. You know, I wish we had a budget to make all the city presenters come to the rural areas to present and all the rural presenters come to the cities to present so that there was that cross-pollination a bit. Can I summarize your presentation as saying that you're not really in favour of hybrids, but in some situations you recognize they're necessary?

Mr. Teja: Yeah, if we're not able to do the option 1. That's mostly what I want noted, that I do like the option 1 the best. If we're not able to do the option 1, we should be very thoughtful and hesitant to use hybrids, but I do think that you probably need them.

The Chair: They are a legitimate option, right?

Mr. Teja: Yeah. The constraints of having to go across a very large district for an MLA are tough, and that's one I can certainly empathize with and understand. If you're trying to represent an area that covers 13 different townships that are all an hour drive away from each other, it's not going to lead to effective representation either.

The Chair: Okay. Well, thank you very much. You'll be pleased to know that we had a government minister present this afternoon and we kind of chided him a little bit about why we only had 89.

Mr. Teja: Well, I'm certainly pleased that that's on your mind.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much for your thoughtful presentation. Please remain, if you can, to hear the other presentations.

Mr. Teja: Thank you.

The Chair: Our next presenter is Denys Robinson.

Please identify yourself, and tell us where you're from and what riding you're referencing.

Mr. Robinson: Yeah. It looks like staff are just pulling up the PowerPoint. My name is Denys Robinson. I reside in Calgary-Varsity, and I'm here to talk primarily about Calgary-Varsity.

The Chair: You're wise to have a PowerPoint at this stage of the evening for us. Thank you.

Mr. Robinson: You're welcome. Okay. Folks can see the presentation all right? Excellent.

Calgary-Varsity is too large. I'm going to talk a little bit about why that is and what my evidence is for thinking that's the case.

Sorry. I'm just getting the notes onto the screen here.

I'm going to go briefly through some of the population growth methodology.

The Chair: Can I ask you: is it too large populationwise or geographically?

Mr. Robinson: Populationwise.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Robinson: Yeah. It's a fairly small urban riding by geographical.

I'm going to talk a little bit about the population growth projection methodology that's used, explain why I think this means you're underestimating the current population and future populations of both Calgary-Varsity and Calgary-Bow, speak a little bit about some of the geographic and historical connections between Bowness and Montgomery, and also talk about the general geography of the area. You discuss in your report the way the river provides a natural boundary between the two ridings, and I'll explain why I think that's not the right way to think about the area. Then I'll suggest a couple of proposed solutions.

First of all, you can ask me questions about this because I don't have time to go through all of it. Basically the statistical methodology used by the OSI to calculate the current and projected populations – well, the current population is probably fine mostly – does not take into account growth from exogenous variables, specifically changes in housing policy and zoning. I'll walk through some of the ways in which both of these areas are undergoing massive change in zoning and projected housing starts, and this is simply not captured by the models you're using or are being used by the OSI, which from my understanding of your report, is your primary reference source. Yeah. If you want me to articulate more on that, you can look at the slide or ask me questions, but I'll run way over the six minutes if I walk through all of it.

6:10

Just to briefly kind of go over some of the details of it, this is a heat map of row house development in Calgary. This was the city ward, so it's a little hard to see, but you'll notice the high area in yellow – that's Bowness and Montgomery – and you'll notice some of the areas in red and yellow are in areas like Banff Trail and Brentwood, Charleswood, areas that are in Calgary-Varsity. These new row house developments substantially increase density and they're not going to be caught by the OSI methodology, so you're not catching those increases in population. I think it's also worth noting that they're largely entirely outside Calgary-West, with the exception of a little bit in Glamorgan in the corner there. No, pardon me. Glamorgan is in Calgary-Elbow, so they're entirely outside Calgary-West.

Additionally, Calgary-Varsity is just generally booming. I believe other presenters have spoken about this, but you're not fully incorporating the numbers in the University district, which is a huge

master-planned area that, once again, the OSI methodology is not going to catch. There are macro factors. The very large employment centres right in the middle of Calgary-Varsity, the hospital and the university, are huge employment hubs that will continue to cause an increase in housing demands. You should expect in the long term that population growth will be more intense there. You could argue with the details, but it doesn't seem to me that the OSI methodology captures those increases.

I'm sorry, I'm having a little bit of trouble seeing my slides from here. Oh, yes. The University of Calgary is undergoing substantial residency expansions. I don't have the numbers off the top of my head, but they're not even able to currently guarantee all of their first-year students a resident spot, and rents are quite high in Calgary. So they have extra land on that university campus, they've recognized a need, and they're building substantial additional housing there. I expect they'll be in, you know, more than one tranche, so over a decade you might see several projects.

Then finally, the current city council, the majority of members explicitly committed to increasing transit-oriented development in the most recent election, and as I'm sure you know, the northwest Red Line passes right along Varsity, so it is very likely to be the case that there will be an increase in transit-oriented developments near University, Brentwood, and Dalhousie stations, which most if not all of that development would fall within the riding.

Calgary-Bow is also booming. The West District is the most significant source of this. That is a large development sort of east of 85th Street in the riding. It's, I think, a little bit less than half done. You can see from this picture. It's just their promotional material, but I've spent a lot of time walking around the neighbourhood and it's quite accurate. It's just huge. There's a ton – an absolute ton – of housing. I believe the estimates are over 10,000 residents when the area is completed. You know, that's slightly less than a one-sixth increase in a population area. Now, some of that will be accounted for already, but once again, not all of it. It will cause a kind of spike in the graph in terms of population growth in that area, and that will not be captured by the kind of backwards-looking projection methodology that's being used. Then there's another West District S. development that's smaller, called Medicine Hill, kind of down the hill from West District, which is also in the mid-stage of being built out and filled in.

Okay. This is the point about the river. You can sort of see that there's a river going through, but there are two additional significant geographic factors that sort of split up this area. The first is the Trans-Canada Highway, which acts as a bit of a divider between communities in some of those areas, and I think the more important one, though, is the escarpment. It's true there's a river – the river separates Bowness and Montgomery – but there's a bridge over it and it's flat ground. You can bike, walk, drive between Bowness and Montgomery. There's a bus line connecting the two, so they're actually quite connected communities. But if you try to go up the hill from Bowness and Montgomery into Cougar Ridge or Paskapoo, any of these areas kind of up the hill in Bow, it's actually quite a long way around. You simply cannot walk or bike that route unless, you know, you have 45 minutes to an hour and the willingness to go up a fairly steep hill. Even a car trip will be four or five times longer than just transitioning across the river.

I think you were correct to say that the river to some extent is a natural geographic divider. But what I would say, really, is that there's not one side of the river or the other. There's on top of the escarpment on the south, on top of the escarpment on the north, and then the river valley, and those three areas: none of them should be carved up separately. They should be left as part of the same area. They're the same communities historically. Bowness and Montgomery were – probably some of you know this better than I

do – separate towns that were incorporated into Calgary as Calgary spread out and have their own history and community and are closely connected in that way.

That brings me to my next slide, which is pulling this all together. We've seen that Calgary-Varsity and Calgary-Bow are booming. You know, like, my basic idea is that these numbers you have for Calgary-Varsity and Calgary-Bow, 57,000 and 55,000, are underestimations and will increase at a faster rate than is projected. I think, especially in Calgary-Varsity's case, what you're likely to end up with over the 10-year period is like the situation you end up with in Calgary-Buffalo, where there's a population boom, presumably because of increased development in the downtown and the central Beltline areas. You're going to have a similar boom in Calgary-Varsity as that intensification spreads out from the core to the ring suburbs in Calgary-Varsity. As you know, I've laid the case that we can already see the areas that are going to increase a lot, and we can also see the kind of basic case for broad increases. So that 57,000, which is already above the average, is going to go much, much higher. I think that's a little bit unbalanced.

Now, the obvious solution – right? – is to not add that section of Bow, Montgomery into Calgary-Varsity, but that creates the problem of, I think, the same thing that is going to happen in Bow. Then, you know, I'm just sort of saying to my neighbours in Bow: okay; well, you guys get the two larger ridings. Then you have to go to the next step, and I think the two obvious places to look at are Calgary-North West and Calgary-West-Elbow Valley. I don't have a strong view about which part is appropriate. These are sort of suggestions. I think Crestmont in the west of Calgary-Bow is less geographically connected and less connected on transportation corridors to those areas up the hill in Bow or the areas down the hill in Montgomery and Bowness, so you could add it to Calgary-North West. In fact, at the city level the ward 1 councillor represents those areas as well as the areas north of the river. So at that other political level, those areas are connected. You'd have to talk to somebody from there as to which area they feel closer to.

This is an area I do know a little bit better. Like I said, I spend a lot of time along 85th Street. There's an area west of 85th Street sort of near the West District development. Google Maps thinks it's called Wentworth. I sort of think of it as west West Springs, so west of 85th Street and just north of Bow Trail. You could simply tack that onto Calgary-West-Elbow Valley instead of going and tacking on a rural area which, as many presenters have suggested, is not as aligned or not as maybe integrated. The reality is that although Bow Trail is a bit of a separator, at 85th and Bow, you know, it's not a huge barrier. It's not like an interchange where no pedestrian traffic can cross. The two areas north and south of Bow Trail are geographically and culturally pretty contiguous. They shop at the same areas. They're probably mostly shopping at the same grocery store, in fact. So I think it's an appropriate connected area, and it would help balance out those population areas.

To make the final point of the argument, Calgary-North West is down, at 52,000, so if you added a couple thousand there, you'd be less at risk. Calgary-West-Elbow Valley is not experiencing the same level of growth as Calgary-Bow and Calgary-Varsity are. There is growth there. There certainly is. But my reason for suggesting is that the vast majority of the neighbourhoods in the east end are 10, 20, 25 years away from their kind of redevelopment turnover and densification whereas the areas down in Bowness and Montgomery or in Varsity are about, you know, 20 years older. They were built more in the '50s rather than the '70s, and they're turning over and densifying with the new R-CG and H-GO style developments, which have a much higher unit rate.

6:20

Okay. Just to recap, we should expect Calgary-Varsity to grow more than your report currently predicts. We should move things over to Calgary-Bow, but Calgary-Bow should expect the same level of projections, and it would be more appropriate to trim a couple of areas off into Calgary-West and Calgary-North West. Finally, I just recommend that you take into account the escarpments-roads-rivers combination when considering geographic continuity, and in Montgomery and Bowness specifically I think it's appropriate that those areas be part of the same riding.

Yeah. Happy to take any questions.

The Chair: Okay. I'm going to start with the questions. You've obviously spent a lot of time, sir, on the population. We have Calgary-Varsity pegged at 57,166 according to the OSI stats from 2024. On your analysis what is the population now? What have we got wrong here?

Mr. Robinson: Yeah. That was a larger endeavour, and I only have access to the description of the model, not the full data sets to run it myself, so I couldn't answer that question. I would tweak a little bit . . .

The Chair: Could I interject and say that you're not sure?

Mr. Robinson: I'm sure directionally, but I'm not sure with a fixed number.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Robinson: I am certain that – sorry; I should caveat this. If their descriptions of their model are fully accurate and correct and they didn't sort of underexplain a part of the detail, I am certain that they have no variable which can or does take into account rezoning or housing growth. They're going down to the plot level, but they're doing it by pulling from the land title data set. As you may know, the land titles do not include information about zoning. All they're doing is saying: ah, these properties changed hands. Basically, what the model says is: we looked at our provincial data sets, and we had these people move in and these people move out. We had these people get . . .

The Chair: Sorry. I'm going to interject here. I'm not sure you're accurate that that's how OSI came up with their numbers. They have a very sophisticated system, and it's not only land titles. My question is: you think the number is higher than 57,166, correct?

Mr. Robinson: No. Sorry. I said two things. I said that I suspect that it could be a little bit higher, but . . .

The Chair: So you think it's higher?

Mr. Robinson: . . . the primary point I was making was that it should be growing a lot more. It says in your report that Calgary-Varsity's population is expected to be fairly stable, and I just don't think that that's an accurate assessment of what's going on.

The Chair: Okay. That's a different challenge, though. What you're saying is that our projections may not be accurate. You're critiquing the model, but you can't say with any certainty what the number should be different than 57,166, right?

Mr. Robinson: I can say directionally. I can't give you a number.

The Chair: Yeah.

Mr. Robinson: Let me make it really explicit. It is not 2024 anymore. There has been, you know, a year, a year and a half from whenever they did it. There have been a disproportionate number of developments and move-ins in Calgary-Varsity since then.

The Chair: Agreed.

Mr. Robinson: So it's got to be higher than 57,000. Additionally, my suggestion is that the rate at which it's higher than 57,000 should be a larger increase than other areas for all the points I made about development. So that's the one point. I can't give you that exact number. If OSI ran their model again, I would expect that they would get a very accurate number. My suggestion is that you should expect that that difference – you know, say there is an average of 1,200 added. It probably would be 1,500 or 1,800 in Calgary-Varsity. That difference, the delta would be there.

The second piece is that in the current version of the report, it's my understanding – I believe that's what I read – that you say that Calgary-Varsity's population has been stable and should be expected to remain stable. My point is that that should be what the OSI model tells you, that historically Calgary-Varsity, that area's population was reasonably stable, but we're entering into a period of substantial growth. So that claim in the report, that it's a stable population, from which I inferred you thought it was reasonable to have that slightly above average, that 57,000 and a bit number: you can't draw that inference. You should in fact think that the OSI model, as I believe I demonstrated, is not going to take into account the projections of increased population growth from variable – it doesn't calculate the zoning changes in these major projects, which . . .

The Chair: Okay. I think I get your point.

I'll open it up to other commissioners. Mr. Evans, any questions?

Mr. Evans: Yes. Okay. You know, whether you don't have access to the data – frankly, I probably have access to the data, but I don't understand it. The models work in the manner that they function, but they do provide a standard upon which we have anchor points that we can look at.

For example, in the census numbers the OSI data that was used to generate the previous data set was 2016, and it had this riding, Calgary-Varsity, at 49,000. Now, we can move forward to the data set that we're using, which is 2024, and it's at 57,166. Whether those numbers are exactly right or not I don't think, from my perspective, is all that important. It's more important the spread between the two and looking at that and assessing whether or not that is representative of the growth you're talking about or whether it's more representative of the growth that we've been relying on and using that to predict into the future whether the historic growth that we can see there is going to continue or not.

The other thing that's very interesting is that if you look at the eligible voter numbers – and I think that's probably a data set that may in this circumstance be very valuable in determining whether what you're predicting is likely to happen or what we're saying, based on our numbers, is likely to happen. Just to give you some numbers, eligible voters in 2019: 27,466. Then in 2023 eligible voters increased to 32,700. I didn't run it, but if we looked at the spread there and we compared it to the 2016 and 2024 numbers, perhaps we'd have a better idea about whose projection is high or low.

You seem to be a numbers guy. Just sitting here right now, would you say that those numbers that I've given you would be more representative of what you are predicting?

Mr. Robinson: No. I want to be clear. My comments were on what we should think directionally about the methodology. I did not run an original set of numbers. I'll point out one thing that you said or that you seem to be suggesting that I strongly disagree with, and that's that eligible voters were more relevant than the total population.

Mr. Evans: No, no. It's simply a factor. It's just another data set.

Mr. Robinson: Okay. I think that I would be deeply concerned about focusing too much on eligible voters, and I'll tell you why. Children are not eligible voters, but they have very, very substantial political and moral interests in our society.

Mr. Evans: But their voice comes from an eligible voter. Don't forget that.

Mr. Robinson: That's absolutely true.

Mr. Evans: So they're not speaking for themselves. They speak through their parents.

Mr. Robinson: Absolutely. I don't have children, but it seems, to me, unreasonable that if there's a riding with, you know, a bunch of families – say we have two neighbouring streets and you have 20 couples with no children and on the other street you have 20 couples with two children each – we sort of say: oh, well, because there are 20 eligible voters on each street, they get weighed the same. There are a lot of benefits to not having children financially. I don't think you also get to then say: oh, I get to cut the kids out of the equation. I think that, yes, the parents do speak for the children. You can argue about what age or whatever, but I think that's roughly how it works in our society. I think it's a pretty good system, and I think that means that you should pay attention to the full numbers.

That may seem like a quibble, but I want to bring that back to Calgary-Varsity. Calgary-Varsity has a number of neighbourhoods in which, basically, baby boom era families are now moving out and it's transitioning to Millennial or Gen Z families, and it's a lot of young families and parents. Once again I would suggest that disproportionately over the next 10 years in those areas you're going to see those noneligible voters, but it's important that they have a voice.

6:30

I think you guys both made the same kind of counterpoint to what I was suggesting, which is: hard to know exactly what's happening here; the statistical model is pretty good, so we'll go with it. I think that that's mostly fair. My suggestion is just that the statistical model – this isn't me saying that I know better than the OSI. The OSI, my understanding of their documents, is that they say themselves that this statistical model is not appropriate for projecting. It's not appropriate for projecting at the micro level, and it will not take into account changes in housing policy. The components growth model that the OSI's model is based on from StatsCan: in the guide to it they explicitly said what I just said. You can see the citations in the slide.

The Chair: Okay. I'm going to stop you there because we've got a lot of questions still to ask.

Susan, any questions?

Mrs. Samson: I just wanted to mention to you that the suggestion you make for Montgomery to move over into Calgary-Bow is a good one. I have read that in other submissions. I think the way you presented it and the way you showed it on the map: it's very clear

that there's an easy connection there that we have disrupted. Thank you for bringing that to my attention.

Just as an aside, what do you do for a living?

Mr. Robinson: I'm a policy adviser by training and trade. I worked for the Ontario government for a number of years, and I married a woman from Alberta, so I'm here now.

Mrs. Samson: Yeah. Lucky us. Thank you.

Mr. Robinson: Well, that's very kind of you. Thank you. Yeah. Lucky me, I usually think.

The Chair: Dr. Martin.

Dr. Martin: Thank you. I'm just very interested in your comments on the methodology. We don't want to prolong it. I don't think any of us in this room would disagree with the notion that, you know, one can presume in your heart of hearts that the number is bigger than the number on July 1, 2024. I think any statistician involved in census work would agree with that hands down all the time. No census is bleeding-edge accurate ever. Never has been, which is why the minute a census is done, they immediately start issuing reassessments. A census is a huge quilt of probabilistic factors, each of which has a different probability weighting. It's like a huge linear equation. They are the first people to acknowledge that it can't be empirically accurate. A lot rides in government. OSI is a department of the treasury which is intensely interested in the distribution of monies to the right number of populations across the province, across the country.

The whole business of doing a census is to establish a baseline – this is the important part – all the factors of which can be deployed in each district of the province. That's the terrible truth of it. Some of the factors that you probably quite rightly see as distinguishing Varsity from other areas can't be replicated across all the districts, so they don't get included.

Mr. Robinson: I mostly agree with you. I think that it would be a lot of work, but you could replicate it. I have at a broad level – the differences are so enormous and stark on the size of these developments. It could be the case that the developments in Bow I talked about add, you know, not just 1,000 or 500 but, like, 10,000 people, right?

Dr. Martin: I don't disagree with that either, but as a commission we have a legally imposed and certainly a self-imposed future restriction. It's what I call the Tyvek rule. If you can't show me Tyvek on the building, I'm not going to count it.

Mr. Robinson: Okay. What I'm telling you is that there are buildings that the Tyvek is now off that aren't counted yet, and those disproportionately exist in Bow and Varsity. I believe that, you know, my slides and references on them do a good job of demonstrating that. If you were to tell me, "Denys, you actually haven't been paying attention to the subdivision development in Rocky Ridge, and there are 8,000 homes there," I would say: "Fair enough. I didn't go up and measure the subdivision." You could look at the D-map yourself and see. It would be quickly apparent what was going on. I didn't check that myself. Yeah.

I'm reasonably confident. I ran a municipal campaign in Calgary in ward 6, so Calgary-West. I knocked, like, 10,000 doors in this neighbourhood. I've been by foot and dropped another 10,000 doors. I spent the whole year doing it for a good friend of mine, so I'm deeply familiar with these areas. And I live in Calgary-Varsity and I've walked all over and biked all over. I also follow housing

policy quite closely as a partly professional, partly personal interest. So just the raw number of D-map applications, review of the local area plans, what's actually going on with the building in these areas: I'm just very familiar with it.

I didn't do the kind of, like, reverse modelling – I do have a day job – that the OSI is able to produce, but the OSI is explicit that they don't take into account the variables that I presented some evidence on. I think the evidence I presented is just so stark that I think it's pretty robust.

Dr. Martin: Thank you.

Mr. Clark: I promise to be quick.

The Chair: Sure. Yep.

Mr. Clark: I guess I have some good news. We're using the OSI data as it exists at July 1, 2024. That's it. I mean, there's no sort of quibble. That's just the way it is. But what I'm interested in is two things that you've raised, that the relevant data set for us is population as defined by OSI that we have access to, not elector roles, not eligible voters, not voter turnout. It's population, and that's been pretty clear for boundaries commissions across the country, you know, for a long time. So that's our data set.

If I could maybe just summarize what I heard from you, Varsity is growing quickly, Bow is growing quickly, so you've got a couple of specific suggestions. What you're not saying so much is that we need more seats. You're saying, listen, these places, Bow and Varsity: one, Montgomery belongs with Bow, and two, it's going to grow more than we've accounted for, so allow some headroom for that; specifically, move Crestmont and Wentworth out to adjacent constituencies. Is that sort of a summary?

Mr. Robinson: Yeah, I think that's fair. I guess there's implicitly a question about what I think about the broader distribution. I think it's very concerning that the gap between the ratio of electors in ridings is pushing at both ends on the rural-urban spectrum. I mean, I think it's well understood in Alberta that it's deeply unreasonable that the Senate numbers cooked up in 1867 give Alberta inadequate representation in the Senate. I mean the federal, the Canadian Senate.

I think the same intuition about the importance of maybe not a strict, you know, one person, one vote but that principle of equal representation is quite central in democracy. I think you're starting to strain it in Alberta with some of the ratios. That's particularly concerning when there is so strong a political divide, right? If you had a situation where there were five Conservative rural ridings and three Liberal rural ridings and two NDP rural ridings, it would be far less concerning. But you have a stark divide where one set of ridings votes a certain way and the other set of ridings votes another way, and then there's this gap in the thing.

I mean, I take seriously the comments of the previous speaker, who suggested that these rural areas require a different sort of representation. But, you know, just as Dr. Martin suggested to that speaker, there isn't a clean dichotomy between "Okay; rural, so it's got to be smaller." There has to be a balancing of the two factors. It's my understanding that the UCP in the last provincial election had a slight disadvantage in the popular vote, so the rural riding advantage for the smaller population numbers wasn't as distorting. But by baking in an acceptance of a distorted ratio over time, that efficiency could change, right?

6:40

It was thought for a long time in the United States that the Republicans were always going to have a more efficient vote. Then,

you know, one time it switched. I think in '16 or maybe in '12 it switched and everybody was very surprised, but electoral coalitions switch over time, and issues become different. If you end up in a situation where a new party system emerges, there's whichever successor party of this or that 10 years down the line dominates in rural areas and their vote is more efficient, you could end up with situations where somebody forms a majority government after losing the popular vote to the other party by six or eight points. The more you push on that line, the more you risk setting up a situation that strains the democratic legitimacy a little bit.

The Chair: Mr. Robinson, I'm going to have to bring this . . .

Mr. Robinson: Yeah. Fair enough.

The Chair: Just in terms of context, though, just so you know, Calgary-Varsity is number 9 on the population level of all 28 Calgary ridings, so there are eight ridings that are higher in population than Calgary-Varsity. I would make one recommendation. Save your presentation for eight years from now because you may very well be proven a hundred per cent correct for the next Electoral Boundaries Commission. Thank you very much.

Mr. Robinson: Fair enough. Yeah. You're very welcome. Thank you for your time this evening.

The Chair: Okay. Mr. David Cloutier.

Mr. Cloutier: Good to go? Fantastic. Great. Thank you, commissioners. My name is David Cloutier, and I'm a lifetime resident of south Calgary. I'm an educator and a parent of two children, aged four and six. I'm grateful to be here again to share some feedback on the future of the electoral boundaries in south Calgary and just want to express my gratitude in hosting these forums, I think in a lot of ways incorporating feedback from the last time we had these consultations.

I have a few things to speak to tonight. The first one I know it's been reflected on here. You know, for the record I know we're bound by the 89 ridings. That makes this work incredibly difficult. Again, thank you for taking that on. But as a member of the public, just want to express my perspective that that really constrains without any flexibility there, I think, a few challenges that have been faced in this boundary drawing process.

To that effect, tonight I'm here to share some thoughts and concerns around the hybrid riding approach in particular in Calgary-Okotoks, instead hoping to urge the commission to adopt a plan B or some iteration thereof. You know, echoing Dr. Stewart's comments, there are things that, if we had more seats, certainly would want to open up more conversation. I think there's really good merit in the idea that the Bow River and the separation between the communities in the south Calgary is significant, but in context of the two options in front of us plan B seems to be a better fit.

I want to talk a little bit more about that just in the context of those communities. When you look at the Calgary-Okotoks proposed riding, there would be my neighbours in the communities of Belmont, Yorkville, Creekstone, and Silverado. Those would be the communities that would be isolated in their representation from Calgary in a Calgary-Okotoks riding. Many of those folks are young families, many new to Alberta. They work in a variety of sectors, but they live in a community with a relatively common experience and way of life.

In south Calgary a lot of our lives revolve around Macleod Trail and not the highway south of the city. When you look at things like schools, when you look at things like recreation, when you look at

things like social circles, those are often integrated for those communities into the communities across Macleod Trail, including Walden, Legacy, and Wolf Willow. There are shared infrastructure resources between these communities, including public transit and the major hub that exists directly north of those at Shawnessy Station. My belief is that merging these high-growth, diverse, and urban communities with the town of Okotoks in the rural Foothills county significantly dilutes the effective representation of those interests and the way of life in those communities.

I think there is a solution that works for both communities. I want to draw particular attention to the commission's report. On page 32 you spent two paragraphs talking about struggling greatly with the map of south Calgary and then proposing two options, you indicated, "with humility and a desire for thoughtful feedback." So that's what I'm just hoping to share in this process.

There is that alternative map that addresses a number of these challenges. I want to talk a little bit more about the municipal boundary. I think that's really going to be important for effective representation when you have a Calgary MLA that can talk about urban infrastructure, that can talk about transit, that can talk about education and other needs that are unique to the city.

And likewise for south of the city, many of those folks in Okotoks. Okotoks is one of Alberta's largest towns. They're neighbours with Diamond Valley and have a close relationship with the formerly Turner Valley and Black Diamond as well as Foothills county. There's shared infrastructure in these areas. They share a lot of natural heritage, including their parks, and then that shared experience in living outside the city.

The commission did note that it would move boundaries around in the city. Again, I think we get into this place of: there is no perfect map, there is no perfect solution to this. But my perspective, and, again, with gratitude for all of the perspective that I think was captured last time, is that the effective representation comes from the preservation of those municipal boundaries and representation in the south.

So my ask for the commission today is hoping that you'll move forward with plan B or a variation of that based on feedback that you receive through the course of these hearings. I'm happy to take any questions.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Evans.

Mr. Evans: No questions.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Mrs. Samson.

Mrs. Samson: I'm good, but thank you for coming out. I appreciate that.

The Chair: Thank you for your very brief and succinct presentation. You're not the first one to have taken that position, I can assure you.

Dr. Martin: I just wanted to ask you: which particular riding do you live in?

Mr. Cloutier: Great question. I have lived in Shaw. Currently I live in Calgary-Lougheed, and I believe the new map would still have me in Lougheed.

Dr. Martin: All right. So, really, you're obviously very familiar with these neighbourhoods.

Mr. Cloutier: Correct. Yeah.

Dr. Martin: Thank you.

Mr. Cloutier: Thank you.

Mr. Clark: Yeah, thank you, and I apologize. While you were presenting, I had my nose in my computer, but it was because I was working on the map and trying to kind of slice and dice and see, you know, where we can move things around in south Calgary. It's hard.

Mr. Cloutier: Absolutely. I would love, you know, when we come around to the next boundaries commission, to have a hand at that tool. It would be amazing. The government of Alberta has published a lot of those ArcGIS resources. The public can go on and access that. It would be really neat to crowdsource some of those maps next time around.

Mr. Clark: Yeah, it's good. But we're not giving up.

Dr. Martin: In 10 years' time we're going to come and ask really difficult questions.

The Chair: Okay. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Cloutier.

Mr. Cloutier: Thank you very much. Have a great evening.

The Chair: We kind of caught up on time a little bit. Let's try to get one more in before a break: Mr. Kristoffer Moen.

Good evening. Please identify yourself and tell us what riding you wish to comment on.

Mr. Moen: All right. Hello. Thanks, Hon. Justice Miller and the rest of the panel. My name is Kris Moen, and I'm a resident of Citadel in northwest Calgary. My home constituency is in Calgary-Foothills. Thanks for the opportunity to present my views on the electoral divisions, areas, boundaries, and names for Alberta.

My main interest in the Electoral Boundaries Commission report is as an extension of my volunteer political canvassing activities. In the last eight years I have door-knocked over 30,000 doors across dozens of campaigns from school board to municipal to federal and, of course, provincial elections. Ninety per cent of my activities are concentrated throughout the northwest quadrant of Calgary. I will be mainly focused on the current and proposed Calgary-Foothills and Calgary-Nose Creek areas. I will also briefly touch on Calgary-Beddington and Calgary-Edgemont.

6:50

I just want to take an aside and say that I'm grateful that this commission decided to keep the constituency names relatively consistent. To the average constituent and the average voter and average Albertan, that's very much appreciated.

The biggest change to Calgary-Foothills is the transfer of Arbour Lake to the constituency of Calgary-Edgemont. I have resided in Citadel for the past 17 years with my wife and my daughter. Throughout this time Citadel and Arbour Lake have always been joined together in district boundaries at all three levels of government. Our kids go to the same schools throughout their academic career, and our communities have joint activities. I would suggest that Arbour Lake should not be transferred to the constituency of Edgemont.

To maintain a balance of 55,000 constituents, I would propose that one or more communities north of Stoney be transferred to Calgary-North such as transferring Sage Hill and the communities of Glacier Ridge and Esker Park, which, for those of you who haven't been around, is the old Symons Valley Ranch, just north of

Beddington Boulevard and 144th Avenue, currently under construction. This would help to provide this balance.

Now, I know that Mr. Clark over here has got his fancy-dancy computer system. I didn't go that route. That's why I am proposing one or more communities just sort of taking the district of north and moving it just sort of farther west until we reach our magic numbers.

As well, I would also suggest that transferring Kincora to Calgary-Edgemont from Foothills along with maintaining Hamptons in Edgemont would provide a population balance this esteemed commission desires. As an aside, a similar transfer for the community of Kincora occurred during the federal electoral district boundary changes, and maintaining consistency between federal and provincial electoral districts keeps things simple for the electorate.

For Calgary-Nose Creek I have extensively canvassed the Calgary-Nose Creek communities of Coventry Hills, Harvest Hills and Country Hills for all three levels of government. There is a strong desire from the residents to be split apart from the northeast residents of Redstone, Cornerstone, Skyview Ranch, and Cityscape. These residents want their own electoral district. Just as a further aside, during the municipal campaign, the Redstone, Cornerstone, and Skyview Ranch residents want the same thing. Both communities want their own residential district, primarily because they're just distinct. Like, Deerfoot Trail really divides those two communities culturally, where they go to work, where they go to school, where they go and see their neighbours.

Looking at the interim report, I noticed that Nose Creek is only a .4 per cent variance from the provincial population average. Given that the communities north of Stoney are largely unbuilt, I would suggest that the new electoral district should be among the smaller districts, much like what is being proposed for Calgary-Hays and Calgary-Lougheed, where they're much smaller in terms of the overall Calgary variant.

To achieve the desired outcome of allowing for population growth, I would suggest transferring the south edge of the Nose Creek constituency to Beddington. This area would be south of 96th Avenue and is currently scheduled to be the Aurora Business Park. However, the city of Calgary has recently rezoned this to a residential and mixed-use area in order to adapt to housing affordability and city densification. This would provide Calgary-Beddington with a natural growth, that the two previous presenters have been desiring, in terms of densification.

Then in terms of Calgary-Beddington – and permit me to square the circle regarding Calgary-Beddington – and maintaining its average of 55,000 constituents, I just proposed maintaining Hamptons in the Edgemont electoral district, and maintaining the average of 55,000 constituents for Beddington can be achieved by keeping the communities of Country Hills in Beddington rather than transferring to Calgary-Nose Creek, as currently proposed.

Additionally, transferring Hanson Ranch into Beddington as well as splitting up Panorama Hills, which is the southern part of the whole Panorama community, in two would maintain the 55,000 population while giving Calgary-North more room to expand. Again, Mr. Clark, I haven't mapped this thing out because I don't have access to your fancy little computer spreadsheet.

In conclusion, my tour of the northwest quadrant is complete. Hopefully, I didn't go over time. Thank you again for the opportunity to share my thoughts. I'm pleased to answer any questions.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Please leave a written copy of what you presented with us.

Mrs. Samson: Because it was very complex.

The Chair: Yeah. And it was rapid. So don't take my not taking notes as an affront.

Mr. Moen: I've always got a second copy here.

The Chair: Yeah. Good.

Any questions, Mr. Evans?

Mr. Evans: I want to know what Mr. Clark's fancy computer stuff is.

Mr. Clark: Oh, man.

Dr. Martin: You've got access to it as well. You could choose to use it.

Mr. Evans: Okay. I'm going to need to read your submissions, actually, because you packed it in. So thank you. I appreciate it.

Mr. Moen: I hope the transcribers can transcribe it.

Mr. Evans: Oh, yeah.

The Chair: They can do anything.

Mr. Evans: They're more amazing than Mr. Clark's computer.

Mr. Clark: That's undeniable.

The Chair: Okay.

Susan, any questions?

Mrs. Samson: Thank you for your time and the detail you put into your presentation. I think probably what will happen is that we'll have a look at all the suggestions and see what works in the big picture and the cascading effect.

Mr. Moen: Okay. Thanks.

The Chair: What are your thoughts on changing the name of Calgary-Foothills to Calgary-Symons Valley?

Mr. Moen: To Calgary, what?

The Chair: Symons Valley.

Mr. Moen: It would not work for the majority of the area. Symons Valley is a very small section, and maintaining Calgary-Foothills, considering they're – essentially, all that you're proposing right now is removing Arbour Lake and then, way far to the north, removing Evanston. But if you're currently in that community – it's primarily because Calgary-Foothills has grown substantially. I think we're close to double in size.

Again, it's more of the average, everyday voter. Like, somebody who says: "Oh, look. There are a lot of election signs going up, and maybe I should think about who I'm going to vote for." And that's like a week before they get in there. Or in the municipal campaign what we found is that it was, like, literally 48 hours before they went to the polls. That type of voter is looking for consistency. They don't want to be tossed around in terms of: oh, I was in this community; I was in that community.

That's what happened during the last boundaries commission. Up until the 2019 boundary redistribution I was a part of Calgary-Hawkwood. Well, what ended up happening was that the community of Hawkwood went over to Edgemont, and they took the Foothills name that was in Edgemont and gave it to us and then

just sort of swapped us back and forth. Massive amounts of confusion for the average Joe electorate. You know, as I said, I door-knocked almost like a second job, but I was having my neighbours just simply coming up saying: “Okay. So what’s going on, Kris?” That level of confusion to the average, everyday voter is what turns people off elections. It’s like: “Well, maybe, okay. It’s a good day in May. It was a really hot day. Maybe I’ll cook barbecue and not cast a vote.” That’s something that we all don’t want to see.

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

Dr. Martin: I failed to follow along with your presentation on the map. I was trying. I grabbed one map here, one map here, and a different map on my phone. Trust me; I was trying to follow along. I’m glad you’re leaving a piece behind.

Largely, your discussion is about: this neighbourhood should be nipped and tucked over here and this one should be altered over here. I’m glad that your unit of discussion is neighbourhoods.

Mr. Moen: Yes.

Dr. Martin: That’s great. I look forward to reading your piece. Thank you.

Mr. Moen: Thank you, Dr. Martin.

Mr. Clark: I was just going to say that I really appreciate your detailed engagement. I mean, I think it’s reflective of every single presentation that we’ve had all day and, frankly, this whole process. People genuinely care about this stuff, and what’s so helpful for us is people who live in the neighbourhoods and in those communities. Even if you live in the city or you think you may have some passing idea, it’s so helpful when someone comes and tells us: well, here’s how it actually is on the ground. Yeah. Do leave that, please, and we’ll read *Hansard* as well. Thank you.

Mr. Moen: Okay. Yeah. For sure. Thanks.

If I could just sort of say that in my day job I’m an accountant, so we’re all about variances and minimizing variances. What I would suggest to this commission, particularly for north Calgary, is to expand out the variances. Like, most of the variances are under 5 per cent. Maybe the solution is involved with sort of the very north, the very suburban areas that are still being built-out, making those have a much lower variance and then expanding out the inner core, which, in regard to the two previous presenters, I would say both areas are going to expand but demonstrated between 2019 and today Foothills doubled in size. I don’t think the inner city has doubled in size in terms of population. Again, I don’t have the fancy-dancy computers to bear that out.

7:00

The Chair: Well, you could look at our report, and that’ll answer it.

Mr. Moen: Yeah. Exactly.

The Chair: Okay. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Moen.

Mr. Moen: Thank you.

The Chair: I think we’ll have a five-minute break for the panel and come back promptly at 7:10.

[The hearing adjourned from 7:01 p.m. to 7:07 p.m.]

The Chair: Okay. We’ll reconvene the commission hearing.
Is Mr. Andrew Bos present?

Mr. Bos: I am.

The Chair: Okay. Please come forward. Have a seat at the table.

Mr. Bos: All right. Well, thank you very much for having me present tonight. My name is Andrew. I’m from the constituency of – I’m going to get it wrong. I was Calgary-Cross for all these years, but now I’m Chestermere-Strathmore. I’ll be short and sweet and get you really back on time. Let’s wait for the map to maybe show up. Maybe not. Either way.

Mrs. Samson: Chestermere-Strathmore.

Mr. Bos: Yeah. Number 53, I believe, on the current . . .

Mrs. Samson: The new number is 57.

Mr. Bos: Fifty-seven. Okay. Here we go. All right.
I can wait for you. Do you want me to wait till you find it?

The Chair: No, no. Please go ahead.

Mr. Bos: No? Okay. Sorry.

Yeah. I’m pretty much really wanting to address your mandate to include some more hybrid ridings. Right now I would propose that option A and B, as on the screen, get tossed out the window. Thank you very much for putting that all together, but I would really like to propose that the boundary kind of stay exactly the same, on the east side of the boundary anyway, so it would go all the way to highway 817, just a little farther east of that. I realize the riding is a little large from the population data.

I would like to also propose that perhaps now is the time to split Chestermere. Yes, the riding name is Chestermere-Strathmore, but the west side of Chestermere is very, very new. I know this. I used to work for the city of Chestermere. When I left there in 2022, there was not much development west of Rainbow Road, and now with the higher density, the way they’re developing communities right now, I think the population is – like, it could easily double. When I left Chestermere in 2022, there were about 21,000 residents, maybe a little more. I drive through on the highway now into work; their sign says 31,000. That’s 10,000 more residents in the last three and a half years.

I know we’re talking a lot about hybrid ridings, so however you want to work the numbers, I’ll leave that up to your expertise, but I think this is a great opportunity for hybrid ridings, say Calgary-Cross, Calgary-East, Calgary-Peigan. All those current constituencies could probably come all the way east. Like, they kind of touch Chestermere already.

I think if there are approximately 10,000 more residents now on the west side of Chestermere, on the west side of Rainbow Road, it may make the most sense for the commission to say: “You know what? Maybe now is the time to split Chestermere.” Even the south side of Chestermere, on the south side of the lake, there’s a whole development in there now as well. Somehow split that up. I’ll leave that to your discretion. I’m not going to blow your minds with maps and community names and all that.

The main part is that the way the current boundary sits right now, on the very south of the previous riding, which would now be High River-Vulcan, is the community of Carseland. Anybody that’s from Carseland: love them; they’re great. But there’s nothing going on south of the river. Like, the next little community is Vulcan, so anyone from Carseland is not going to cross the river south unless you’re going to go to the campground for a weekend. They’re going north to Strathmore.

I think it's very important to keep Carseland in the riding. Like I said, how the boundary currently sits . . .

The Chair: Okay. I think we need to clarify. When you say "current," and we've got this map – this is our proposed map.

Mr. Bos: This is your proposed, yeah. The current, how the current riding sits.

The Chair: Yeah. Okay.

Mr. Bos: Yeah. So like I said: option A, option B. I think this is both. I think Chestermere didn't have much variance between option A and B on the commission's report.

Mr. Clark: No, I don't think so. Let me just see here.

The Chair: I'm not sure there's an option A or option B relative to this one.

Mr. Bos: Oh, yeah. Sorry. There probably wasn't, and that's why when I was on the website and you click option A or option B, there isn't much change.

The Chair: So this particular electoral division: can I hear from you what your comments are with respect to this?

Mr. Bos: This as it sits right now?

The Chair: Yeah.

Mr. Bos: I'm not much of a political person, but I think it's garbage.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Bos: It doesn't represent the riding. It represents the riding, but, like, you're losing all of Wheatland county.

The Chair: Yeah. That's the point. What are we missing?

Mr. Bos: You're missing all of Wheatland county, which Carseland is a part of. Wheatland county is a major part of how the boundary currently sits. It's a major part. Plus there's De Havilland airfield going in. Chestermere, Langdon, Strathmore: it's like a tripod. We rely on each other.

Chestermere is very close to Calgary, obviously. However, for your numbers it would have to work to keep current Chestermere in there, in the riding, you know, to pop up the numbers a bit. But the amount of development going on on the west side of Chestermere, between Chestermere and Calgary: like, 10 years from now you're going to be splitting all that up even more. It's going to explode, the economic development in between the two cities right now.

How the current proposal sits as well: High River-Vulcan wraps around to the north side of township road 250. There are a few communities up in there that right now have the ability to go talk to their MLA. She's in Strathmore; it's real quick. They're going to feel cut off. If High River-Vulcan is the community name, chances are the MLA will have their office in one of those two little towns, perhaps.

Mr. Evans: Are you talking about 65B?

The Chair: Okay. Now we're moving to 65, right?

Mr. Bos: Yeah. Well, now I'm just, I guess . . .

Mr. Evans: Maybe if we put up 65B it'll make more sense.

Mr. Bos: If we could put up how the current constituency sits, it would make even more sense then, I think.

The Chair: Well, this is what we've proposed, so we're happy to hear critiques about what we've proposed.

Mr. Bos: Yeah. Okay. I would put, again . . .

Mr. Evans: Let's put up 65B. I think it'll help you. It'll be appendix H, page 208.

7:15

The Chair: Sorry, sir. This loss of time is not going to be counted against you.

Mr. Bos: It's all good. I guess my confusion was the difference. Yeah. I'm thinking of how the boundary currently sits whereas you've been living in the proposed boundaries, which is the current boundaries, right? I'm talking the existing, how the 87 currently sits.

The Chair: Right, but we're – yeah.

Mr. Roth: This is the proposed, sort of a larger area here.

Mr. Evans: Yep. That's the one.

The Chair: Okay. If it helps, sir, for you to make your point, please grab the microphone, go to the screen, and point out the changes that you'd like to see made.

Mr. Bos: Yeah, I could.

Mr. Evans: Can you explain the Carseland connection again? You said that Carseland doesn't cross the river except for the campground kind of thing.

Mr. Bos: Yeah. Carseland is – let me go here. I'll try not to stand in your way, but I kind of have to. Okay. Yeah. Like, Strathmore is obviously up here. All right. Yeah. The river. Carseland is down in this corner right here. There's about, I'd say – I have the numbers. It's part of Wheatland county. I think there are probably 220 houses there. I don't know; four residents per house? I don't know. You do the quick math. I counted them last night in Google Maps, how many houses are in Carseland.

Anyway, so these residents here – right? – there's nothing more going on down here for them. They go all the way up to Strathmore, or they'll take 22X into Calgary and then same as up here. There are a few communities up in here. Lyalta. Yeah. There's one of them, anyway, right there. Obviously, you know, the current residents – it's rural population, so obviously you have to go quite large, but I think you could honestly make a case to kind of split Chestermere in half. Keep the Strathmore boundary how it currently is: follows the river, kind of comes up here, goes around Namaka, up at Strathmore, and then it kind of goes up and around.

To incorporate all these residents that live in here again, keeping them in Chestermere-Strathmore, if you nipped off the west side of Chestermere, there's your 10,000, 15,000 people right there, and then the residents that live on this side of town – Calgary-Cross, Calgary-East, Calgary-Pegan – however . . .

Mrs. Samson: They belong to Calgary, you're saying.

Mr. Bos: Yeah.

The Chair: So put west Chestermere into . . .

Mr. Bos: Into the hybrid. Yeah. Into three or four hybrid ridings that you would be able to do.

I'm going to give you guys feedback, so I'll put this down. I hope that kind of helped.

The Chair: What I understand you to say is: take the eastern part of the riding, expand it towards the existing makeup of the riding, cut Chestermere in half, and put the west half into Calgary ridings.

Mr. Bos: Correct. Yeah. I think that would benefit the residents there.

Mr. Evans: And the east half goes to Strathmore.

Mr. Bos: Yeah. If you've got the existing riding maps, not the proposed riding maps, you could keep the east side of the riding exactly the same. Then on the west side of the riding . . .

The Chair: And you live in that riding, sir?

Mr. Bos: Yes. I'm a resident of Langdon.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Bos: Yeah. Right now I kind of did the quick – you guys have it, too, right? Chestermere: 28,000, but their sign says 31,000 right now. It's not official, but that's what they have. Strathmore is at around 16,000. Langdon is at around 5,500, and then Carseland is about 226 houses. Lyalta is 200 houses. Cheadle is a whopping 35 houses, right? They're smaller communities, but they're all hamlets within Rocky View or Wheatland county, and they all rely back and forth. To have representation from, you know, one MLA, especially with De Havilland going up, Langdon, Chestermere, Strathmore: it's going to blow up. Figuratively, not literally.

Mr. Clark: Hopefully not literally.

Mr. Bos: Not literally, right?

Again, De Havilland: like, 1,500 employees directly involved with it, let alone all the other economic development encouraged with it.

I guess to quickly sum it up, I think we're doing a disservice to the residents of Wheatland and the east side, like Wheatland county and kind of east of Strathmore. They live, work, breathe Chestermere, Strathmore, Langdon, and to keep them kind of close together – it's almost like it's a hybrid community of itself with Chestermere, Langdon, Strathmore as your urban and then you have all the rural all the way around it. Then the same as the other, like I said: Calgary-Cross, Calgary-Falconridge, Calgary-East, Calgary-Peigan. I'll leave that up to your minds, however you want to divide those up to kind of come all the way across to the boundary.

The Chair: Okay. Good. Thank you, Mr. Bos.

Any questions, Mrs. Samson?

Mrs. Samson: I have one question. When you talk about De Havilland, is that the same thing we heard about with Shepard Logistics? Is that the name of it?

Mr. Bos: No.

Mrs. Samson: What is that?

Mr. Bos: The Shepard Logistics park? I believe that is the Prairie Economic Gateway.

Mrs. Samson: And that's a big deal, too.

Mr. Bos: That's a big deal, too. De Havilland is strictly planes.

Mrs. Samson: Okay.

Mr. Evans: I can see where the Wheatland county boundary is, but then the other county that you were saying was important or municipal district . . .

Mr. Bos: Yeah. Right now it's Rocky View county and Wheatland county.

Mr. Evans: Rocky View is on . . .

Mr. Bos: Right now, how that presents, that square right by 270 is the Wheatland county boundary pretty much.

Mr. Evans: Okay. Then on the other side of that is Rocky View.

Mr. Bos: Yeah. It is Rocky View. Then it kind of cuts in towards Strathmore.

Mr. Evans: So if I understand what you're saying, your concern is that if you give these guys one MLA, they're not going to get the type of representation they could get if they had two or three MLAs representing them in Edmonton. Is that right?

Mr. Bos: I'd say the opposite. Yeah. If we lump them all in together with the current MLA, I think they would get better representation with one MLA than the poor individuals almost all the way up there by highway 9. Like, way up there you're almost in Drumheller, and your MLA, you know, may have a constituency office in Vulcan or High River. I get it. Ridings have to get big at some point, but perhaps not this one, please.

7:25

The Chair: Okay.

Dr. Martin, any questions?

Dr. Martin: Well, I'd just like to say that of all the presentations we've heard today, this is the boldest, I think. I commend you for thinking this through. You know, the notion of cutting the town of Chestermere in some fashion hadn't actually occurred to any of us. It's just intriguing enough that we will want to think about it some more. The net effect of doing that, of course, would be – logically it would reduce the overall population of whatever the remaining riding was, whatever the boundaries. It would be 10,000 people fewer. Have any of your rough-and-ready calculations accommodated that?

Mr. Bos: I believe Chestermere-Strathmore is currently over your – what's it? – 55,000. I think it's at 58,000.

The Chair: No, it's actually . . .

Mr. Clark: It's almost exactly perfect.

The Chair: Yeah, it's almost right on the money. Yeah.

Mr. Clark: Right on the pot. Yeah.

Dr. Martin: Mind you, if you return to the older boundaries that include Langdon and Carseland in the south, go along the river that much further, perhaps you make up the difference. I don't have any particular critique of what you suggested, but I have to sit and chew on it.

Thank you.

Mr. Bos: Yeah. You do this every 10 years?

Dr. Martin: Well, don't expect us.

Mr. Bos: No, not you but the commission.

Dr. Martin: I'm not going to be here in 10 years.

Mr. Bos: If it's right on the money now, you're going to be way over in very, very short – so the commission should probably take that into consideration now and do something with, again, like I said, the development between Chestermere and Calgary, divide that up into some of those hybrid ridings. Anyway, sorry.

Mr. Clark: Yeah. I mean, it's really interesting. That's exactly where I was going to go, the development, especially the De Havilland stuff. Super exciting. Like, it's a massive opportunity for our province and this region and the same thing for Prairie Economic Gateway. To borrow a phrase from my esteemed colleague, the Tyvek test is always the one – you know, it's tough, right? I do wonder if on some of this you're living 10 years in the future. In a good way, right? You're right. It's coming. We need to think about that. At the same time, we're trying to solve today's – we have enough problems today rather than borrow some from the future to apply to, not to say that we don't think about that. There are certainly a lot of cases where we have skated to where the puck is going to be and left some space. That's definitely what I'm going to think about here.

Mr. Bos: Yeah. I believe De Havilland is actually actively involved in building houses, like not a developer but partnering with developers. They're building in the east side of Strathmore to accommodate. That's also one of the reasons I bought in Langdon. I'm looking in my crystal ball as well. Like, my house is worth this much now. De Havilland shows up. There are 800 engineers showing up to De Havilland. They're going to want a house. I'm on a quarter-acre lot in the middle of a hamlet right now. It's going to grow.

The Chair: Where is the De Havilland plant?

Mr. Bos: Right in the corner. Right by, again, the 027. If you go up highway 9 from Langdon and you cut right on highway 1 . . .

The Chair: So it's right in between Chestermere and Strathmore.

Mr. Bos: It is pretty much dead centre between Langdon . . .

The Chair: I drive that from time to time, and I don't . . .

Mr. Bos: Yeah, you won't see it yet.

The Chair: Oh, okay. So nothing is constructed.

Mr. Clark: Yeah. It's a ways off.

Mr. Bos: You'll see a fence if you look. If you drive that area quite often – yeah – there's a truck stop right past highway 9. There's a Burger King that I don't know if it's even open.

The Chair: Oh, yeah.

Mr. Bos: It's going right in behind that.

The Chair: Oh, yeah, I know where it is. Okay.

Mr. Bos: Yeah. Again, I encourage the commission to look in the crystal ball and see how it's going to expand in the future. You're going to have to make room for population in the riding. Maybe it's underrepresented now, but it's going to grow. Langdon itself: the communities are growing.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Bos.

Mr. Evans: Rocky View surrounds Calgary on the north, on the east, and on the west, so your point about having one MLA represent Rocky View and Wheatland: that's not really possible. In light of that, is that problematic for you? Have you thought through that?

Mr. Bos: Yeah. Well, Rocky View county is huge.

The Chair: Part of Rocky View and all of Wheatland: is that what you're saying?

Mr. Bos: Not even all of Wheatland. That's how it currently works. MLA de Jonge does represent half of Rocky View, a bit of – not even half of Rocky View; just that eastern side of Rocky View and Wheatland county and Chestermere and Strathmore and Langdon.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Bos: It works well now. But, yeah, you're not going to incorporate all of Rocky View and all of Strathmore or even half and half.

Mr. Evans: So there are going to be multiple MLAs in any scenario for Rocky View, for certain.

Mr. Bos: Correct. I'm speaking just on the economic development, essentially centred on De Havilland and the big circle around that.

Mr. Evans: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Bos.

Mr. Bos: Thank you.

The Chair: Our next presenter is Keira Gunn.
Good evening.

Ms Gunn: Good evening. Thanks for having me. The short intro: my name is Keira. Thank you again. I live in Calgary-Varsity. I moved there about nine years ago to attend the University of Calgary and just kind of stuck around since. I'm really close to the community of Varsity and the neighbouring ones. I've talked to all sorts of people in those neighbourhoods, so I have, you know, a really good chance to get a feel for the different areas.

Before talking about Calgary-Varsity specifically, I did want to express a huge appreciation for the amount of work that went into the whole first draft of the project and everything that you all have been doing. I also want to give a huge appreciation that, by and large, it has preserved municipal boundaries. I do think that that is really important. I think, especially in the last few weeks dealing with the water main catastrophe again in Calgary, it does highlight the need to respect those municipal boundaries. We do know that provincial and municipal issues are closely intertwined, and it's pretty important that our MLAs represent just one municipality wherever possible.

It's not just about, you know, lifestyles and livelihoods; it is about resource allocation and how those decisions are made. Municipalities compete with each other for resources that are granted by the provincial government, and I do think that if you have one MLA representing multiple municipalities at the same time, that can create conflicts within the same district association just of how those decisions are getting made and then representing different interests at the same time. I do really hope that final draft will maintain that preservation as much as possible.

The Chair: As it relates to Calgary.

Ms Gunn: The bigger cities, by and large, right? I mean, we're seeing it right now, the big demands for responding to these emergency situations. There are different interests for different municipalities. Yeah.

Second, I want to address the proposed change in Calgary-Varsity, which I think the gentleman before probably spoke a lot to as well. That is that there's the proposition of bringing Montgomery into Calgary-Varsity. I did miss, I think, most of his presentation. I just saw a little bit of the back and forth, but I have a guess that what he was largely speaking to was population. I know that in the previous election Calgary-Varsity probably was one of the smaller districts in Calgary. Based on the mid-2024 numbers you did sort of say that it wasn't the biggest, but it was above average for the other districts in Calgary. Again, I'm not going to beat the horse dead. I think he probably largely talked about this. Even with the developments that are happening right now in Calgary-Varsity and probably even since that mid-2024 estimation, it has grown pretty substantially.

I know that we can't have any sort of, like, uniformly populated ridings, but I do think with just the circumstances of Calgary-Varsity, where it is a fairly urban riding but at the same time it's currently not nearly as dense as it could be and it's potentially being positioned to be sort of a mega populated riding, we need to kind of be mindful of where it's going to be in five years.

Just touching on things, University District itself still has massive development. I think it's still got a 10-year plan in place, and throughout that whole time there will be more high-density developments going in place. We've also got, for example, Banff Trail and Capitol Hill. They've just had two fairly large developments that are, I think, just finalizing right now. When people start moving in, we can see also the multiplexes that have been previously approved all going in those two neighbourhoods, and there's plenty more room for growth. There are all sorts of bungalows in those areas right by the C-Train. Triwood area hasn't been hit with the multiplexes quite yet, but it's, you know, continuing to have growth with higher density homes being turned into a lot of student housing still.

7:35

I think another really big issue that's fairly unique to this is that it's a major C-Train corridor, so massive public transportation. There are three train stations in or on the boundary of Calgary-Varsity and another one just outside. You know, I think there are some other districts that have similar numbers as far as the C-Train, but Calgary-Varsity is also complemented by having one of the city's biggest economic drivers, the University of Calgary, so that's going to drive both more population growth and traffic throughout the area.

We know that the city has just changed its strategic plan for how population growth and housing is going to be managed. It is moving towards a strategic targeting of neighbourhoods with an eye towards infrastructure, so that is going to mean more targeted growth near the university. If you follow any of the really successful models across the country – I used to live in Burnaby – it's a very successful model. It's aggressive, dense growth near train stations. I think it's realistic to expect that we are going to see that happening very, very quickly and very high density in those areas, and there's a lot of room for it, too.

Even just last week I received a notification in my mailbox alerting me that there was a multiplex proposed around the corner from me. I live in the Varsity neighbourhood of Calgary-Varsity, and we haven't had any of that yet. We've actually kind of escaped

it, but it's now going to start happening, and it is a good thing because that's not a very dense neighbourhood despite its location, and I would expect it's going to pretty aggressively grow as soon as they start coming in. And it needs it, right? People need to live somewhere, and it's a great neighbourhood.

I think those factors – oh, I lost my sheet here. I do think that those factors mean that it's very uniquely situated for very aggressive population growth, so I think that we are going to see Varsity on its own grow really quickly. Of course, Montgomery itself is growing very quickly right now as well. It's getting, I think, a lot of the holdover from the growth that's happened in Bowness previously. It's starting to come into Montgomery. Those two added together, I think, are really going to make an exceptionally populated area in fairly central Calgary.

I think I already touched on this. Aside from population, I also want to add that they are very different populations, Montgomery compared to the rest of Calgary-Varsity. Calgary-Varsity is very, very deeply connected through the university as well as the C-Train and being that channel. Most of the people in Calgary-Varsity: their lives do somewhat revolve around the University of Calgary, be it through employment, education, or just the community services provided. Even though Montgomery does have this physical proximity to the university, it's not connected by train, and I do think that that makes a really big difference. I think that Montgomery is better defined by its proximity to the river and also ease of access to downtown. That's very different from much of the rest of Calgary-Varsity.

Actually, Montgomery, for comparison, is really similar to Bowness. There are a lot of parallels there. It's a town that was annexed by the city in the '60s, and you can kind of see that in the way that the neighbourhood still exists. The people in Montgomery very largely rely on parks, paths, river for their amenities versus what's offered by the university. It's got its own little downtown, a leftover from being its own municipality, a downtown with sort of, like, thriving small businesses, and none of the neighbourhoods in Calgary-Varsity have, really, anything like that, so it is a very different economic interest.

Just to kind of add to that, in the federal redistricting project they had originally proposed to take Brentwood out of Calgary Confederation, and I think – if you know, there's Triwood, right? – there's Charleswood, and Collingwood. I'm guessing some people complained, but they did go back to their decision and decide, you know, that Brentwood is very similar to these two other neighbourhoods that should stay together as far as a constituency. I think the same kind of mistake might be made with Montgomery with how similar it is in sort of demographic and lifestyle to Bowness and just the other neighbourhoods in Calgary-Bow that do rely on and have that proximity to the river. Like, it is just very different. I think Montgomery would get really lost in Calgary-Varsity amongst the interests that are very focused on the university, when it's just not as much down in Montgomery.

Yeah. To bring my presentation full circle, I'm going to talk about the water main just briefly. We also can see just how much that impacted Montgomery and Bowness. You know, up in Varsity I'm not really impacted any more than anybody on any other side of the city whereas there's that very different interest for the people that live close to the river compared to those that don't.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Clark, any questions?

Mr. Clark: I mean, you referred to the previous presenter, and I guess what I'm – I don't have any sort of big questions. I guess it's

really more just interesting context for us as we start to kind of – even if you’re from the city and you know the city, you look at a river and you think it’s probably a pretty good boundary.

Ms Gunn: Yeah. It’s true.

Mr. Clark: So we used the river, and the numbers then sort of work, but I think it’s just really interesting to hear that, you know, local perspective. I just want to thank you for coming. I know that that’s something, speaking for myself, I’ve definitely heard. I’m going to think a little bit about what the implications of it might be if we start to shuffle stuff around.

Ms Gunn: I just think they’re very similar. Yeah.

The Chair: You helped put a microscope on this probably.
Dr. Martin.

Dr. Martin: No. Nothing to add, but to echo my colleague’s remarks, we need to look at this area again. It seems to me, you know, if one looked around, you would find seemingly anomalous neighbourhoods in other parts of town and in Edmonton and whatnot, so the question really is about our gut feel for future growth.

Ms Gunn: Yeah.

Dr. Martin: That’s something we’re burdened with. We try to constrain it by not getting too reckless about what might happen. You know, developers will tell you anything about the growth potential, which may very well be true, but the actual growth: who really knows? Your points are well taken, but they do key on expectations of growth at a rate comparable to what we’ve seen in the past two years. I have to ponder that because I doubt our rate of growth is going to be like that anymore. But it might be for this district.

Ms Gunn: Yeah. Most of the neighbourhoods in Calgary-Varsity have not had that aggressive growth that you see in, like, Sunnyside or, you know, more urban or Bowness, for example. They just haven’t had it, and because they haven’t had it, I am willing to put money that they will get it very quickly.

The Chair: It’s coming is what you’re saying.

Ms Gunn: Yeah.

Dr. Martin: Okay. It might be. I don’t doubt you, but you see what we have to . . .

Ms Gunn: Hindsight will be 20/20.

Dr. Martin: We have to chew on that.

Ms Gunn: No matter what you do, someone is going to come back and say: I told you so.

Mr. Clark: We can hardly wait.

The Chair: Okay.

Mrs. Samson, any questions?

Mrs. Samson: No, I’m good. Thank you for your presentation. I appreciate your time.

The Chair: Mr. Evans.

Mr. Evans: Yeah. When I look at the growth rate over the eight years, there was a population growth, assuming that the trend is

accurate even if there’s some question about the OSI data, to 8,166 in terms of population growth, which is a 16.67 per cent growth over an eight-year period.

Ms Gunn: Sorry. Was that for Calgary-Varsity?

Mr. Evans: Yeah. That’s for this electoral district. So my question to you is: has there been in the last year or two a huge increase in noticeable growth?

Ms Gunn: I think where it’s hit is Banff Trail and Capitol Hill, and that’s where it started. I think it’s had largely to do with the process of getting approvals for municipal developments. We know that that area has been hit particularly harder with the blanket up-zoning. But now that they’ve shifted to a more targeted model – again, we’re all making guesses.

7:45

I lived in Burnaby when they were doing the aggressive growth along the SkyTrain, and basically, if Calgary doesn’t do something like that, I will be very upset with Calgary. For how successful that model was, I would really hope that they follow that and do that aggressive growth. That is going to hit three stations in Calgary-Varsity. There’s room for it, probably more than, you know, any other area that has that many train stations in it.

Mr. Evans: That growth rate is only 1.95 per cent per year, though. There’s a disconnect in terms of – what I hear is, “The sky is falling; the sky is falling,” and I run the numbers and I go, “But it’s 1.95 per cent growth rate per year.” If that’s the sky falling . . .

Ms Gunn: No, it’s not happening there yet. I think where you would have seen much, much larger growth is in more of, like, the Mountain View area. That riding would have probably had much more aggressive growth over the last 10 years whatsoever, but it’s hitting a breaking point. Some of those other neighbourhoods are hitting that carrying capacity where unless you do start building apartment buildings, high-rises, it’s not going to get any more dense, and they’re going to push their way out. Now, when it pushes its way out, it’s going to follow the C-Train corridor. That’s Calgary-Varsity.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much, Ms Gunn. Appreciate it.

Ms Gunn: Thank you.

The Chair: Our next presenter is Mr. Grant Van Kammen.

I guess he is not our next presenter.

Jennifer Yermiy. Please identify yourself. Tell us what electoral division you’re speaking to.

Ms Yermiy: Jenny Yermiy. I’m in Calgary-Bow, and I’m going to speak to four districts: Calgary-Bow, Calgary-North West, Cochrane-Springbank, and Airdrie-West.

He has a presentation he’s just bringing up for me.

The Chair: Okay.

Ms Yermiy: I appreciate you guys wanted to see the new maps, so you’ll have to bear with me because I have old maps, but then I’ll build to the last slide. The last slide of the four that I’ll show will show the new maps, how I got where I got.

The three of us are speaking from the Recall Nicolaides group. We’ve been on the streets in Calgary-Bow for the last three months working hard to understand the neighbourhoods and understand people within it. It’s been a very rewarding experience.

Next slide, please. What I've got up here on the left is the Calgary-Bow map as it was in 2023, and on the right is what I'm proposing as the change to the boundaries. Appreciating that Calgary-Bow is too populous, so it does need to have a component come out of it, what we are recommending is to keep Montgomery within Calgary-Bow and instead move Valley Ridge into Calgary-North West. So that's our first recommendation.

Mrs. Samson: Sorry. Which one into Calgary-North West?

Ms Yermiy: Valley Ridge.

Mrs. Samson: Valley Ridge. Thank you.

Mr. Clark: It's at the top left there, right underneath the words "north west."

Ms Yermiy: That's right. Yeah. My logic for that is the highway. Valley Ridge is on the north side of highway 1, easily accessible to a constituency office, for example, in Calgary-North West. There isn't a school or anything in that community, unfortunately, so there's no risk to losing a public school whereas Montgomery would cause that.

If you could just go to the next slide, please. For Calgary-North West I'm suggesting that, as I said, Valley Ridge be added to it, but I'm also suggesting that Bearspaw and Lynx Ridge could come out of Calgary-North West. My logic in that is – again, I also have had experience on the ground in Calgary-North West. Lynx Ridge is a very different demographic than the rest of the constituency, and it's also on different water. It's on municipal water there from what I understand, as is Bearspaw, so to me, I think it's just a logical cut-off to have that where the municipal water is going out that way, to move it into what is now being called Cochrane-Springbank.

Next slide, please. On the left is the 2023 map, and on the right is the 2026 proposed. I understand you're trying to balance the population, so now that I've offered to put more population into Cochrane-Springbank, I'm suggesting that Airdrie-West could be expanded to the west so that there is a balance between Cochrane-Springbank and Airdrie-West.

Just on the next slide is that other – yeah. I'm suggesting that Cochrane-Springbank change to accommodate that population increase in Calgary-West so that you have a balanced amount in each of those four.

The Chair: Okay. But you're not contemplating our recommended ridings in our report here, are you? You're using the existing map from 2017, actually, and then your new proposal.

Ms Yermiy: Yes. I'm saying for Calgary-Bow to keep it as it was in 2023 but release Valley Ridge instead to Calgary-North West. Calgary-North West didn't change in your proposed 2026.

The Chair: Okay. Yeah.

Ms Yermiy: So in this case it would be adding to Calgary-North West, and then I'm saying to alleviate that, allow some of that to go into the Cochrane-Springbank riding that you've created, as I said, to then accommodate. I was trying to also do a little bit of work for you there to help understand how to balance those two.

The Chair: Okay.

Ms Yermiy: Okay. I'll just let Lindsay speak.

Mr. Clark: Sorry. I just want to make sure I understand. I recognize the map on the right is the interim draft that we've come up with.

That red line right down the middle of the words "Cochrane-Springbank": you're suggesting that's the new Cochrane-Springbank, and then to the east of that Airdrie-West shifts a bit and bites that chunk.

Ms Yermiy: Correct. Yeah.

Mr. Clark: And that's not a massive population area?

Ms Yermiy: Well, I don't have that information for you, but I'm just looking at the numbers. I looked at the map loosely, and it didn't look like it was a ton of population in there.

Mr. Clark: I don't think there's a massive population.

Mr. Evans: You're carving a piece out of the west is all you're doing there.

Ms Yermiy: That's right. Yeah. If you swing back to the last map, it'll show you the other . . .

Mr. Clark: Oh, I see. Yeah.

Ms Yermiy: I'm suggesting to expand Airdrie-West because it's only got 48,000 members of it, just to balance those two. Again, I did try to reach out to somebody who might have more information, but I don't know that area well, so I can, you know . . .

Mr. Clark: That's fair.

Ms Yermiy: Whatever makes logical sense.

Mr. Clark: I just wanted to make sure I understood.

Ms Yermiy: I just appreciated that I was putting more population in Cochrane-Springbank, so I wanted to do a little work for you as to what made sense to me to accommodate that.

Okay. I'll let Lindsay speak to some of the rationale behind this. Thank you.

Ms McLaren: Hello. My name is Lindsay. I also live in Calgary-Bow.

The Chair: Could you give us your full name, please?

Ms McLaren: Lindsay McLaren. I also live in Calgary-Bow, specifically in Montgomery, so I'd just like to say a few more specific words about that. The commission recommends removing – oh, please advance the slide. Thank you. Yes. Great.

The commission recommends removing Montgomery from Calgary-Bow and moving it to Calgary-Varsity, and based on the interim report, this seems to be based on two reasons. One is the desire to make the population of Calgary-Bow smaller, and the other is to have all of Calgary-Bow south of the river. I think that latter one would make sense if one simply looked at a map but didn't go there or didn't talk to anybody there, so I'd like to make a few comments about this.

7:55

Our recommendation, as Jenny just said, is to keep Montgomery in Calgary-Bow and instead move Valley Ridge to Calgary-North West. We have a number of points to support this recommendation.

Firstly, it would respect that the Bow River is not, I would argue, the meaningful boundary in that area. Bowness, despite being south of the Bow River, is well known as a northwest community, and it shares the Bowmont, which is Bowness-Montgomery, geocultural identity with the neighbour of Montgomery, so splitting those two up I don't think makes good social sense.

Secondly, removing Montgomery would result in Calgary-Bow losing public schools. It would lose Terrace Road school, which would be very detrimental to the Calgary-Bow constituency. In contrast, moving Valley Ridge out of Calgary-Bow would not result in a loss of public schools because Valley Ridge, unfortunately, doesn't have any. This would be made even worse if Wildwood were also removed from Calgary-Bow, which I understand was subsequently suggested and would result in the removal of a second public school, reducing the number in Calgary-Bow to just three.

Thirdly, even though the interim report is clear that population parity is not the only consideration, we note that swapping out Valley Ridge rather than Montgomery would also approximately equally well achieve the goal of bringing the constituency population closer to the provincial average. It also makes more sense in terms of socioeconomic similarities based on the 2021 census.

A final point, which I believe Rob will talk more about, is that there is currently an active recall campaign in Calgary-Bow.

Dr. Martin: We can't talk about that.

Ms McLaren: Not at all?

Dr. Martin: No.

The Chair: No, we're not interested in that.

Ms McLaren: Okay. So I can't say that . . .

Dr. Martin: No, you can't.

Mr. Clark: Well, you can say whatever you want. We can choose to consider it or not.

Dr. Martin: No, you can't, because we can't entertain purely political interventions.

Mr. Evans: You can talk about facts you have gathered, just not necessarily how you gathered them.

Ms McLaren: Okay.

Dr. Martin: We know what's on your mind, but we can't hear it.

Ms McLaren: Okay. Let me give this a shot. At the last provincial election the Calgary-Bow riding was very close. The outcome was very close between the two leading political parties, and of the voting stations in Calgary-Bow that recorded more votes for NDP than for UCP, all of them were located in either Montgomery or Bowness, so to remove Montgomery feels politically motivated.

Dr. Martin: Well, thank you for that, but we're not going to comment on any of that.

Ms McLaren: Okay.

The Chair: Okay. Anything else?

Ms McLaren: That's good. No. I will turn it over to my colleague.

Dr. Martin: Well, again, my stricture holds.

Mr. Miller: Yeah. No worries.

I'm Robert Miller, and I live in Calgary-Bow.

The Chair: Robert Miller?

Mr. Miller: Miller, yes. Hi. No relation.

The Chair: Cousin Bob?

Mr. Miller: Yeah.

What I wanted to express as a concern today was the proposal to include Springbank in Calgary-Bow. That proposal was put forth by the MLA for Calgary-Bow, which I find inappropriate.

Dr. Martin: But again: be careful.

Mr. Miller: Yes. That's all I'm going to say about that.

Mr. Clark: Sorry. Point of order.

Dr. Martin: We're just an electoral commission, and we want to keep away from the raw policy.

Mr. Clark: I appreciate, Julian, that that is our remit. What people come before us to say is up to them. We can choose to consider it or not. Ultimately, it's up to the folks who have come to present to say whatever they wish, and we may or may not consider it.

The Chair: Okay. Let me interject.

Dr. Martin: But I still have registered . . .

The Chair: Okay. Julian, we've heard your point.

Dr. Martin: . . . a rubric about how much conversation we can have about policy.

Mr. Miller: This is just my concern.

The Chair: Julian, we've heard the comment.

Now, sir, maybe a little bit of context would be helpful.

Mr. Miller: I have that, yes.

The Chair: Okay. Let me ask you this: are you addressing a proposal by an MLA to this commission?

Mr. Miller: Commenting on it, yes.

The Chair: Did that MLA make his proposal to this commission?

Mr. Miller: Oh, yes, he did. Yeah.

The Chair: Okay. And the proposal included Springbank?

Mr. Miller: To add Springbank and remove Wildwood, yes. That was the proposal.

The Chair: Was that subsequent to our interim report?

Mr. Miller: Yes.

The Chair: Okay. So tell us why that's a bad idea.

Mr. Miller: Okay. In terms of Wildwood I feel that that could be appropriate. It's fairly split. It's a nonpartisan riding, so I think as a choice it's a nonpartisan choice for making a change. It could be moved out of Calgary-Bow, which was the proposal. However, the Springbank riding basically was not a very balanced riding. It was 2 to 1 votes in favour of . . .

The Chair: Springbank riding? Terminology is important here.

Mr. Miller: Sorry. The Springbank area within the Calgary-Bow riding. Yeah. You're correct. That is the area that's being proposed to move into Calgary-Bow.

The Chair: From where?

Mr. Miller: From Banff, Cochrane. Yes. Thank you.

That's being proposed to move in, and I just don't think it's appropriate because the Calgary ridings should be kept intact within municipal boundaries.

The Chair: So this effectively is a hybrid, then, a proposal for a hybrid. Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Miller: It is. Yes.

I think the needs of urban voters are very different from rural voters. I think that for reasons of commonality the urban area should not be brought into Calgary-Bow.

I also wanted to comment on Montgomery. As a resident of Bowness for 25 years, I feel that there is a lot of commonality between Montgomery and Bowness. These communities share parks, businesses. They have common issues with transit, zoning bylaws, emergency services, et cetera. I can't think of many neighbourhoods that are more common than Bowness and Montgomery. They shared the same train line for the old commuter train that used to go out to Bowness, so there's a shared history. These old riding boundaries worked before, so we shouldn't be creating new boundaries that might create confusion amongst the residents there when they're voting, amongst the electorate.

I don't think we should be dividing communities with a lot of commonality. I do understand that you need to balance the numbers, but I think there must be better choices than that.

Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Miller.

Now, in the previous slide there was something about how it's inappropriate for an MLA to do this. We've had lots of MLAs that gave us recommendations. I mean, there's nothing unique about an MLA making a proposal that may advantage him or her. I just want to make that point.

Mr. Miller: Ah. Okay. That was my point. Thank you.

The Chair: That's the nature of our business. We got a lot of that from all sides.

Any questions or comments from our panel to any of the presenters? Mr. Evans.

Mr. Evans: I just want to understand Montgomery.

Aaron, could you maybe go to Calgary-Bow.

The Chair: Before you go further, can I just get a clarification? Were you here when Mr. Robinson presented?

Ms Yermiy: I missed it. No. I don't think the three of us were.

The Chair: So you can't answer my question whether you're saying the same thing as he is.

Ms Yermiy: No. Not that I'm aware of.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Continue, Mr. Evans.

Mr. Evans: And Keira Gunn, kind of the same sort of thing.

I really want to know where Montgomery is. Everyone talks about Montgomery. You're going to be shocked. I have no clue where Montgomery is, but it sounds like a great place.

Ms Yermiy: It's right in here. It's this area here.

Mr. Evans: Which area?

The Chair: You can go up to the map and point it out. That might be helpful.

Mr. Evans: I'm going to draw it on my map.

Ms Yermiy: As Lindsay was saying, there's a bridge that brings – Bowness Road goes right through Bowness and Montgomery. Montgomery is this area all through here. I forgot to mention this. This is Shaganappi. When you think about putting it in Calgary-Varsity, that's a challenge for Montgomery folks to get to their constituency office, for example. It's right here.

8:05

Mr. Evans: Could you point to where you would consider to be the end of Montgomery? Up there, okay, and then it goes all the way down.

Ms Yermiy: Just to the river here. Yes. So it fills this space.

Ms McLaren: It goes south of that 16th Avenue, and it goes south to the river.

Ms Yermiy: And then appreciating that . . .

Mr. Evans: It goes south to the river?

Ms Yermiy: It's north of the river here.

Ms McLaren: And south.

Ms Yermiy: Oh, and south. Sorry.

Ms McLaren: Not of the river, of 16th Avenue.

Ms Yermiy: Of 16th Avenue. So there's 16th Avenue.

Ms McLaren: This is Montgomery.

Ms Yermiy: And that's Montgomery as well.

Mr. Evans: Just that portion there?

Ms Yermiy: This wedge here, yeah.

Mr. Evans: Okay, not above? It doesn't go above 16th?

Mr. Miller: Yeah, it does.

Ms Yermiy: It does, yes. It's here, and then it goes all the way up here, to here.

Mr. Evans: And then back along . . .

Mr. Miller: Shaganappi.

Ms Yermiy: Yeah, and, like, from Bowness, this is the bridge that brings them together. So it's not like the river is a barrier between the two communities because of those bridges.

Mr. Evans: And they're pedestrian bridges or vehicle bridges?

Ms Yermiy: Vehicle bridges.

Ms McLaren: Both.

Ms Yermiy: Both. There you go.

Mr. Evans: There are two? Somebody was talking about history: how long have they been there?

Ms McLaren: A very long time.

Mr. Evans: Beyond everyone's lifespan.

Ms Yermiy: Yeah. I don't even know how long it's been there.

Mrs. Samson: The Hextall Bridge is, I think, 100 years old at least. It was the old train bridge for the trolley car that is now a pedestrian bridge.

Mr. Evans: Okay. So then there's a substantial connection between – and then Bowness would begin and end where?

Ms Yermiy: Bowness goes all the way to the ring road.

Mr. Evans: On one side of the river?

Ms Yermiy: It's all here. This is all Bowness, this whole area. Like, Bowness is massive. It goes from here all the way to there.

Mrs. Samson: Can you show me where Wildwood is?

Ms Yermiy: Wildwood is right here. The other thing I was going to mention is, like, Wildwood is – we take our dogs there. I'm in Cougar Ridge, so there's a big connection with Wildwood in this way. My kids could have gone to the Wildwood school. They don't have a designated school in Cougar Ridge. So this is an important area for families to send their kids to school. Big connection between Wildwood in that case as well.

As we were saying, the one that we're suggesting – because we understand and we would prefer not to lose anybody, but we understand somebody has to go, and that's where Valley Ridge seems like the most logical.

Mr. Evans: Where did you . . .

Ms Yermiy: Valley Ridge is here, right? Where am I?

Mr. Evans: North of 16th.

Ms Yermiy: North of 16th, yeah. Like this is Valley Ridge here, and it's quite spread out, like it's not super dense, so we think it's a similar trade-off to Montgomery in terms of its population.

Mr. Evans: Does Montgomery go beyond that, where it says Calgary-Varsity?

Ms Yermiy: No. It stops here, again. Yeah. The thing about it is it's a massive hill. It's like a little San Francisco in Calgary, right? So there's a very logical break here. This is where the mall is.

The Chair: And it doesn't come through on a map like that.

Ms Yermiy: That's right. It doesn't show you, but this is a . . .

Mr. Evans: I'm going to check out Montgomery.

Ms Yermiy: It's quite spectacular. Yeah. It's like a little San Francisco.

The Chair: Okay.

Susan, any questions?

Mrs. Samson: No, I'm good. Thank you.

The Chair: Did I understand that one of you presented that you're going to lose a public school? How do you lose a public school? I guess I don't have a context for that.

Ms Yermiy: Well, we have 11 communities in Calgary-Bow currently, and we have five public schools. So we have a lot of area with a very limited number of schools. This is part of the reason why we are doing the work we're doing today.

The Chair: Okay. I've just betrayed my own ignorance of what's going on here.

Ms Yermiy: Yeah. No, no, no.

Mr. Evans: I had the same question.

The Chair: Okay. So who's losing the school? Is it Calgary-Bow or Calgary-Varsity?

Ms Yermiy: If Montgomery leaves, Calgary-Bow loses a public school.

The Chair: Okay, but the province doesn't lose a public school, does it?

Ms Yermiy: No, it doesn't. But what I'm saying is our ability to have access to schools, to be able to speak to our MLAs about, you know, trying to – I mean, it would be lovely if . . .

The Chair: You know what? Could I get you to put that in writing? Because I'm having trouble understanding, and the hour is late here.

Ms Yermiy: Yeah. Sure.

The Chair: I'm having trouble understanding how a public school vanishes.

Mr. Clark: Can I ask a clarifying question?

The Chair: Yeah.

Mr. Clark: I think I understand, but I'm curious. Are you saying that people who currently live in Calgary-Bow have kids who go to Montgomery school, and so now that you live in this constituency, you cross the invisible line, you go to that school, and so it's sort of lost, quote, unquote, to the constituency?

Ms Yermiy: That's essentially what I'm meaning, yes.

Mr. Clark: Yeah. It's still there, kids still go to the school, you cross the bridge, but you're saying that it's a natural connection because it's part of the school catchment.

The Chair: Oh, okay. I'm getting it now.

Ms Yermiy: Yeah. I'm thinking of a balancing between all of your districts. I think it would be logical to make sure you were considering the public services that are available within those constituencies.

The Chair: Got it.

Mr. Clark: Yeah. School catchment as a consideration.

Ms Yermiy: Yeah. So we considered the municipalities. Like I was saying, Lynx Ridge: the water is not served by the city of Calgary; it's served by Rocky View county, as is Bearspaw. To me, those do not make sense as somebody who's been on the ground in Calgary-North West. Those are not logical communities to be

included in with Tuscany and with those. So to me it just makes another thing, like looking at all of those socio factors.

The Chair: Could I make this request? As a non-Calgarian, you've blasted me with a lot of data that I'm having trouble with. I will have a conversation with my colleague who knows Calgary much better, I'm sure, but if you could reduce it to a two- or three-page submission to us in the next few days, it might be helpful.

Ms Yermiy: Absolutely.

The Chair: It would be helpful for me to digest, I can assure you.

Ms Yermiy: Greg, was it clear for you? Can I just confirm?

Mr. Clark: Absolutely. I understand. That's sort of what I thought you were saying.

Ms Yermiy: Okay. But the suggested boundary changes and stuff, it all made sense?

Mr. Clark: Yeah.

Mr. Evans: Can I ask one question about the school? Because the schools are going to be governed by the school boards, what are the boundaries for the school boards for the schools that we're talking about that are swinging one way or the other?

Ms Yermiy: I am not familiar with that. Does somebody else want to take a stab? I'm not sure.

Ms Saxton: We have different public school trustees in Bowness.

Ms Yermiy: Oh, we're talking about wards basically versus . . .

Ms Saxton: That's the wards, because that's the municipal government.

Mr. Evans: Right, so I'm talking about the school trustees.

Ms Yermiy: Yeah, you're right; that's more municipal.

Mr. Evans: If you give us the names of the schools, then we can overlay that.

Ms Yermiy: Yeah. You bet.

The Chair: Okay.

Dr. Martin, any questions?

Dr. Martin: No. Actually, I just want to say that I do know Montgomery. It's one of the few parts of Calgary I do know. Maybe I'm an old hippie.

The Chair: Maybe?

Dr. Martin: I recognize the cohesiveness of that community. Thank you.

Ms Yermiy: Yeah. Thank you. Appreciate it.

Mr. Clark: My only question was around the school, which I think we've sorted out, so I appreciate that. Thank you.

Ms Yermiy: Okay. Thank you all for your time. So we'll summarize to a two-page submission.

The Chair: Yeah. Just check with Aaron, and he'll give you the contact information.

Ms Yermiy: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you so much.

Now, I believe that takes care of everyone on the list that we have. Is there anyone that is here that wanted to present and has not been able to yet and saw some of the presentations and wants to chime in? Going once. This includes former commissioners as well. Going once, going twice, three times.

Okay. We'll close the hearing and reconvene tomorrow at 9 a.m.

[The hearing adjourned at 8:15 p.m.]

