



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission
Public Hearings

Calgary

Tuesday, January 13, 2025
9:05 a.m.

Transcript No. 32

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission

Justice Dallas K. Miller, Chair

Greg Clark
John D. Evans, KC
Julian Martin
Susan Samson

Support Staff

Shannon Dean, KC
Philip Massolin

Aaron Roth
Rhonda Sorensen
Christina Steenberg
Amanda LeBlanc

Clerk
Clerk Assistant and Executive Director of
Parliamentary Services
Administrator
Manager of Corporate Communications
Supervisor of Communications Services
Managing Editor of *Alberta Hansard*

Electoral Boundaries Commission Public Hearings – Calgary

Public Participants

Patti Dolan
Willem Klumpenhower
Lee Krywitsky
Art Matsui
Michael Parker
Peter Scholz

9:05 a.m.

Tuesday, January 13, 2026

[Justice Dallas Miller in the chair]

The Chair: Thank you, everyone, and welcome to the second day of the second round of public hearings for the Alberta Electoral Boundaries Commission. Someone misdescribed it as the electric boundary commission, and it's quite a shocking thing to come to that. It's a little more boring for the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

Welcome, everyone. We will be running most of the morning with public submissions, but before I start the public submissions, I want to give some introductory comments and remarks about the commission. You can see from the name plates and from the screen the names of those of us who are sitting on the commission. For biographical information you can go to the website and see our background.

Alberta is at this stage of the election cycle such that we are legislatively mandated to review the electoral boundaries in the province. Two things are motivating that change. One, an increase in the number of electoral divisions from 87 to 89; that amendment and legislation took place a little over a year ago. When we make a change like that, we then must consider population. Of course, as everyone knows, individual voters, eligible voters in an electoral division have the right to elect their member of the Legislature to sit in the Legislative Assembly in Alberta.

The second aspect of not only increasing the number of seats is that we have a significant increase in population since the last Electoral Boundaries Commission report in 2017. A rough approximation is that we have over 800,000 new people since 2017. The question is: where do we draw the boundaries in order to provide for effective representation?

Just to go back to the last report of 2017, there was an estimated population of just over 4 million people in Alberta, divided among 87 electoral divisions, resulting in an average of 46,697 voters per division. We do not strive for that absolute average. We've worked towards the range of minus 25 per cent population to plus 25 per cent population. You can see the range that the 2017 commission worked with for their report.

Because of the increase in population we have approximately 4.8 million people as a population base that we're dealing with for this commission. If you want to know how we arrived at that, you can look at our report. I believe it's pages 15 to 17 that talk about why we chose that figure as the best estimate for us to use as the population base for the province. When you factor the 89 seats into that population, it reveals an average population of 54,929, which is almost 55,000. The target range, then, is the minus 25 to plus 25 you see on the screen, just over 41,000 to almost 69,000.

Our task is not to come up with a map that shows one person, one vote. We are not like our American neighbours to the south who have a very strict constitutional principle of one person, one vote. Rather, in Canada we have the term "effective representation." Many factors go into assessing what effective representation is. I'll chat about those in a minute, and some of those issues will come out actually in the presentations, I'm sure.

We were appointed in early April last year, and the work of the commission involved those four tasks starting in May. We discussed and spent a lot of time talking about population, and we came up with the agreed upon population demographics based on the latest Statistics Canada report of 2021, which was continually and consistently updated by the Office of Statistics and Information from the Alberta Treasury Board department. Again, the basis for those statistics can be found in our report.

We also reviewed hundreds of written submissions from interested Albertans, public officials. Then in May and June we spent several weeks travelling across the province, having public hearings and listening to individuals across the province. That was probably one of the most rewarding aspects for us as a commission, to be in parts of the province we normally wouldn't be and hear the perspective of interested citizens in those venues.

Then, after that was all completed, we worked hard with the map people at Elections Alberta, and the purpose of that was to create maps that provided 89 boundaries that provided for effective representation. In late October we completed and published our interim report, and we were pleased to be able to present that to the Speaker of the Legislature, after which he tabled it and every member of the Legislature received it.

Now we're at the stage of receiving public input and public response to that interim report. Just so everyone knows, we used a number of factors to come up with the boundaries that we did in order to ensure each Albertan had effective representation. Again, population is only one factor. It's one of the primary factors, but it's only one factor that's to be considered. Our goal ultimately was to come up with understandable and clear boundaries, and we are hearing from Albertans whether we did a successful job of that.

After we tabled our report in late October, we then opened it up for further public responses to our report, and from early November to December 19 we received in excess of 1,100 written submissions. Now we are at the stage of having a second round of public hearings. This is the first week. We've dedicated approximately three days in Calgary, and then we move to Edmonton this week, and we will be hearing in-person submissions in Edmonton next week and virtual or online submissions as well. We are not travelling throughout winter. We're just staying in Calgary and Edmonton.

I hope that gives you a background as to where we're at and why we are here. We had a full day yesterday. And as our second day leadoff we will hear from the presenters that have signed up.

Is Michael Parker present?

Mr. Parker: Yeah.

The Chair: Okay. You're first up, Mr. Parker. Please come forward. We have allotted 10 minutes per presentation. As a terrible timekeeper I've honoured that more in the breach than the observance, so don't panic. Please have a seat, introduce yourself, and tell us what constituency you are coming from and which one you want to comment on.

Mr. Parker: I'm Mike Parker from Banff-Kananaskis. First, a little bit about my background and then I'll kind of get into what I'd like to talk to you about here today. I live in the summer village of Waiparous, as I said, in Banff-Kananaskis.

The Chair: Sorry. What village?

Mr. Parker: The summer village of Waiparous.

The Chair: Waiparous. Okay.

Mr. Parker: It's about 20, 30 kilometres northwest of Cochrane. It's in the foothills, in Ghost River valley.

You know, I think the Banff-Kananaskis riding is one of the most unique in the province because it's very diverse: First Nations, tourism, agriculture, ranching. I worked 40 years in the oil and gas industry, currently a member of the village council, as well as a member of the volunteer fire department. I've lived in Alberta for much of the last 24 years, splitting my time between Calgary and

Waiparous. I lived 10 years in Calgary in city centre and then in 2016 moved full-time out to Waiparous. I think it kind of gives me a unique perspective about what's important to people in the city or a town like in Calgary and, say, Cochrane even versus those in the Bow Valley in more of a rural setting.

I guess the key point I'd like to make first is to tell you thank you. I actually talked to you back in June. If you remember, we went to UT. Yeah. I had two main points or two requests when I came and talked to you. One was that you keep the ridings fair and logical, and the other was that you put communities with similar issues and interests in the same riding as much as possible.

9:15

As far as my first point, I asked that you honour the past practice of having fair and logical ridings, and you did that. As you can tell from my accent, you know, I did not grow up in Alberta. I grew up in the States, went to school in the States, and I'm now a dual citizen. One of the things I noticed when I moved to Canada was that the riding boundaries made sense. They were logical; they seemed to have similar communities and neighbourhoods in them. This is very different from what I was used to in the States, where a lot of the ridings would be gerrymandered to the point of being ridiculous, strictly for the point of giving one particular party an advantage in an election. That was before you consider what's going on there right now, which is: what do we even discuss?

When I look at the maps of the proposed Banff-Jasper riding – and in fact, actually, when I kind of glance at all the maps – they look logical. You all did a very good job of laying out why you made the changes. It's all based on data and good logic. So, yeah, like I said, I think you did a good job, and I'd just like to say thank you for upholding my faith in Canadian politics.

The second point regarding communities: you know, I said ridings should consist of neighbourhoods and communities with common economies, geographic commonalities, and issues. That allows the MLA to properly represent their community in the Legislature with issues that affect the riding. I think the Banff-Jasper riding does that. If you look at Jasper, Banff, Canmore, and the Bow and Ghost River valleys, they all have similar concerns and issues; and in all the communities in the Banff-Jasper riding the environment, tourism, and wildlife preservation are all key issues. As you point out in your report, they actually all have either a direct or indirect tie to the national parks.

I think it was also good to bring in some of the First Nations communities that you did, because we already have a fairly large First Nations population. In fact, especially the Stoney Nakoda community, so that now all the Stoney Nakoda are represented by one MLA.

I also think that if you look at the west side of Calgary and the communities that you removed from the current Banff-Kananaskis riding, in the new one, I think they're basically suburbs of either Cochrane or Calgary. They have issues much more aligned with the ridings in Calgary or Cochrane than they do with those people living in the Bow Valley, and, like I said, as somebody that's lived in both places, I can appreciate and really understand the differences between those. I think your proposed map does a good job of recognizing those differences. You know, to me it's a win-win. You've got the Banff-Jasper, which is, like you said, people that are focused on the national parks, the environment, wildlife, and, like you said, needing to split some off, the ones you split off definitely, I think, are more aligned and fit well with the new ridings that you put them in.

In closing, I'd like to say thank you for your hard work. I know it was a difficult task, but I think you've done a good job of listening to everybody's input. I was impressed in June when I talked to you.

Everybody seemed engaged. Everybody seemed to listen. Everybody asked good, relevant questions. You know, I think you've done a good job of developing an electoral boundary map that's fair to all Albertans. So again I just wanted to say thanks for upholding my faith in Canadian politics, and I'm open to any questions that you have.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Parker.

Mr. Evans, any comments or questions of this presenter?

Mr. Evans: No, but thank you for coming back and telling us we did a good job.

Mr. Parker: I figured you'd probably get more negative than positive. Definitely a thankless job. I understand, so I wanted to do that.

Mr. Evans: Appreciate it. Thank you.

Mrs. Samson: Again, I have to say thank you. First thing in the morning to have praise works well, so thank you.

I do want to ask you a question. Although the riding didn't change for Canmore and the area around Canmore, now that we hook together the national parks, both of them, do you think that that's a problem for Canmore fitting in? The national park element, in my mind, might be overbearing.

Mr. Parker: No, I don't think so. I think, too, from a population standpoint Canmore is still going to be the largest population, right? Also, I think it probably will help Canmore, to be honest. One of Canmore's big issues is that they are a tourist economy. They basically have to deal with, you know, two, three, five times the amount of people that come in there. They need the infrastructure for a very large population, but the people living there aren't there. So from that standpoint, they actually are very much like a Banff or Jasper.

I think it will actually help them because, like you said, they deal with the same issues as far as housing and, you know, affordable living that Banff and Jasper do. It's interesting. I had not even thought about pulling Jasper in, but it makes a lot of sense. It really does.

Mrs. Samson: Great. Thank you for those comments.

The Chair: This report may be criticized that Banff-Jasper is a bit of a balkanization, especially that it's a very large riding and may be difficult to traverse in winter. Your comments about Canmore: doesn't that maybe warrant keeping Canmore and Banff together?

Mr. Parker: Well, obviously, I mean, Banff and Canmore definitely need to be in the same riding, without a doubt. Like you said, you're probably going to hear it today, too, a few people that say that maybe it should be the Jasper-Banff-Canmore riding. You'll probably get some of that, but as far as – yeah. It's already a large riding. You're right. Adding Jasper will make it a little more challenging.

I feel confident, though. From your report it sounded like Sarah Elmeligi, the MLA, is actually one of the ones that kind of suggested it. I think she would have a good handle or feel for it. You know, there's not an ideal way to handle it, but I think, especially with current communications and Zoom – I mean, right now she lives in Canmore. Going all the way down to Millarville is an hour-and-a-half drive for her now. Going up to Jasper is a little bit further by probably a couple of hours or so, but I think it's doable. I think the downsides of it – let me say that I think the upsides outweigh the downsides.

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

Dr. Martin: Thank you. I want to first ask where Waiparous is. Is it just north of Canmore?

Mr. Parker: No. It's actually due north of Mini Thni, or Morley. If you know where Ghost Lake is, it's basically up highway 40 about 17 kilometres, but geographically it's, like, due north of Ghost Lake about maybe five, six kilometres.

The Chair: How do you spell it?

Mr. Parker: W-a-i-p-a-r-o-u-s. It's in the foothills. As the crow flies, we're probably 30 minutes from Canmore. Driving there it's about 45, 50. We actually have to go back around the reserve.

9:25

Dr. Martin: Thank you. My more substantial question is about Kananaskis Country as we generally understand it. It's pretty clear, then, that Canmore has a strong relationship with that region also, you know, leaving aside the relationship with Banff national park. Can you speak to the economy of Canmore vis-à-vis the opportunities in Kananaskis Country?

Mr. Parker: Okay. Yeah. You're right. You know, Canmore's economy is tied to tourism, whether that be the national parks or whether it be Kananaskis Country. Kananaskis Country gets a significant amount, probably not as many international tourists that probably go there just because of – but definitely local and Albertan and stuff. So, no, I do think having those tied together makes a lot of sense even though Kananaskis is not a national park, being a provincial park and being very much a tourism-based economy and also dealing with the issues of the environment, wildlife preservation, management of all of those kinds of conflicting and interlocked issues.

There is a lot of similarity between Kananaskis and the national parks and therefore Canmore also, so I think it makes sense to have them all together although it does make for a large riding. Now, I'll say that peoplewise you're not adding that many people. You know, there are very few people that live in Kananaskis, but it definitely makes sense to have them together.

Dr. Martin: Thank you.

Mr. Clark: You mentioned Indigenous peoples and that connecting is one of the features you liked about this constituency. I mean, it is a large constituency. One of the things I'm curious about – you may not know this, so if you don't know, that's okay. If you do, I'd love to hear your thoughts. The O'Chiese First Nation near Rocky Mountain House, which is the kind of north bit right on the map where it says Clearwater county boundary: do you know much about the O'Chiese First Nation? Do you have any thoughts on whether it makes sense to bring in?

Mr. Parker: I mean, the only thing I know is what I've read online. So, yeah, I probably don't know, like you said, whether that one makes sense to pull in or not. You know, I'm much more familiar with, say, Eden Valley. The Stoney Nakoda is currently in our riding. I'm much more familiar with Stoney Nakoda. I do know, like I said, bringing Eden Valley in made sense. The O'Chiese: that one, unfortunately, I'm not as familiar with.

Mr. Clark: Fair enough. Okay. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Parker. You're excused. Feel free to stay and hear the other presenters. If there's time after, we can have a more general conversation. But, yeah, I appreciate your input, and thank you for coming back a second time.

Mr. Parker: Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Mr. Klumpenhouwer.

Dr. Klumpenhouwer: All right.

The Chair: Good morning.

Dr. Klumpenhouwer: Well done on the last name there.

The Chair: Identify yourself, sir. Tell us where you're from and what particular electoral divisions you're wanting to address us on.

Dr. Klumpenhouwer: Sure. I will go through that. My name is Willem Klumpenhouwer. I live in the relatively unchanged riding of Calgary-Acadia. I'm not really interested in speaking about it unless you have burning questions about that area. But I'd like to talk a little bit more broadly about some of the proposed changes, mostly on the, like, fringes of Calgary and Edmonton.

The Chair: Okay.

Dr. Klumpenhouwer: I'll mention a few specifics, and then we can talk about them after if you'd like.

I just wanted to situate briefly where I'm coming from. I work professionally with spatial data a lot in my day job, and I've spent a lot of time thinking about how lines on a map can really shape real-world outcomes. I'm very aware that drawing things like electoral boundaries involves a lot of difficult trade-offs, and I want to echo the praise that this is not an easy job to do. There's no such thing as a perfect system, especially between population equality, shared interests, values, geography, and with our first past the post system it's really imperfect solutions.

My intent is not to second-guess your work but to highlight a trade-off that maybe you haven't thought of or haven't heard of yet or maybe you have thought of but I wanted to sort of echo and re-emphasize, and I think it matters for representation.

Before I turn to that, I want to take one mild point of friendly frustration offered constructively. For data nerds and members of the public like me, I like to engage more deeply with the process. I like to have access to the data and the information, and I found it very difficult to find the spatial data needed to bring into your own maps and do some of your own analysis. That was very hard to access. It was not offered in an open way, so I would love if you would consider doing that in the future. You know, I feel that open data is sort of a key part of democracy, so it would be great if you could share those kinds of things, but I'll leave that now.

The perspective I want to offer comes from some research on Alberta's sort of urban-rural fringe, specifically the ones that looked at Rocky View county and the Calgary region more in depth. It was conducted by a scholar who actually later went on to serve as mayor, and it was grounded in both close observation of how growth, governance, and political conflict play out in these sort of fringe, edge areas. I'm not trying to appeal to authority with that but just to signal that the perspective is grounded in research and then practical work as well.

Some of the proposed ridings – and I’m going to talk a little bit about Calgary-Okotoks and Edmonton-West-Enoch – combined three very different kinds of places: a sort of satellite municipality, a rural land that lies in between, and a portion of a major city. Often I’ve heard these described as hybrid ridings. People have talked about them as hybrid ridings as though hybridity itself were sort of this form of cohesion, that hybridity can be a good thing. The research suggests, and I kind of feel that there’s a more cautionary interpretation, that hybrid spaces are not defined by shared identity but really more about shared conflict or shared pressures but very different conflicts and very different ideas about how to deal with those pressures.

Calgary-Okotoks is probably the clearest example of this challenge, which, you know, combines part of Okotoks, a distinct satellite municipality, intervening rural lands, and the edge of Calgary into a single electoral district. It may appear reasonable on a map, but socially and politically these areas operate with very, very different expectations. Okotoks being an incorporated municipality, it has its own governance, services, civic identity. Rural residents in between may prioritize things like land use and agriculture viability, taxation. Then Calgary edge communities may be focused on more city issues: transit, schools, those kinds of urban infrastructure. They may experience common growth pressures, these areas, but they want often very different policy responses to those things, right? That’s a big challenge.

I think the riding of Edmonton-West-Enoch raises kind of similar concerns. We have an Indigenous community, adjacent rural lands, and suburban Edmonton neighbourhoods. Again, proximity is not really a proxy for shared political interest. These communities have very distinct governance structures, priorities, and relationships to the land.

In Alberta’s urban-rural fringe conflict operates at multiple levels at the same time. There’s, obviously, conflict between these groups that we mentioned. There’s conflict within groups, which is not necessarily a bad thing to have in a political discourse, and conflict within individuals themselves. They don’t disappear because people live near one another. In fact, I think that often the proximity of these different shared values together can sharpen those conflicts a lot.

The trick is that from the standpoint of effective representation, combining multiple structurally opposed communities into a single riding can really create a risk of dilution of representation. I know from being sort of an active individual that representation can often go to the loudest group or the group with the most resources, and quieter or more marginalized groups, less institutionally embedded groups can often be sidelined. I think the risk is greater in these sort of hybrid areas.

I’m not arguing that these areas aren’t connected. They clearly obviously are geographically, but electoral boundaries kind of serve a different purpose than regional co-ordination. I feel they should make sort of representation legible and achievable. Trying to maximize the effectiveness of representation is the way I see these things. I think that on these hybrid ridings it’s a reason to be very careful and avoid this kind of aggregation that can happen in these ridings and in fast-growing regions like Calgary and Edmonton’s peripheries. Electoral boundaries work best when they respect the distinct political identities of municipalities, rural areas, and urban communities rather than trying to combine them all into a single district.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Clark, any questions or comments?

Mr. Clark: Yeah. Thank you very much. I appreciate that submission. I’m really curious. You didn’t mention Calgary-West-Elbow Valley, and we had a submission, in fact, if I’m not mistaken, our very first one yesterday, from someone who shares your view that hybrid constituencies are, broadly, not something they wish to see. However, in the case of Calgary-West-Elbow Valley there were certain characteristics they felt spoke in favour of a hybrid in that specific circumstance.

9:35

In that case Elbow Valley shares underground sanitary sewer infrastructure. I think they may be on city water. No, I think they were on the water licence, but they shared that infrastructure. There’s a somewhat similar built form, somewhat higher density. She compared that though to Bearspaw or Springbank, which is, you know, two- and four-acre, quite different well-water septic system kind of thing. Would you agree that there are cases where a hybrid makes sense? Even if we accept your sort of broad submission to maybe be careful about it, there may be some cases. I think we’ve had a few written submissions, not in person. But Calgary-Cross I think includes Conrich, right? They are areas that are kind of practically speaking part of Calgary even if they aren’t geographically within the four walls, if that makes sense. Are there scenarios in your mind where hybrid makes sense?

Dr. Klumpenhouwer: It’s possible. There’s not going to be a perfect way to do it. I don’t know how far west Calgary-West-Elbow Valley goes. Just looking at this map, I don’t quite know what...

Mr. Clark: All the way to highway 22.

Dr. Klumpenhouwer: But it doesn’t include Bragg Creek or Cochrane; those are separate? It just kind of follows along the highway?

Mr. Clark: L-shape.

Dr. Klumpenhouwer: In a little L-shape.

To me I tend to focus on and I think that what I was reading tends to focus on governance and, like, the representation of that. In that sense, you know, you could follow that conclusion to say that you should follow municipal boundaries as much as possible, which I understand has been a big part of the conversation, whether we should do that or not.

Obviously, there are going to be shared interests. How provincial those interests are versus how municipal those interests are probably matters. Like water infrastructure: I mean, we can get into water infrastructure. It’s very relevant right now, but that might be something that is a little confused about what is an issue. But I do generally tend to think that the growth pressures that sort of the Calgary-West-Elbow Valley suburban area has, which looks like Tuscany to me, and the pressures sort of further west are probably different. Or the pressures might be the same, but people want to respond to them a lot differently.

Mr. Clark: Thank you.

The Chair: Dr. Martin.

Dr. Martin: Thank you.

I wanted to ask you about Edmonton Enoch. I’m going to posit that there is a significant economic linkage between Enoch Cree First Nation and its economy and that of the western part of Edmonton. The Enoch Cree Casino is the largest in western Canada. It has a thousand employees; 200 of them are from the

band. The rest are from Edmonton. I mean, I think the economic linkage is inescapably large. Its social and entertainment features, because it's not just a casino, you know, also bring it well within the orbit. In fact, it's central to the orbit of Edmonton's music and entertainment scene. On both those parameters the linkage is very, very strong.

I think that your general argument about hybrids being not uniform and not free of different interests is inescapably true, yet there are other considerations that make them plausible. I think Enoch Cree is a plausible choice for a hybrid situation.

Dr. Klumpenhouwer: Yeah. I have two thoughts about that. One is that I tried to pick areas – the two areas I focused on were areas where I saw sort of three distinct governance structures. I mean, again, maybe to Mr. Clark's point, Calgary-West-Elbow Valley has sort of two things. I didn't focus on areas that had sort of just a rural and then the edge of a city. I picked those two because I feel like they have three distinct sort of governance structures with a reserve, a sort of rural county, and a city. Three may be too much to ask, frankly, of an MLA to represent.

Dr. Martin: Well, you can ask.

Dr. Klumpenhouwer: You can ask, but I think we should be making the barrier as easy as possible for individuals.

I also wonder about the argument that economic link is a reason to draw a boundary. For example, I mean, you could take that argument and say that downtown Calgary is obviously economically linked to the rest of the city, so you would want to have representation. If you're going to follow the economic argument, then you'd want to have downtown be represented by other ridings as well, but we don't. We divide it up so that downtown partially has its own riding. I don't know that that economic link is necessarily a representation problem.

Dr. Martin: Oh, it is. I mean, it's one of the factors that cluster under the heading of communities of interest, so it's one that we are bound to look at seriously by the act.

Dr. Kumpenhouwer: Yeah. I do think I would agree that issues that come up that have to do with the economic link are shared issues probably. Right? If there's a problem with what's going on where someone works and where they live and those are tied together, you probably want somebody to represent that fairly. But I think we can't do that entirely well inside a city necessarily either because cities have sort of an economic link that's very clustered and centred versus the fringes.

My focus was mostly on governance. I would say that the argument for having three different governance structures is what concerned me, but perhaps that is mitigated in the Edmonton-West-Enoch.

Dr. Martin: I like the simpler label.

Dr. Kumpenhouwer: Yeah. I do, too. I was trying to use the official one.

Perhaps it's mitigated in that case and there's potentially a justification for it, but, yeah, it was those three different ones that I was focused on.

Dr. Martin: All right. Thank you.

The Chair: Mrs. Samson.

Mrs. Samson: Thank you for the presentation. Interesting thoughts. I wasn't aware of the Rocky View county man that wrote

or investigated the theory of hybrids. What is that? Who is that individual?

Dr. Kumpenhouwer: That was actually Jyoti Gondek.

Mrs. Samson: Thank you for that. I'm going to look that up.

Also, my thought was around the Enoch. I was interested in your comments on that, and I think you've answered my question there.

Dr. Kumpenhouwer: Okay. Good.

Mrs. Samson: Thank you again for coming out today.

Dr. Kumpenhouwer: Yeah. Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Evans.

Mr. Evans: Yes. Mr. Kumpenhouwer.

Dr. Kumpenhouwer: Yes. Good enough.

Mr. Evans: Did I get that one? Like is that better than Justice Miller?

Dr. Kumpenhouwer: Marginally.

Mr. Evans: The name pronunciation.

I was very interested in your submissions with respect to a couple of things. One, how you were using the concepts of marginalized and loudest in terms of representation and how you considered that was going to be more problematic with hybrids than nonhybrids. I'm going to ask you to give me some further thought on that because I don't know that that's necessary. To me that doesn't make sense. I think those issues, those concerns that you've raised, which are valid, are applicable in any riding.

I would suggest that, in fact, in a nonhybrid riding it may be more difficult and be more of a concern that needs to be guarded against than a hybrid riding. I'll suggest that the reason for that is because if you look at the act in section 14, and 14(b) talks about communities of interest and then it talks about including municipalities, regional, and rural communities. What the act has done there is specifically identified hybrid ridings as a means of identifying communities of interest. You have clear demarcation, I would suggest, of a community of interest being rural versus urban, which I would suggest makes it easier because if you can identify what your communities of interest are, you can guard against the dangers that you've mentioned. It makes it easier to do that. For example, in a nonhybrid riding, say, you know – pick a riding.

Dr. Kumpenhouwer: Calgary-Acadia, since that's where I live.

Mr. Evans: Sure. You could have some significant and potentially larger or bigger communities of interest that have completely opposite views or interests that are within that riding.

9:45

The other thing that I'm going to ask for some comment on is the governance issue that you've raised by saying that there's going to be a difficulty because you have two municipalities, which is what you used in Calgary-Okotoks. I think you have a much more difficult problem when you're dealing with the ward system in Calgary in terms of being able to have a voice with a representative that's going to be able to protect the interests of that particular area.

An issue that's front and centre right now, that clearly indicates this is your water issue in the city of Calgary: what a disaster. Why? Because your ward system does not facilitate being able to target resources to a specific area from one municipality, one municipal

government, so each ward has its own interests. Each ward may not have the same water problems, and therefore there's not a unification on: hey, we've got to solve this problem. If I'm in ward whatever number and I don't have a water problem and I've got a beef with another alderman, I don't care. I'm not going to support them. That's a problem for the people, and that's a problem that we face in terms of our politicians changing all the time.

My concern is that people focus on this urban and rural and forget that those are just communities of interest and should be treated exactly the same way as a Muslim community of interest versus a Jewish community of interest versus a whatever community, hockey group.

The Chair: That is a long and wrong – I think there's a question there, but briefly respond, sir, please.

Dr. Klumpenhouwer: Okay. I could give you a couple of thoughts. I'll try and address them. First, let's set aside the Calgary ward system. There's another commission, I think, for that.

Mr. Evans: Well, we have to deal with that.

The Chair: No. Okay. We need time. Very succinct.

Dr. Klumpenhouwer: Okay. Let's deal with the urban-rural. I think that there is a difference between who you look for as a representative, as I think many people, like – the majority of the population – often don't exactly know who to ask and who to go to for what issue. I think that will be sort of more problematic in an area where you actually have three different municipal structures going on at the same time. You have a county, you have potentially an incorporated city, and you have Calgary. Knowing where to go for what issue is going to be even more difficult, and the governance differences will emphasize or will sort of more strongly create this problem where voices are not heard.

I think we should absolutely not be drawing lines, you know, on the basis of demographics. I think that's a very slippery slope to do, and I think communities can be very different things. I like to focus on the governance part of it because I think it is different. It is about who you talk to and who will listen to you to bring back to this representative democracy.

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

I just want to make a comment, and you'll have a brief response. We have found in this process – and you've touched on it a little bit – that there's a civics problem in the public mind. This isn't a criticism; I think it's just reality. We've taken an approach, at least, I think, from my contributions to the interim report, to basically lay out a civics lesson for Albertans or contribute to that process.

I think it's important to make clear that there are really only three options when we deal with boundary reallocation and redistricting. One is to add a bunch more seats to the Legislature, and that hasn't been done. I mean we only got two. The second option is to simply take away more seats from the less populated areas. That poses a whole bunch of other issues relative to effective representation. And the third option is hybrid ridings, and it is a legitimate option, and most of Alberta has been living under that option for generations. Now it's getting to the point where Alberta has changed tremendously over the last few decades, and hybrid ridings are a reality, and we are working hard to make sure that they're not inappropriate. They are a reality, and they are an option. So I just want you to consider that. That's part of our attempt to explain the true legal options to the Alberta public. Okay?

Dr. Klumpenhouwer: Yeah.

The Chair: Thank you very much. You know the task we have. I mean, you've obviously studied this, and you know how difficult it is. Your comments about data: I'm the wrong guy to take up that torch, but certainly somebody will. Your comments on accessing the data are very important.

Dr. Klumpenhouwer: Yeah. I'll say very briefly then that, you know, my job as an interested person is to just give you more complexity and more nuance, and then it's your job to try and sort that all out. Absolutely I understand you wouldn't have proposed them if they weren't a real possibility.

Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much, sir.

Our next presenter is Lee Krywitsky.

Mr. Krywitsky: Hello. My name is Lee Krywitsky from Calgary-Glenmore. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and the entire boundary commission. Again, my name is Lee Krywitsky, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you. I want to thank all of you for your efforts to date and applaud your current trajectory for updating Calgary-Glenmore's constituency perimeter and express how doing so and doing it well is so important to sustain our democracy.

I've been very fortunate to live in the community of Woodlands in the Calgary-Glenmore constituency since 1983. I'm semiretired and most of my career was that of a technical entrepreneur involved in designing, manufacturing, and marketing high-specification flow equipment in the aerospace, nuclear, refining, and transportation industries, then applying these proudly engineered and Alberta-manufactured technologies in dozens of countries. I've had the privilege of serving our community as a co-chair in Woodlands parent-teacher council. I've been volunteering and chairing a technical committee for the Canadian Standards Association with a mandate to ensure public safety. I continue to participate in professional organizations that mentor youth and strive to diversify our economy.

Trying to achieve these noble goals, like the one you have been asked to do, whilst addressing the concerns of all stakeholders is often a daunting task and at times, no doubt, seemingly thankless. I appreciate and do want to thank all of you for your collective efforts. Thank you.

Our wonderful riding is diverse, vibrant, and nurturing for all the people that call it home. We have a community with outreach facilities that try to improve the lives in Glenmore and for all Canadians. For example, the William Roper Hull school is very close to where I live, and that wondrous place has changed the lives of many students that face the challenges of emotional, social, and psychological issues. Glenmore has lower income, high-density housing as well as many affluent areas. Calgary-Glenmore citizens have access to 15 public schools, four child care centres, an orphanage, three nursing homes, two long-term care facilities, two medical centres, a hospice, and the wonderful Rockyview hospital. It's a great place for families with lots of recreational facilities and places to enjoy, the highlights being Fish Creek provincial park, Heritage Park, and the Glenmore reservoir.

Calgary-Glenmore's recent demographics reveal a slow and steady population growth, yet we are impacted by the rapid growth that Calgary overall is experiencing. We're living with the changes and challenges that come with such rapid change. Special-needs schools, a very new, busy Ring road, bus transit routes, and more are all part and parcel of a thriving community that commits to supporting our friends, helping our neighbours, and doing our part for the city, province, and nation. I'd also mention we have a

thriving, jam-packed, new huge Costco nearby, which is always a good thing.

9:55

The prospect of augmenting electoral boundaries was not of interest to me until recently. I was in Ukraine in March of 2022 trying to assist with refugees that were affected by the Russian territorial aggression. I personally witnessed first-hand the effects this has on scores of ordinary people I met, with this most unwelcome and unwarranted boundary redistribution. I've done much business in the U.S. during my career, and I've seen the recent swell of polarization and the proliferation of gerrymandering of voting areas that are packed, cracked, and stitched together to favour one party to stay in power longer. So witnessing this and the onslaught of the other incredulous events that are accosting us every day, I've tried to better understand the spirit and intent of your task on the boundary commission.

My understanding is that the commission's mandate is to independently review and propose new provincial electoral divisions, the ridings we live in, to the Legislative Assembly to ensure fair representations by balancing population size with communities of interest, geography, and historical patterns. These pillars, I understand, include the thoughtful composition of your board, the mathematical guardrails and population mandates, defining a boundary-drawing criteria, and public transparency of this actual process.

As well as to better understand the spirit and intent of the why of updating of provincial boundaries, boundaries were articulated, I believe, very well by the former Chief Justice Beverley McLachlin in 1991. This seemed very reasonable then and especially now. Justice McLachlin's approach to boundaries is both literal, in literally referring to electoral districts, and philosophical, referring to the limits of government power versus the right of the citizen. She argued the rights of effective representation, that electoral boundaries' population size should be roughly equal. The primary goal, of course, is effective representation. Justice McLachlin argued that democracy is not just simple majoritarianism, that idea that winner takes all and does whatever they want. I would argue that the world's democracies are being stress-tested today like never before with that very threat, so we must collectively be vigilant in safeguarding it.

I come here today to thank you for all of your hard work on this quest. The proposed changes you have considered so far for Calgary-Glenmore seem spot-on. Adding a segment of North Glenmore Park and the addition of the community of Kingsland makes sense, and leaving the rest as is is dialed in just right. I feel this proposed positive change will encourage the citizens of the new Glenmore boundary to keep participating in and growing our community and doing so in a fair and healthy democratic system. It is a precious system, one that built this great city, province, and wonderful country. I sincerely thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, sir. Your comments are most appreciated. I would invite you to remain after you're excused, because it's helpful for everybody to hear the other presenters. If I had a magic wand, I would have locked everybody in a room and made them hear everybody else's presentation. Thank you so much.

Mr. Evans, any questions or comments?

Mr. Evans: No, but thank you for your comments.

Mrs. Samson: Thank you for the excellent presentation. I appreciate your kind words, and I just want to say to you and the rest of the group that we were pleased to leave Calgary-Glenmore pretty much intact the way we found it. That makes it very valuable

to the people who live there because nothing has changed for them. Continuity, familiarity of what's going on will stay, and I think I'm always pleased to celebrate that. Thank you again for coming out today.

Mr. Krywitsky: Thank you.

The Chair: Dr. Martin.

Dr. Martin: Thank you. I very much appreciated your thumbnail sketch of the riding and the very large and diverse number of communities and activities that occur there. Indeed, it's food for thought, really, to consider that even in what is, in effect, a long-standing inner-Calgary riding, you have that full range of communities of interest and activities that we talk about more generally. I thank you for your description of the riding, and of course I'm happy that we got it pretty much right.

Mr. Krywitsky: Thank you.

Dr. Martin: Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Clark.

Mr. Clark: Yeah. It is nice to get things right occasionally, so let's celebrate that as a win.

Your comments about the Supreme Court reference have got me back reading the reference itself just to remind myself of some of the principles contained therein and just, you know, reminding ourselves of what the definition of relative parity of voting power is, where we're allowed to deviate, how we justify that. We consider factors like geography, community history, communities of interest, minority representation: taking all those into account.

This isn't so much a question as a bit of a speech, so I'll keep it very brief. In referencing back to an earlier presenter and the differences between Canada and the United States in particular, I do think we have both an opportunity here in this panel and this process as an elevated one that sort of supersedes partisan interests and really does look at these things. It doesn't make it easy because there are a lot of different definitions that could meet what the Supreme Court says, right? I think the general direction of travel is about right, but within that there's a pretty wide berth of what we could actually land on.

I guess with that and in conclusion, I would just say thank you. It makes a big difference to us, for yourself and everyone else who's come to present, in helping us determine exactly where we draw those lines. Thank you.

Mr. Krywitsky: Well, thank you for your kind words and your sustained and courageous efforts. They're greatly appreciated. Thank you so much.

Mr. Clark: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

Peter Scholz, the next presenter.

Mr. Scholz: Good morning.

The Chair: Good morning. Make yourself comfortable. Please state your name for the record and tell us where you're from and what riding you wish to comment on.

Mr. Scholz: My name is Peter Scholz. I reside in Banff-Kananaskis. I have lived at different times in both Banff and Jasper, and I've worked with most of the communities and First Nations in

the area. I'm just waiting for my six slides, approximately one minute per slide. There it is.

My comments focus on whether the proposed Banff-Jasper electoral district reflects the realities of how alpine Alberta actually functions. The proposed Banff-Jasper district is here critiqued using economic relationships, transportation patterns, service delivery, and provincial jurisdiction. Ladies and gentlemen, contrary to what you have heard from former Canmore mayors and the current MLA who lives in Canmore, alpine Alberta is not a single park-based economy. This perspective, which received much weight in the report, is common in central Bow valley, which is itself a tiny portion of alpine Alberta. Sorry; I don't have bifocals yet. I'm getting used to these new eyes and being old.

Alpine Alberta functions as an integrated mountain-foothills ecosystem rather than a linear park corridor. Mountain parks, foothill communities, and extensive working Crown lands form one interconnected region economically, ecologically, and hydrologically. While tourism is important, regional economies also include forestry, ranching, transportation, and a legacy of mining and resource development alongside expanding recreation activity. Further, the vast majority of tourism growth is not inside but outside the national parks. As a former Parks Canada agency employee, I can state with certainty that Parks Canada policy is deliberately geared to limit new growth within the national parks. Gateway and corridor communities such as Hinton, Cochrane, Nordegg, Crowsnest, Bragg Creek, and Sundre, all within provincial jurisdiction, support these new and emerging multicentric systems. They function differently from the national parks, particularly in housing, labour markets, and service provision.

Provincial jurisdiction includes highways except in the national parks, wildfire management except in the national parks, health services, education, and land use decision-making, again except in the national parks. These provincial activities are essential to how communities interact in co-ordination and partnership with the national parks and should therefore be reflected in electoral boundaries. Stated more plainly, a provincial electoral district should not be based on certain limited federal jurisdictions.

10:05

Several issues arise when the proposed Banff-Jasper district is examined through a functional lens. First, the proposal includes a 200-kilometre unpopulated gap along the Icefields Parkway. There is no comparable example in southern Alberta of an electoral district anchored by such a long stretch with no permanent population or intervening communities. They are common in the north, but those are much larger jurisdictions with very limited population.

Second, the configuration groups together communities that have limited regular interaction, different service centres, and distinct economic orientations. The long extensions and odd shape of the riding, in my opinion, to be frank – and please take this gently – leaves the ABEC vulnerable to accusations of gerrymandering.

Third, the proposal effectively conflates national parks and multiple First Nations reserves into a single federal community of interest. In practice these represent fundamentally different governance relationships and daily realities. We must also ask if a provincial MLA's job is to focus more on federal jurisdiction than provincial.

Fourth and finally, by emphasizing a tourism and park framing, the district risks marginalizing nontourism sectors, including ranching, forestry, transportation, and resource employment, that remain central to much of alpine Alberta.

An alternative approach is to organize representation around corridors that already function as coherent systems. The first would be a Canmore-Crowsnest Pass district aligned along the southern

Rockies and eastern slopes. Communities here, from Canmore to Bragg Creek to Diamond Valley to Crowsnest, share terrain constraints, limited developable land, growing recreation pressure, debates about significant transportation investments, and common land-use and wildfire challenges. They are linked by highway 22 and highway 40 and share a legacy of coal mining, transportation corridors, and ongoing economic transition.

The second is a Rocky Mountain House-Banff district spanning the Bow and North Saskatchewan headwaters. This configuration brings together gateway communities, Crown land, forestry activity, recreation, and Indigenous lands within a continuous service and travel network. Highways 1, 11, 22, and 40 reflect real movement patterns for workers, visitors, and emergency services. Banff and Canmore are tightly integrated such as that they operate almost as a single unit. Even the station stop locations for the future Banff-YC railway have been selected in these two towns.

Political representation to advocate for Banff-Canmore integration has limited need. I would no more hesitate to place them in separate electoral districts than I would to separate Calgary-Klein, where we now sit, from Calgary-Cross, which is right next door. I can confirm that both of these proposed electoral districts remain within the allowable population variance.

Slide 5. Almost done. With respect to Jasper and as a former resident of Jasper I remain unconvinced that removing it from West Yellowhead improves representation. My argument here effectively is: if it ain't broke, don't fix it. I have lived in Jasper and can state that it has long-standing functional ties to Hinton and Edson much more than to Banff. Jasper and Hinton share labour pools, freight and rail corridors, wildlife response, and regional services. By contrast, Jasper is separated from Banff by approximately 200 kilometres of unpopulated parkland with minimal day-to-day interaction between the communities.

The current West Yellowhead population remains within acceptable variance, and its continuity has supported effective representation for decades. Indeed, I understand the population has effectively remained static in this riding for the last five years. Decreasing the size of a riding that is either decreasing or increasing, depending on which source you read, but very slightly is difficult to justify.

Final sentence. In conclusion, effective representation in alpine Alberta depends on functional geography rather than symbolic linkage. The proposed amendments retain population balance while aligning districts with real economic systems, transportation corridors, and provincial responsibilities.

Thank you for your time, and I'd be pleased to answer any questions.

The Chair: Thank you very much, sir. Can I encapsulate that your presentation is in that we should be going east-west with respect to Banff and Jasper rather than north-south? That's one way to describe what you're saying.

Mr. Scholz: Yes. For economic, ecological, and hydrological reasons.

The Chair: Okay. So it's not only directional.

Tell me, because we've heard some comments about – I'm not familiar with the transportation corridor except in summer. What's access from Banff to Jasper like in the dead of winter on highway 93?

Mr. Scholz: That depends on the God of winter. If it decides to snow, the highway, basically, will usually need to be shut down.

The Chair: So it is shut down from time to time?

Mr. Scholz: It is frequently shut down. There's a location near the Weeping Wall where there is, basically, a mountain with a full avalanche slope that goes right down to the highway. The base of the valley is, like, 150-metres wide, and that particular mountain catches a lot of snow. It's at the Columbia Icefields. The Columbia Icefields are there because there's a lot of snowfall there. But this particular mountain is not glaciated, so you get these big snow buildups, and Parks Canada has to blow it. Then you get these videos. These massive avalanches come down, and then they have to clear the snow out, and they usually have to blow it twice to make certain. It's Rocky Mountain snow, and Rocky Mountain snow is inherently unpredictable. So it's often shut down for days. Every time there's a big snowfall, good chance it's going to be shut down for a period of time.

The Chair: Okay. I assume we're going to keep that PowerPoint and we'll get a copy of your presentation.

Mr. Scholz: You have it.

The Chair: Dr. Martin, any comments or questions?

Dr. Martin: Oh, yeah. Thanks.

Thank you very much. Very comprehensive. It's clear from the language that you deploy that you are versed in the language of planning and policy.

Mr. Scholz: I'm a professional planner registered with the province of Alberta.

Dr. Martin: I can, with my own personal experience of having done research in the mountain parks and working quite closely with the superintendents, attest to your assertion about the antigrowth, skeptical of growth policy that permeates national parks for obvious ecological reasons, it seems to me.

Mr. Scholz: That's correct, sir.

Dr. Martin: That certainly has continued. The governance structure of the parks is that the superintendent is lord.

Mr. Scholz: Effectively, yes.

Dr. Martin: So when they decide that a road will close, it will.

Mr. Scholz: Yeah, basically. It functions well in its own way in terms of government. I certainly have disagreements with the Parks Canada agency around certain directions, which is why I resigned from that agency. But, again, it is a federal jurisdiction. The power of an MLA in there is relatively limited except for health and education.

Dr. Martin: I have one further line of questioning. I'd like you to speak a little further about the interface, gateway communities, as you referred to it in this particular slide. That interface is of great interest to the rest of Alberta, I think.

Mr. Scholz: Yes.

Dr. Martin: Can you characterize how that works? I mean, all of the forestry industry, the mining, and so on and so on is centred on those particular villages and towns. You call that still part of the alpine Alberta region, correct?

Mr. Scholz: Yeah. Alpine Alberta comprises two geophysical zones. One is what we think of as the Rockies. The other is the foothills, which is forested, hilly, bumpy, and generally very

underpopulated or very low permanent population but generally, actually, with very good infrastructure: highways, power lines, even railway access into Robb and formerly into Nordegg to access coal deposits, timber supplies. But it's still very heavily used on a tourist perspective.

Most of the tourism growth in Alberta is shifting to this area, and there are very significant concerns happening out there. Talk to any county representative – say, Clearwater county – and they will go on about: tourists are coming in; we don't know where they're going. They don't have clear lines of protocol. They use the infrastructure that was installed by industry. There's a lot of space out there. People don't realize how big of an area we're talking about. It takes an hour to drive from Sundre to the base of the mountains moving at 80 kilometres an hour. You think of Sundre as right at the edge of the mountains. It's not. It's a good hour there. The farther north you go, the wider it is.

I could spend a long time talking about this, but what you're seeing is that the mines that moved into the mountains: you've got some fee simple title lands, and people want to live in the mountains. When the green-light zone was established in the 1930s and '40s in Alberta, the thinking was: farmers need to own their land so they can farm properly, but who wants to live on a lake in the woods by themselves out in the hills, surrounded by trees? I mean, it's dangerous. There are bears, and there are forest fires. Why would anybody want to do that? How are they going to earn a living? Well, that's changed now. Now everybody wants to live on a lake in the trees out in the foothills, but they can't because there are no fee simple lands.

I mean, look at Canmore. It went from a 5,000 mining town to a 20,000 tourism town. If somebody said, "I want to mine a coal deposit outside Canmore," like, good luck. You're likely to be lynched and hung from the nearest tree. Crowsnest: you're starting to see the same power. Try to drive into Crowsnest on a Friday afternoon before a long weekend. Good luck. They're looking at twinning the highway. You're seeing the same pressure, but in Crowsnest you're seeing tremendous push-back against the Canmore subculture. I could definitely see an advantage for an MLA that's representing Crowsnest, Canmore, Bragg Creek, Diamond Valley. These are all mining communities.

Sorry. I can go on this for hours. I'll stop. But, you see, it's all the same issue in different phases, so they can communicate with each other, and up in Banff, Rocky Mountain House, Banff is basically the headwater zone. It's full. They're not allowing any more growth in there. Every five feet right on the edge of the Banff national park there's another tourist operator looking at a new ski resort or a new hotel or a new something, and they can't get through because there's no cohesion, but the Banff market is spilling over.

10:15

Banff has become so expensive that it's basically an international market. That is where Albertans are going. Alberta is growing at around a 2 per cent growth rate. In 35 years we're going to double the population because this city is probably going to be the size of what Vancouver is now: 3 million people. Where are they going to recreate? Where is that going to be? That's all going to be where we're talking about, so you need to have really powerful representation that's taking experience from Banff for working in co-ordination with Banff for the extension of that zone eastward and co-ordination also with all the industry that's going on.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Clark.

Mr. Clark: Thank you. I'm curious. I mean, I'm trying to get my head around the geography that you're talking about, both in terms of connecting Rocky Mountain House to Banff but also Canmore to Crowsnest. My friend Google Maps tells me that a drive today right now from Canmore to Pincher Creek in Crowsnest Pass is about three hours and five minutes. If I was to go Banff to Jasper, highway 93 – I acknowledge it's not always perfect – that's three and a half hours. Banff to Rocky Mountain House is also three and a half hours, so I'm not seeing how your proposed alignment solves the distance problem.

Mr. Scholz: My focus wasn't on the distance problem and how long it takes to drive. My focus was on the distance of the unpopulated region. There is no community between Lake Louise and Jasper. Saskatchewan crossing is a resort with a staff population of about 20, which goes down to about 10 or five in the wintertime for maintenance purposes. There's 200 kilometres there. If you drive from Canmore to Crowsnest, you're going community after community after community. There's a constant link there. One MLA can drive that length and hit most of the communities in one shot. Similarly, I mean, there's Lake Louise, yes, which is a very low voting population because it's mainly staff workers, some of whom are international.

But that ecosystem, the Banff ecosystem – like, if you're hiking into Mosquito Creek, you hike one day in, you're at the headwaters of the Red Deer River in this super isolated valley which goes down to Red Deer. That area is the headwaters of moving into the larger ecosystem, and that tourism market, the local Alberta tourism market, is less and less. It's using Banff very, very heavily on a general basis. Believe me. I live near the freeway. I can see the traffic jams and the accidents.

More and more it's switching to the east side of Banff national park. There's a resource tourism economy under very high strain going on there, and the riding boundaries, if you notice, just touch on Cochrane a little bit. You know, what's the point in that? Cochrane's founding is as a sawmill. The sawmill is one of the biggest single employers in Cochrane. We're including that catchment area where they get their timber in that, so I'm seeing it as a – it's basically the western portion of central Alberta. Yeah, it's about three hours to drive from Rocky Mountain House to Banff, but that road is pretty much always open, and . . .

Mr. Clark: Sorry. I don't mean to cut you off because I know there's some interesting . . .

Mr. Scholz: I apologize. I do this for a living. I can go on and on.

Mr. Clark: No, not at all. I do appreciate it. I just have a couple of other questions, and I want to save a little time for my colleagues here as well. You know, that's one of the things we're really struggling with in the entire map, right? Alberta: very big, lots of space between lots of places. You've identified the north, lots of other spots, so I think that's one of those sort of unavoidable things one way or the other.

Just in terms of connecting Banff and Jasper, though, it's worth noting, and I'm curious based on your experience in the mountain parks, that the town of Jasper has written us a letter saying, "Yeah, we'd like to be with Banff; that makes sense to us, and by the way we're okay adding the name Canmore in there as well," very generously. I'm just interested in that because, I mean, I think that's something they've identified and said: yeah, we actually do connect with Banff. Notwithstanding the fact that there's this large geographic distance, there's a community of interest there. What's your thought on that?

Mr. Scholz: Well, what Mayor Ireland says or doesn't say is, obviously, completely out of my power. The argument is that, you know, there's a common interest amongst the national parks, but I would argue that that belongs in the federal segment, which I believe has already been done. It's not Albertan-based forest mismanagement that led to the great fires. It was Parks Canada fire mismanagement that led to the fires, so I would love to see the MP for that region at the House of Commons going: why is Parks Canada not treating fire risks more seriously such that with 30 years' advance warning they still weren't prepared for a fire that burned a third of the town? The house I lived in was burned to the ground. The reason I quit in 2008 was because of long-standing fire concern issues that I wasn't being listened to about. Why am I working as a town planner when I believe that the town might be burned down to the ground? What's the point of doing my job? That's why I quit. One of the main reasons I quit, I should say. That issue, I believe, belongs in a federal riding.

For provincial jurisdiction we're talking about things like Yellowhead Pass twinning. We're talking about the fact that Jasper has got a severe housing shortage right now. People are not living in Lake Louise or Banff and commuting up to Jasper every day. People that need housing are living in basements in Jasper or they're in Hinton or have found a basement in a cabin in east Jasper right at the edge of the park there at Overlander, and they're driving in every day. There's no bus service. There's no train service. There are these unco-ordinated, recreation-based subdivisions that are forming all around Brûle and near Entrance, Alberta, which is an old station stop just west of Hinton. They're kind of unco-ordinated, and you're getting this mishmash of different land uses that are going to interfere with the resource base on highway 40. Those are provincial jurisdiction issues.

Mr. Clark: Thank you very much. Appreciate that.

Mr. Scholz: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.
Mrs. Samson.

Mrs. Samson: Thank you. You've given us a lot to think about. We've had lots of input both for and against, and you have very powerful reasons to have a real hard look at this again.

I am struck by the lack of co-ordination in that area that is not known as the Rocky Mountains, the foothills, like where there's sort of lawless recreation happening and camp where you may or quad or whatever. Now I start thinking about it in terms of: who's going to manage that when we've given them the national park thing?

Mr. Scholz: Historically the foothills have been treated as an afterthought for ridings based on the prairies. It's still flatish land, but just west of highway 22 or around highway 22 there is a transition from prairie to foothills, and it's always been east-west. You look at the ward boundaries in the counties. They'll have a base in Caroline and they'll extend all the way to the mountains. There's an underrepresentation going on there, and what I'm saying is that we need that area to have its own representation.

What the market wants to do – people are going to freak out. Half a million Albertans want to move in there or they want to recreate there, but they can't because it's all Crown land. It's part of the green zone, which was established in the 1930s and 1940s. Is that the right thing to do? I am not going to answer that question, but I'm putting the question. That is a real thing facing Alberta.

Our population is at 5 million. We were at 4 million, like, yesterday. We're going to 10 million. We're going to 10 million

within our lifetimes, a very high probability. By the time I die, I expect Alberta is going to have 10 million people. Are we going to have 4 and a half million in Edmonton and 5 million over here in Calgary and, you know, a million scattered along the other communities? That could be an option, but I don't see it as the ideal option. That's where we need to be thinking about this long-term future and how we're going to approach. That's why we need strong provincial representation that understands the international and tourism role of the national parks but how that is now extending eastward into the foothills.

Mrs. Samson: Right. Thank you very much. I appreciate those thoughts.

Mr. Scholz: You're welcome. Thank you. Would you like my notes?

The Chair: Yeah. Please leave them with Aaron.

Mr. Evans: I missed how you were dealing with Jasper, the Jasper national park. Where does that fit in the proposal?

Mr. Scholz: I believe Jasper should remain part of West Yellowhead.

The Chair: The existing one.

Mr. Scholz: The existing one. The population hasn't changed. I'm saying: if it ain't broke, don't fix it.

Mr. Evans: The national parks are hugely problematic. Anyone having dealt with them: it's a world unto itself. Even when you reference health and education as being provincial jurisdiction, it's ethereal at best because the physical facilities are still controlled by the parks.

10:25

Mr. Scholz: Parks has a very tight control over the community of Jasper, a little bit looser on Banff, but I run into the same issues. I've been talking to, over in British Columbia, the councillor for ward A of Columbia-Shuswap regional district because Parks Canada has not rebuilt the glacier lodge at Rogers Pass for 15, 20 years, which is bringing down the tourism economy for the entire region, and they struggle with the same issue. Yeah.

I'll say that I am in contact with Big Horn First Nation, which is a Wesley, Goodstoney version, and they're looking to – I'll put it this way. In 2008 I met them and I said, "Are you interested in developments on the east side of Banff national park?" They said: "The elders said no. It's too early." Myself and a First Nation associate I work with: every three to four years we asked them, and they kept on saying: "No, it's too early. It's too early." Last year they called me and they said: "It's time to start thinking about it. What can you share with us?" Okay? So we waited 15 years until the elders said: it's time to start thinking about what sort of investments we can make. I have not been in communication with O'Chiese, but I know that they're now starting to think about: we have to do an MDP for our land and those kinds of things. They're moving slowly, but you can feel that pressure building. Big Horn, O'Chiese: they fit into what I'm talking about. They do not fit into what Banff and Jasper are talking about.

Mr. Evans: If they're moving slowly, then in conjunction with the federal government and the parks will be glacier slow.

Mr. Scholz: Well, O'Chiese is moving slowly. Big Horn is moving fast.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Scholz.

Mr. Scholz: Thank you.

The Chair: Please do stay if you can. We've got a couple more presentations, and from time to time we have informal discussions.

Mr. Scholz: It would be my pleasure.

The Chair: Your input is very interesting. Thank you.

Mr. Scholz: Thank you, sir.

The Chair: Okay. Mr. Art Matsui. Please have a seat, sir, and just identify yourself again and tell us where you live and what electoral division you're speaking to.

Art Matsui: Well, my name is Art Matsui. I live in Calgary-Buffalo in the neighbourhood of Ramsay, right adjacent to the Stampede grounds, and under your interim proposals I would likely be redistributed into the new riding of Calgary-Confluence. It'll be the third boundary redesignation since I've lived there, so I'm of big interest in this.

Anyways, I guess I'm ready to start. It's probably hard to see, but these are my data sheets. I'm here to speak about the proposed urban redistribution in Calgary, specifically the creation of Calgary-Nose Creek in the north and Calgary-Confluence in the inner city, and the impact these proposals would have on Calgary-wide elector parity. The purpose of my submission evaluates these proposals using elector parity as a primary measure of democratic equality. My conclusion is straightforward. Creating two new ridings in the inner city and north would worsen vote inequality in Calgary by concentrating representation in areas with significantly fewer electors per MLA. While population growth pressures are real, redistribution that relies primarily on population rather than electors risks systemic overrepresentation in high turnover, lower registration urban areas. That outcome is inconsistent with the principle of effective representation.

Effective representation means parity of voting power, not simply equal population. In dense urban Calgary geography does not justify elector-light ridings. Both north Calgary and inner-city Calgary already have the lowest electors per MLA in the city. Creating Calgary-Nose Creek or Calgary-Confluence would deepen that imbalance while suburban ridings, which are closest to the provincial elector norm, would be diluted. An elector-based approach is the fair and more defensible solution for Calgary.

Using the Elections Alberta elector quotient of approximately 33,300 electors per riding, this disparity becomes clear. Inner-city Calgary, following a Calgary-Confluence carve-out, would be projected at 22,000 to 26,000 electors per MLA, or roughly 65 to 78 per cent of the provincial average. North Calgary, following a split to create Calgary-Nose Creek, would fall even lower at approximately 20,000 to 25,000 electors per MLA, or 60 to 75 per cent of the provincial average. By contrast, suburban Calgary ridings such as Calgary south, Calgary-Varsity, Calgary-Foothills already sit at 110 to 140 per cent of the electorate quotient. The result is that a suburban Calgary voter would carry nearly half the voting power of a voter in the north or inner-city Calgary. This disparity would be created or worsened by adding new seats in elector-light areas.

Legal framing re effective representation. The Supreme Court of Canada has been clear that absolute voter parity is not required, but deviations must be justified by legitimate factors such as geography, community history, or minority representation as set out in reference re provincial electoral boundaries, Saskatchewan. In

urban Calgary none of these justifications apply. There is no geographic remoteness. MLA accessibility is high. Community interest can be preserved without reducing elector counts. Persistently allocating MLAs to areas with substantially fewer electors undermines the equality component of effective representation, particularly when those deviations are not balanced elsewhere in the city.

Application to the proposed ridings. In north Calgary ridings show very high population deviation but only modest elector counts. Creating Calgary-Nose Creek would push multiple seats towards the bottom of the electorate distribution, worsening inequality. In inner-city Calgary, Calgary-Buffer and adjacent inner-city areas already have low elector density. Combining portions of Acadia, Peigan, Klein, and Calgary-East into Calgary-Confluence would likely produce one of the most elector-light ridings in Alberta without geographic or constitutional justification.

Conclusion. On an elector-weighted basis Calgary does not require additional inner-city and northern ridings. The creation of Calgary-Nose Creek and Calgary-Confluence would reduce average electors per MLA, intensify vote inequality, and move Calgary further from elector parity. Calgary's population pressure can be addressed instead through boundary realignments within existing Calgary ridings, shifting redistribution pressure towards elector-strong suburban seats, targeted voter registration and list maintenance in north and inner-city Calgary. These approaches address growth without undermining voter equality.

Thank you. These are my charts that I base this on. I got the population charts from the boundary commission.

The Chair: Okay, so you've used our population numbers for these electoral divisions.

Art Matsui: Yes. As you can see, Calgary-North East is the highest population deviation in the province at 55 per cent, but they're right almost on the elector average. So if you reduce the population of Calgary-North East by 55 per cent, say – and I'm not suggesting that you are – then it would place Calgary-North East in the range of 86th in the province for electors per MLA.

The Chair: Okay. Mr. Matsui, I didn't take much math in university, okay? These graphs: I want to be sure I understand them before we open it up for questions. So you're saying that there's an incongruity because in Calgary-North East you've got the population at 85,000. Our proposed riding shows it at 54,540.

10:35

Art Matsui: No, that's proposed. This is before redistribution.

The Chair: Oh, so these are the existing ridings?

Art Matsui: Yes. These are the existing ridings, just to be clear.

The Chair: So column B is the existing ridings, not our proposal.

Art Matsui: Yes. All of these charts are on existing . . .

The Chair: Okay. Good. That's helpful.

Art Matsui: I'm just saying that because it's unknown, but . . .

The Chair: Right. Okay. That's helpful.

Now, let me ask you a couple more quick clarification questions. Calgary-North East deviates 55 per cent with the average population. Explain that to me.

Art Matsui: Yeah. Well, the average population . . .

The Chair: Is the 48,000 under the old regime?

Art Matsui: No, no. It's proposed to be 55,000. Currently, if you did nothing, Calgary-North East would be 55 per cent over the proposed average population, which is 55,000, right?

The Chair: Okay. And where do you get column D from?

Art Matsui: Column D comes from the 2024 electoral list from Elections Alberta.

The Chair: Okay. I think I have clarified for myself in my own mind these statistics, so I'm going to open it up for questions from the panel.

Mr. Clark.

Mr. Clark: Yeah. Thank you very much. Appreciate that that's twice we've had the Supreme Court reference quoted to us today. This is a banner day for the lawyers on the panel, so thank you. You know, having read it, though, or at least looked at the reference case, you'll see that the justices refer to population as part of the criteria.

Art Matsui: Yes. I understand, like, you guys are based solely on population, and I think that's a mistake to not consider, you know, electoral weight.

Mr. Clark: I hear what you're saying. I think the Supreme Court would disagree with you. Just to make sure I'm clear on what you're saying with your spreadsheet, the current Calgary-North East has a population of 88,188. You're saying: that's okay; we should keep it roughly that because there are 35,000 electors, and that's where we should be measuring electors.

Art Matsui: I'm not saying that. I gave you a copy in my notes.

Mr. Clark: Yeah, please. Thank you.

Art Matsui: What I'm saying is that you have a mandate to come within plus or minus 25 per cent on population, correct? That's what I'm assuming. But there's no mandate about electors. If you were, the way that Calgary-North East and Calgary-Buffer are the two highest in the city – like, Calgary-Buffer is plus 41 per cent above the 25 per cent. I acknowledge that. Populationwise you're mandated to reduce our population, but you have a parameter of plus or minus 25 per cent, and you're not taking into account the elector distribution.

If you brought Calgary-Confluence by combining these things – and I'm not exact on these numbers. I know what you're taking from Calgary-Buffer. But no matter how you calculate this, they would have in the range of 20,000 to 25,000 voters in the new Calgary-Confluence, and that's far too low. That puts it in the range of, like, Peace River or something.

Mr. Clark: If you don't mind, I'll ask just a quick follow-up.

Art Matsui: Sure.

Mr. Clark: You've obviously done quite a bit of reading. Have you read any of the other electoral boundary commission reports from other provinces or the federal government, and do you know if any of them have used what you're saying? Is this a model that has been applied anywhere else?

Art Matsui: No, I haven't. I mean, I'm interested in this solely from the fact that I'm in another new riding, you know, every time we get redistributed. Ramsay, Inglewood, which is an area – well, you're from Calgary. I mean, it's comprised differently of the

Beltline, so right now Calgary-Buffalo is the Beltline plus Ramsay, Inglewood.

Mr. Clark: If you don't mind, Justice, can I ask just one more brief follow-up?

The Chair: Yeah.

Mr. Clark: Would you agree that elected representatives represent people who can't vote? Kids, new Canadians. All of those folks use provincial services: health care, social service, education. They're not voters, but they are . . .

Art Matsui: I'm not disputing the population aspect of it. I'm just asking that, you know, there should be some balance with electors, and it doesn't seem like the process allows for this. It's only population plus or minus 25 per cent.

Can you put up my other slide?

Mr. Clark: That's all. Thank you.

The Chair: Are you saying, sir, that as we look at the range, plus 25 or minus 25 from the average, we should be considering other numerical factors, i.e. number of electors per electoral division? Is that what you're saying?

Art Matsui: Yes, because you don't want to create these . . .

The Chair: Artificial, cookie-cutter numbers. Is that what you're saying?

Art Matsui: Yeah. Just because now you've got the population down, but you've put the elector count into, like, the worst of the far-north regions. They have a geographic reason. We have no such geographic reason in the city of Calgary that an MLA can easily represent.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you for that clarification.
Dr. Martin.

Dr. Martin: Mr. Matsui, I have intellectually – but not written spreadsheets – noodled around with this issue as well, and what I think my question, really, that I want to share with you is: how would we use your data sets as a tool in the work of this commission given its strictures on the kind of factors we can take on board? We have a catch-all category called (f), any other things that the commission feels are relevant. But really, more to the point, I'm asking: what kind of a tool is this? You know, perhaps it's applicable at the margins, the gross and dramatic differences at either end of your spreadsheet, but how would you govern this tool? We govern the population with a plus or minus 25 per cent variation that's allowed to us as a part of our tool kit. Are you implying that we should have a similar tool kit under our section (f)?

Art Matsui: Okay. Now I've sorted the list the other way, so this is the ranking of ridings by population. You can see that, well, number one is Airdrie-Cochrane. They're 39 per cent over the electoral average. On your one list, by population, you're putting Calgary-North East as your primary hit target because, man, these guys are so far over the population; we've got to do something. Well, none of the urban ridings face pressure on the electoral side. If you look at the chart, the first time that someone appears, it's Calgary-Bow and Calgary-Shaw on this list. It's nothing to do with the north or the inner city.

So now you're not addressing the inequality on the electors side in the southern Calgary ridings. You're only addressing population

in the northern and inner-city ridings and causing this voter inequality to be – you know, you're going to push down into the '80s these two new ridings. That doesn't seem like sound planning that you would put them on the fringe. They went from the upper fringe of population to push them down into the lower fringe of electoral representation.

10:45

Dr. Martin: Well, it's certainly a cautionary tale, at the absolute minimum, that you would inadvertently create new ridings that are like rotten boroughs, you know, where you have a dramatic deficit in the number of eligible voters in the new district. That would be wrong-headed.

Art Matsui: Well, without proper justification. You know, you go into Lesser Slave Lake and of course you're going to have some kind of deficits there.

Dr. Martin: But if we do that in, you know, central Calgary, then we've done something wrong.

Art Matsui: That's what I'm here to say.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.
Mrs. Samson.

Mrs. Samson: Thank you. We've been toying with this concept. It's been brought up starting yesterday. We prepared the interim report without considering voters. Like, we identified when we started that it wasn't going to be voters; it was going to be population. I think we have to have a conversation amongst ourselves how we want to manage this tool. For my own clarity, based on this chart that we're looking at right in front of us with Airdrie-Cochrane at the top, the problem is not limited to urban centres.

Art Matsui: No. But obviously, my interest is Calgary and all of Calgary, you know.

Mrs. Samson: Exactly. So I think your point is well taken.

I'd have to think about this a bit more, so I need all of this stuff left behind, and then I think we have to have a conversation here.

Art Matsui: Yeah. I've submitted these charts. Just so you know, I just whipped these up. I'm sorting by elector and I'm sorting by population, and you're only sorting by elector count, right? So the first chart, or the population versus elector: that's what you're really working from, not really working from the elector side but just the population side. You know, I'm saying: well, there's this other chart that talks about elector inequality. It's not just in Calgary, although I only considered Calgary because I live here, and I'm part of one of the ones that's going to be newly created, being Calgary-Confluence. But I looked, and Calgary-North East is an even worse example of this electoring because Calgary-North East has – you noted this. It's roughly the average, right?

The Chair: Our proposed Calgary-North East. Yeah.

Art Matsui: Calgary-North East, the existing Calgary-North East, is the largest population riding in the entire province, so it has to be redistributed somehow. But electorwise it's sitting at just about the average, so when you take away 25 to 50 per cent of their population, it's going to push the remaining Calgary-North East down to the bottom. And because you're pushing so few electors over by redistributing out of a low-electors riding, now the new riding is also going to be down on the list, so you're going to have

two – not just one, but two – of the lowest elector deviations in the entire province in north Calgary, specifically more or less northeast Calgary. That doesn't seem right, that we're a third of the population of the province and yet we have two of the ridings that have the lowest elector representation in the entire province.

The Chair: Okay. I'm going to have to move on and let other panel members – any more questions?

Mrs. Samson: I do have one more that just came to my mind because this is all new to me. Do I have to grapple with why the population is not voting? Like, does that mess up the whole concept of why we're trying to be – can you comment on that?

Art Matsui: Well, I don't think you have to consider that. I mean, if you look at it – I've lived in Calgary and in the northeast for a lot of years. The northeast is growing. You know, I hesitate to say this, but it's growing with immigrant population . . .

Mrs. Samson: New Canadians.

Art Matsui: . . . new Canadians, but not necessarily voting, and not only new Canadians: a lot of permanent residents and temporary workers. I have a thought that as a Canadian my vote should count, right? When people move here, that's under the understanding that, no, I don't get to vote here until I become – you have to have some incentive for permanent residents to become Canadian citizens and take part in democracy. Just because you move here, I mean, I know we have to take care of these people, but as far as governance goes, the governance should go to people who have invested the whatever to become a voting citizen. We're a citizen-led democracy, so I think that needs to be taken into consideration.

Mrs. Samson: Good answer. Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much.
Mr. Evans, a question or comment?

Mr. Evans: Yeah. I mean, you brought up some interesting points with respect to the Supreme Court of Canada decision in Saskatchewan and Carter. I'm going to read from the head note of the Supreme Court of Canada decision because it deals with the issue of voter parity and it comes up with a concept of voter equity. It sort of interchanges those two terms.

From the majority decision:

The history or philosophy of Canadian democracy does not suggest that the framers of the Charter in enacting section 3 had the attainment of voter parity as their ultimate goal. Their goal, rather, was to recognize the right long affirmed in this country to effective representation in a system which gives due weight to voter equity but admits other considerations where necessary. Effective representation and good government in this country compel that factors other than voter parity, such as geography and community interests, be taken into account in setting electoral boundaries. Departures from the Canadian ideal of effective representation, where they exist, will be found to violate section 3 of the Charter.

I think the confusion is the language of "other than voter parity," and I think what you're suggesting is that voter parity or voter equity would be a factor to be considered in determining effective representation in conjunction with population density.

Art Matsui: Yes. That's my point exactly, that it doesn't seem to me – I don't know how you came about these decisions – that you only considered population and things like, you know, you talked with this other fellow about geography but none of those facts. And I'm only talking about Calgary for voter equity. We should have

voter equity across – we're a homogeneous kind of area, being urban Calgary. I'm willing to go outside of Calgary, as you've done. Like, I'm okay with these hybrid ridings, but I think we still need to consider voter equity. It doesn't feel right to me, especially since I'm the victim of not having voter equity in my riding.

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

One last quick question. In your studies and your research for this presentation, have you come across any academics that back what you're saying or make reference to this principle?

Art Matsui: No. I mean, like Mr. Evans said, there's the Supreme Court Saskatchewan decision. It still talks about population a lot and, you know, that there are mitigating factors to lower this equity, those factors being like communities, geography, minority representation, those kinds of things. I think those kinds of things can be applied to electoral count as well.

10:55

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Matsui. Again, please stay for the rest; there's only one or two more presenters.

I think we'll just barge on through and not have a break. The last presenter for this morning is Patti Nolan.

Ms Dolan: Dolan.

The Chair: Dolan. Sorry. Yes.

Ms Dolan: Bad printing.

The Chair: No. Poor eyesight.

Ms Dolan, tell us where you're from and what riding you're commenting on.

Ms Dolan: Sure. I'm Patti Dolan. I live in Calgary, and I reside in Calgary-Bow.

The Chair: Okay.

Ms Dolan: All right. Good morning, Chair and commissioners. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today and the important work that you're doing here.

My name is Patti Dolan. I'm here to speak against the proposal to move the community of Montgomery out of Calgary-Bow into Calgary-Varsity. I've lived in Calgary-Bow for the last 25 years; 23 years in Bowness and the last two years in Montgomery.

When I moved to Montgomery, I chose to stay in the area very intentionally because from a resident's point of view, Bowness and Montgomery are not separate communities; they function as one. Both were originally independent towns before being amalgamated into Calgary, and that shared history still shapes daily life. We rely on the same services, attend the same events, use the same roads and transit, and face many of the same challenges.

A clear example of a shared experience is the flood of 2013. During the flood both Bowness and Montgomery were heavily affected. Homes, businesses, and community facilities in both neighbourhoods were damaged. Residents supported one another through evacuation, cleanup, and rebuilding. Community halls and volunteer networks stepped up because the impact didn't stop at an arbitrary boundary; the river connected us. Varsity, by contrast, sits on higher ground and did not experience the event in the same way. Flood mitigation, riverbank protection, emergency response, and long-term recovery continue to shape Montgomery and Bowness together. These are shared priorities that make sense to address within the same electoral division.

This shared vulnerability is not just historical; it is current. Right now Calgary is experiencing a significant water infrastructure crisis, and once again Bowness and Montgomery are directly affected together. Residents are dealing with boil-water advisories, localized service disruption, and traffic congestion caused by emergency repairs and detours. The impacts affect daily life: commuting, accessing services, supporting local businesses, and ensuring the safety of vulnerable residents. Emergency vehicles, transit routes, and the commuter traffic all rely on the same constrained corridors that serve both communities. Varsity, while subject to city-wide water restrictions, is not experiencing these impacts in the same way. It is not facing boil-water advisories or localized infrastructure disruptions to the same extent.

This difference matters because of the highlight of how Bowness and Montgomery share infrastructure risks and emergency realities that Varsity does not. Beyond emergency events, day-to-day community life is deeply intertwined. Residents attend each other's community events, participate in shared programs, and volunteer together. Families move back and forth through school activities, recreation, and local services without thinking twice. Long-standing events such as Tour de Bowness, the Montgomery street fair, reflect a shared local identity. These are not siloed neighbourhoods; they are part of one connected community.

Transportation further reinforces this. The number 1 bus route runs directly through Montgomery and Bowness and is a lifeline to residents for commuting to work, school, and services. This daily connection does not extend into Varsity the same way. From a community of interest perspective, these shared experiences, emergencies, infrastructure challenges, celebrations, transit, and daily life are what define effective representation.

I understand that the proposed change is driven by population balancing, and I respect that consideration. However, I don't believe it fully reflects the long-term growth trends in the area. Calgary-Varsity, particularly the university district and south Shaganappi area, is already designated for significant growth under the south Shaganappi community local area plan, and that was approved in March of 2025. As that development progresses, Calgary-Varsity is likely to see substantial population increases. Any short-term balancing achieved by moving Montgomery would likely be temporary. With boundaries expected to remain in place for eight to 10 years, it may make more sense to consider additional representation in Calgary rather than dividing closely-connected, well-established communities.

In closing, I respectfully ask the commission to retain Montgomery within the Calgary-Bow electoral division. Doing so reflects lived reality, preserves strong historical and infrastructure-based ties, and supports effective, responsive representation.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Dolan. You're not the first person that has made this point.

Ms Dolan: Good. I'm not unique, you're saying.

The Chair: Right. Yes.

Comments, questions, Mr. Clark?

Mr. Clark: I don't, no, aside from a thank you. And yes, you are unfortunately not the very first, so I'm afraid any question I've had has already been asked and answered, but thank you so much.

Ms Dolan: You bet.

The Chair: Dr. Martin.

Dr. Martin: Thank you. Like the others said, we've heard a lot about Montgomery. I want to ask you to speak further about the linkages and not just the pedestrian and what seems to me by looking at Google Maps the only road that links the two across the big river. I'm more interested in the historical linkages that are social and cultural. You suggest that those persist, and I wonder if you can describe some of that.

Ms Dolan: Sure. Montgomery and Bowness have a very small-town atmosphere. There are a lot of local businesses, very, very few if any box-store type businesses in the area, so it is very much connected as, you know, small, family businesses. Several generations have been there. Recreational facilities are shared. Shouldice pool is across the street from me in Montgomery yet that's the main facility for Bowness. There's nothing else in the area, so it is very intertwined. The park system: the pathways run from side to side, so there is the physical river dividing one bridge, but it's very . . .

Dr. Martin: There's a pedestrian bridge right next to Bowness Road. Is that correct?

Ms Dolan: That's correct. That's the Hextall Bridge.

Dr. Martin: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms Samson, any questions?

Mrs. Samson: Thanks for coming in today. I really appreciate that. From my own perspective I want to tell you that I live in Sylvan Lake, and when I looked at the map and I saw the Bow River, it was a natural geographic feature that would easily allow me to support taking Montgomery away. I so appreciate that it's real people in places that tell us: that's not right. Thank you for that.

Ms Dolan: Perfect. Thank you.

The Chair: I was going to say that, in our defence, we use the river, which nobody faults you for using a river, generally.

Ms Dolan: Well, it makes sense if you don't live in the community. If you live in the community: no.

The Chair: Yeah. Thank you.

Mr. Evans, any questions?

Mr. Evans: Yeah, I've got a question about, I think it's Wildwood. Wildwood is in the top left-hand corner of what we have as Calgary-Bow. Tell me about the connectivity and the interaction between Wildwood and Bowness.

Ms Dolan: Well, as a cyclist there's a connection there. Edworthy park is just below Wildwood, and so that is a natural extension of Shouldice-Bowness into the south side of the river. It's also a very old community. Again, the community structure there is very similar. It was built in the '40s, and, you know, small businesses are in that area, too, and a lot of park systems. It has a small-town atmosphere also. You have to visit the community because it backs on to an escarpment that goes down to the river, so there are a lot of similarities there I think in lifestyle.

11:05

Mr. Evans: Is it on both sides of 16th Avenue or the Trans-Canada?

Ms Dolan: No. Montgomery is on 16th Avenue going to the river. The river kind of twists and turns throughout. It's not a straight line.

After Hextall Bridge once it becomes Montgomery, it kind of snakes along the river over to, I think, Crowchild, is where the division is.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Dolan.

Ms Dolan: That's it?

The Chair: Yep. Thank you so much. I appreciate you coming.

I think we're going to break now. I don't believe there are any other presenters, so we're going to close our morning meeting for a break for the panelists. We've been sitting for a while, but we're happy to talk to any of the presenters or any of the people that are here in informal capacity, and we'll reconvene at 1:30.

[The hearing adjourned at 11:07 a.m.]

