



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission
Public Hearings

Calgary

Monday, April 12, 2010
1:23 p.m.

Transcript No. 27-3-2

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission

Judge Ernest J.M. Walter, Chairman

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

Office of the Chief Electoral Officer

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

Participants

Rebecca Aizenman
Stan Hall, Calgary-Varsity Liberal Constituency Association
David Hartwick and Mark Scholz, Northern Hills Community Association
Maureen McLeod
Pinky Nantais, Vice-President, Sandstone MacEwan Community Association

Support Staff

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

1:23 p.m.

Monday, April 12, 2010

[Judge Walter in the chair]

The Chair: Good afternoon. We're going to start. Melanie, our first presenter.

Ms Friesacher: Our first presenter is Mr. Stan Hall with the Calgary-Varsity Liberal Constituency Association.

The Chair: Mr. Hall.

**Stan Hall, Calgary-Varsity
Liberal Constituency Association**

Mr. Hall: Thank you, Judge. I previously mailed in a copy of a letter, but I've come along today to supplement it with a few other remarks and also present some maps that I think may clarify the issue, if that's helpful.

The Chair: Thank you. We had your letter from before, and we now all have copies of the maps also. Thank you very much.

Mr. Hall: Okay. Wonderful. I'd just start by saying thank you for taking on the big job of trying to realign constituency boundaries for the province of Alberta. I do appreciate the effort that must go into that. There has been an extra constituency added to the northwest part of Calgary, and that has obviously required some rejigging.

I'm not going to comment particularly on what happened farther to the northwest. Where we're impacted is with the shift of a constituency that has been part of Calgary-Varsity for some time into the new constituency of Calgary-Hawkwood. I guess in my first map I show the two in yellow with just a shift going on. My second map is the Calgary-Hawkwood issue, and the yellow constituency on the right is Dalhousie, that I refer to in the text, that has been part of Calgary-Varsity. The yellow-marked constituency on the left is Silver Springs.

Now, I'd like to just comment, first, on population. It turns out that the populations of these two communities are identical according to the community population comparisons, city of Calgary civic census. They're both a little over 9,000 people, so there didn't seem to my mind to be any particular reason to make that shift.

What happens, though, if Calgary-Varsity does adopt Silver Springs, the one farther west? It imposes a little bit of a geographic disadvantage on both Calgary-Varsity and on the new constituency of Calgary-Hawkwood. I'd like to point out that the fairly big white area just to the east of Silver Springs is a ravine area. On the map it shows a connecting road. In fact, that's an old bus link that is no longer functional; it now has concrete barriers on it. So there is no communication between Silver Springs and the community of Varsity and Varsity Estates, which is the one that is not shown in yellow but south of Dalhousie. Likewise, there's no direct communication between Dalhousie and Ranchlands other than a bus link with a trap, so communication there between paired constituencies is only by the main road, by Crowchild Trail.

What happens, then, if Dalhousie is lost to Calgary-Varsity is that it doesn't fit nicely with Hawkwood, and the proposed new constituency of Silver Springs is significantly farther west. You know, despite the way it looks, despite the ravine system, that's not obvious, perhaps, and the golf course areas, it's a little bit farther west than it looks. So just transposing those two communities degrades the geographic integrity, I guess, of both constituencies is what I'm saying.

I also point out in my letter that the time of development of the constituencies involved is significantly different. Silver Springs and Hawkwood and Ranchlands came in about the same time, so they have fairly similar demographics, if you like, similar problems associated with, say, development of community centres, schools, that kind of thing. So I guess I'm contending that there's good reason to leave Silver Springs as part of Calgary-Hawkwood just because of demographic similarity. Hence, I guess I'm talking about the keyword in your preamble to your exercise, the right to effective representation. So numerically, no reason not to switch Dalhousie back into part of Calgary-Varsity. Geography and right of effective representation, a similar sort of thing.

1:30

I've talked about arithmetic; I've talked about geography, a little bit about governance on demographic grounds. There is another factor, which impacts us particularly, because it turns out that Dalhousie is the home community of a sitting Liberal MLA. So this comes into governance as well. What I'm going to contend is that there's no valid reason to shift Dalhousie into the new constituency of Calgary-Hawkwood. From the point of view of governance and just complicating the business of representing fairly the people of the northwest, it's somewhat of a disadvantage. It's disruptive I guess is what I'm saying.

I think that's pretty much where I'd like to leave it, unless you'd tolerate a question from me and just allow me to ask if you see any advantage to having switched Silver Springs into association with the constituency of Calgary-Varsity as opposed to leaving it where it is, paired under the old Calgary-North West with its other neighbours, especially neighbours to the north.

The Chair: Well, it's a bit ironic that the populations are just about equal. We will have some questions for you if you wouldn't mind. Perhaps, Brian, we'll start with you.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Chairman, and thanks very much, Mr. Hall, for your presentation. Thanks, in particular, for your maps. It's very helpful to have the maps as well.

What you're saying makes good sense to me. I guess my only question, then, is whether that Silver Springs area, that you've identified, is better aligned with Calgary-Hawkwood, where you have to go across Crowchild Trail, or Scenic Acres, where you have to go across Nosehill Drive, and whether there's much difference or whether it's a 60-40, 40-60 kind of situation in terms of if everything else were equal and Silver Springs had an opportunity to have an input, whether they would prefer to be in Calgary-Hawkwood or in Calgary-North West or, indeed, whether they'd prefer to be in Calgary-Varsity.

Mr. Hall: I'm not quite sure how to respond glibly to that. All the new communities out there, including Silver Springs and Hawkwood-Ranchlands, seem to be defined by fairly definite roadways and boundaries. You know, in the old part of the city it was easy to get from one community to another apart from going out onto a four- or six-lane highway.

I think Scenic Acres and Silver Springs would probably be likely to consider themselves close neighbours. They do communicate, I guess, across Nosehill Drive fairly easily.

In terms of the north-south orientation, it's certainly as easy to get into the northern communities as it is into, say, Varsity or Dalhousie.

Mr. Evans: Scenic Acres. My recollection is that it's quite a bit newer than Silver Springs and Hawkwood.

Mr. Hall: Yes.

Mr. Evans: So the Ranchlands area and the Silver Springs area were probably, more or less, developed around the same time frame?

Mr. Hall: About, yes.

Mr. Evans: Okay. All right. Well, thank you very much. I appreciate it.

Mr. Hall: You're welcome.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Hall, thank you very much for coming in today and for your very clear maps. They help us a lot.

I'm just following up a little bit on Brian Evans' comments with respect to the redrawing of the boundaries. Your suggestion is to move the Calgary-Varsity boundary back to, sort of, Sarcee Trail to take in the community of Dalhousie.

Mr. Hall: That's where it is now. The current Calgary-Varsity includes Dalhousie.

Ms Jeffs: Yes, the current. I'm sort of looking at the proposal and where we would shift from there. Do you have some thoughts in terms of an appropriate sort of line for us in putting Silver Springs into Calgary-Hawwood just in terms of a boundary? I mean, a lot of what we did was that we were trying to find boundaries that made sense.

Mr. Hall: Okay. The continuation of Sarcee Trail to the south.

Ms Jeffs: To Silver Springs, and then there's a ravine there, you're saying?

Mr. Hall: It's shown as Silver Springs Gate. There's green space on either side of that. Where it turns, there is further green space, and a ravine goes down to the river. There is a golf course in the upper areas that winds around Varsity Estates. I'd continue Sarcee Trail down to the river, basically, is what I'm suggesting as a boundary through the green space.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. And that green space – I'm sorry – is it a ravine and a golf course that's in there?

Mr. Hall: Yes, both. Right.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. Sorry. It's been a while since I've lived in Calgary.

Mr. Hall: Right. Well, just to review, then. All of the housing in both Silver Springs and Varsity Estates is on top of the escarpment, which drops, then, very steeply down to the river. The red line, the boundary on the south, is, in fact, the Bow River. So there is further green along the river accessed only by pathways.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

The Chair: Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Hall. As you may be able to tell if you look at the Calgary map that is part of the

interim report – it's attached at the back of the schedule – one of the major factors . . .

Mr. Hall: I think I've reproduced it here.

Mr. Dobbie: Okay. If you look at the entire city, what was driving a bunch of our thinking last time was looking at the major traffic routes. We didn't necessarily have particular information from the neighborhoods, particularly here: Dalhousie or Silver Springs. So in answer to your question as to why we would make the recommendation we did in the interim report, it was largely driven by our assessment of what the communities of interest would be. It's clear that you've made a strong argument that we might have missed it here.

The second thing you should know is that one of the factors that we didn't have data on nor did we actually take into account was the actual residence of the sitting MLA. It's something that we weren't aware of nor, frankly, were properly considering. Certainly, the proposal that you're giving is consistent with a number of others that we have seen in writing, which is a version of the Hippocratic oath: first, do no harm. First, make no changes unless there's a compelling reason to do so. Yours would be an example, certainly in my view, of that argument. So thank you for putting it so clearly and also with as much backup data as you've done.

Mr. Hall: I appreciate that input. That's nice.

Dr. Archer: Thanks, Mr. Hall. Again, I appreciate these maps. This looks like one of those instances in which the recommended change is what we would probably consider to be tweaking that responds to the kind of in-depth community knowledge that you're bringing to the commission. The fact that the two communities within the constituencies are roughly equally sized, I think, is really helpful for us in considering this change. I'm pretty familiar with this area. I know that it's virtually impossible to get from Varsity Estates to Silver Springs without coming back onto the Crowchild. So you're right in saying that there's no direct connection between the two.

I also know that as the city was growing, the development was fairly planned such that the community of Dalhousie was developed right after Brentwood was developed, and that sort of just kept cascading out into the farther reaches of the city. So I think in terms of the historical development of the area bringing Dalhousie back into Calgary-Varsity seems to make a lot of sense.

1:40

I would like to just raise the question that Brian Evans was leading you to comment on as well. If the commission takes up your recommendation to move Dalhousie back into Calgary-Varsity and to move Silver Springs out of Calgary-Varsity, is your recommendation that the best location for Silver Springs, the best constituency for Silver Springs is, in fact, the Calgary-North West constituency or the Calgary-Hawwood constituency? Once we start moving communities in and out of a constituency like Calgary-Varsity, it does give us the opportunity to consider whether Silver Springs, in fact, should be in Calgary-North West or should be in Calgary-Hawwood. Any advice that you have for us would be useful.

Mr. Hall: Well, I guess the way I've drawn the map, I'm implying that Calgary-Hawwood would be the logical thing. Not living in Silver Springs, I guess I feel a little bit shy about saying what is best for them necessarily. Silver Springs and Scenic Acres as a pair, certainly, also does make sense. I guess I looked at the map with

Foothills as well with a certain amount of angst, if you like. Edgemont is immediately north of Dalhousie, and it's on the slope of Nose Hill. Edgemont then drops over the hill and spreads right up into the far northwest of the city, as you've shown it, including beyond Stoney Trail, which I think may raise some governance issues there. You know, if you're going to further consider some boundary changes, I wonder if Calgary-North West might extend a little farther north kind of thing.

You know, without thinking numbers a little bit more clearly, I'm not sure I can make any really definitive statements up there. It just strikes me that Calgary-Foothills becomes really quite a big mixture of fairly established communities, newer communities, and just coming out of the ground communities – right? – so it could well grow substantially in the next little while. I don't know if that helps or not. I'm sure these are things you know already.

Dr. Archer: Well, I think it's helpful just to serve as a reminder that although one could see these two communities as a bit of a trade-off, to a certain extent, just putting Silver Springs into Calgary-Hawwood, I was also struck by the fact that the connections between Scenic Acres and Silver Springs has always struck me to be a pretty strong one. A lot of the kids up there would go to the same schools, for example, belong to the same sports teams. I know the hockey teams draw from both of those areas, all of which suggests to me that, on the one hand, I found your suggestion to move Dalhousie back into Calgary-Varsity to be very useful and compelling but also simply suggesting that as a commission we may want to take a closer look at that configuration as we go farther northwest and don't simply as a default put Silver Springs into Calgary-Hawwood but consider the best alignment in the various communities up there.

Dr. Hall: Okay. I guess my primary concern was the minimal change that Dalhousie should stay with Calgary-Varsity unless there's a compelling reason to suggest otherwise.

Dr. Archer: Yeah. Thank you.

Mr. Hall: Just a further comment on your preliminary note that it's difficult to get from the Calgary Varsity Estates community into Silver Springs. I did a little Google thing and came across a fellow who is complaining about the bike path even being blocked with the concrete barriers that replaced the bus trap.

The Chair: Anything further?

If not, thank you very much, Mr. Hall. That was a very good presentation. Thank you again for the maps and the materials. We'll certainly take careful consideration of them.

Mr. Hall: Thank you for your attention. I hope I get my wish. Thanks again.

The Chair: Thank you.

Is there anyone here who has scheduled a presentation?

Is there anyone here who would like to make a presentation at this point? Yes, ma'am.

Ms Aizenman: Would the chair accept an informal presentation? I'm scheduled for tomorrow afternoon, but since I'm here, may I make use of your time and mine? My presentation is informal. I must stress that I don't have 10 copies for the committee and its support team.

The Chair: Well, come on forward, and we'll hear what you have to say. I would ask, ma'am, since this is all being recorded for the record, that we have your name. All right?

Rebecca Aizenman
Private Citizen

Ms Aizenman: Yes, sir. My name is Rebecca Aizenman. I'm scheduled to speak tomorrow afternoon, so you have the spelling of my name. I'm here as a citizen interested in the political process, although once upon a time I was very, very active in the Calgary-Elbow Liberal association.

I welcome you back to Calgary. I commend you on the process because you've been very open. You've welcomed input. You've advertised yourself. Yet I'm underwhelmed by the lack of participation. I don't know if that's due to a lack of understanding of the process or simply an "I don't care; it doesn't matter approach." It does to me because to be involved in the political process, I think, is very, very important.

When I presented my comments to you last fall, I stressed that we needed less representation but more effective representation. When your interim report came out in late February, about February 24 or 25 there was a very pointed editorial in the *Calgary Herald*. In a written presentation I would take the liberty of attaching that editorial to my written comments.

You're bound by legislation to redo the electoral map for Alberta. I don't know if you can override it, but in the interim report I did read that you took into account presenters' comments that we didn't need to expand the size of the provincial Legislature. I'm particularly concerned about the cost of extra MLAs at a time when the province is in deficit. To use an example, services to the disabled are being cut as of a story in the *Calgary Herald* this morning. I ask the question: do we need more MLAs at this time?

With respect, I live in Calgary-Elbow right now.

The Chair: Ma'am, could I just help you there for one second?

Ms Aizenman: Yes, sir.

The Chair: We are bound by the act to divide the province up into 87 ridings. We don't have any authority to give less in terms of ridings or more. We did, though, in our report point out that there were more than just yourself who had the comments about: did we really need more ridings and representation and the costs that went with them? We are aware of the concerns, and we tried to point it out in our report, but we're bound to set the boundaries for 87 ridings.

1:50

Ms Aizenman: Thank you for the clarification, Your Honour.

With respect to the configuration of Calgary-Glenmore, because I now will be in Calgary-Glenmore, I have some concerns. When I first appeared before you last fall, I was very emphatic about including the community of Kingsland in Calgary-Glenmore. If you live in Calgary-Elbow, you cross the street, for example, to go get your coffee at 7-Eleven, at Tim Hortons, at Starbucks. Now, I've got all of them in, but my point is that the social interaction is across the street called Elbow Drive. If you go to the intersection of 75th Avenue and Elbow Drive, there is a very convenient little shopping centre. Across the street is St. Peter's Anglican church. On the northwest corner is a dominant feature of the area, Henry Wise Wood high school.

What I'm saying is that there's a great deal of social interaction. The social culture, the social geography, between the communities

of Chinook, Kelvin Grove, and Kingsland is interactive. It should not be divided by Elbow Drive, which is a major thoroughfare, but we cross it with lights and – what do you call it? – those yellow pedestrian signals. I would respectfully ask that you look at the map again and give serious consideration to including Kingsland in Calgary-Glenmore.

There is a historical continuity in Calgary-Glenmore. When you say, “I live in Calgary-Glenmore,” it raises a certain image in your mind which is hard to describe. Glenmore Trail should be one of the definitive boundaries to identify this constituency. As it is, it goes from Anderson Road, up Macleod Trail, over to – what is it? – Heritage Drive, along Elbow Drive, across the avenue, and then back up to Macleod Trail, hit or miss at the intersection of 26th Avenue.

My main concern is that Kingsland be included in Calgary-Glenmore. I know you’re bound by population figures – it has to be plus or minus the given percentage – but I don’t think that should matter. I’m more concerned about social continuity, political interaction. There is a historical background to Calgary-Glenmore which should be maintained. It’s hard to imagine that Calgary-Glenmore will now go as far north as the river and those landmarks across from the exhibition grounds.

I have concern about Erlton being included. If I read the map correctly, it would seem to me that the medium-density population and housing in Erlton should be part of what was Calgary-Currie at one time.

That is all that I have to say at this point. I thank you for your attention and your acceptance of an informal presentation. I was prepared to come tomorrow afternoon, so I thank you for hearing me in an informal way without proper paper.

The Chair: Would you mind if we asked you a few questions?

Ms Aizenman: No, sir.

The Chair: All right.

Dr. Archer: Thanks very much for the presentation. We had a presentation earlier today that focused on the proposed Calgary-Elbow constituency, and it had some implications for Calgary-Glenmore as well. I wonder if I can run some of these by you and then see if we can integrate those with your comments as well.

Ms Aizenman: Certainly.

Dr. Archer: At the moment the northern boundary of Calgary-Glenmore is the northern shore of the reservoir. The suggestion was to move that up to the Glenmore Trail, so bring Lakeview into Glenmore, and then to keep the northern boundary of Calgary-Glenmore as Glenmore Trail all the way across. That northern boundary would be a consistent northern boundary all the way to the eastern boundary, so it wouldn’t include the area sort of east of the Elbow River that is in the current map. But then a question arises as to what is the appropriate northeastern boundary, I don’t know the location of Kingsland, whether it’s that area that is south of Glenmore Trail and east of Elbow Drive.

Ms Aizenman: Yes, it is.

Dr. Archer: And up to Macleod Trail?

Ms Aizenman: Yes.

Dr. Archer: I see. So the suggestion would be to take that out to Macleod Trail and then to kind of square up the riding by the sounds of things.

Now, bringing Kingsland in would bring in about 4,300 people, so we’d have to have a pretty close look at what these various changes would do in terms of the population. But your suggestion is not inconsistent with what we heard earlier; it’s simply extending it a little bit farther east.

Ms Aizenman: I think it just makes sense to use Glenmore Trail as a major delineation. You’re living adjacent to Glenmore Trail, and that sort of identifies you. It’s not Elbow Drive; it’s Glenmore Trail. It’s the same with Lakeview. To leave Lakeview, you can only get out by travelling east-west on the Glenmore Trail or north on 37th Street, which you wouldn’t want to do in the near future because a major intersection is planned at that corner.

Dr. Archer: Right. So you’d be supportive of that idea of making the northern boundary Glenmore Trail?

Ms Aizenman: Yes, I would be.

Dr. Archer: That’s all I have.

Ms Aizenman: Thank you.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you again, Ms Aizenman, for bringing us your comments. I’d like to ask you about the Lakeview neighbourhood. Have you spoken to people in that area? One of the concerns we have is that if you use Glenmore Trail as the northern boundary, that community is essentially isolated from the balance of the Glenmore constituency.

Ms Aizenman: I’m familiar with Lakeview. In fact, I have a colleague and friend who lives there. When the boundary report first came out, she said: oh, I’m still in Calgary-Elbow, and the rest of our little network is on the other side. Lakeview is in a unique position geographically because it’s entirely south of Glenmore Trail. There’s west Lakeview, and there’s east Lakeview, although it’s referred to as north Glenmore. It could go either way, but if you want to be consistent, again, the Glenmore Trail marks a convenient boundary because to the west of Lakeview is 37th Street, to the south of Lakeview is the Glenmore park, to the east of Lakeview we’re getting into the area around Rocky View and the reservoir and Glenmore park. So there’s a big natural element that makes for a prominent feature which separates Lakeview from the people, communities east of 14th Street.

Mr. Dobbie: Again, just so I’m understanding. At least the one person that you talked to is, I guess, indifferent or doesn’t really mind one way or the other? Is that a fair assessment?

Ms Aizenman: She was concerned, but I think it’s something that I looked at. It’s something that the commission is looking at. I don’t recall if Lakeview was in Calgary-Glenmore before other divisions were made. I’d have to go back and check the maps from 1989, 1993. I use those dates because those were election dates.

Mr. Dobbie: Again, just so I understand. The area to the east of Macleod Trail, you recommend, would form part of the newly proposed Calgary-Acadia?

Ms Aizenman: Yes, please.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you very much for your presentation. I don't have too much to question or add to this, but I want to follow up a little bit on what my colleagues have said about this issue with Lakeview. Sometimes we hear from people that having a constituency cross a natural boundary like that is a problem; sometimes it's not. Is it your sense that they wouldn't feel isolated there on the other shore of the reservoir?

2:00

Ms Aizenman: Could you repeat the last part of your question, please?

Ms Jeffs: Is it your sense that they wouldn't feel isolated? If Lakeview was added to Calgary-Glenmore, is it your sense that they would not feel isolated on the other side of the reservoir? It seems like their transportation network and everything is different.

Ms Aizenman: I think people would see it either way, depending on their pattern of transportation and their social network, but they must come out on Glenmore to leave the community. In fact, there's only one way out of Lakeview wherever you live, and that's Glenmore and Crowchild Trail or 37th Street, way, way down at that end adjacent to the reserve and up 37th Street. It could go either way, depending on the population.

I don't see any intense opportunity for population growth in Lakeview. It's mostly R1 housing, some medium-density housing, but virtually there isn't any land that could be redeveloped into higher density housing.

Ms Jeffs: You feel very strongly that we should find a way to nudge Kingsland into Glenmore. All right. Thank you.

Those are my questions. Thanks very much.

The Chair: Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Thank you again, Ms Aizenman, for your second presentation. We've done our best as a commission to try to narrow that percentage of variance from the quotient, the 40,880, as much as possible. However, we have seen distinctions even in urban areas between established communities, more homogeneous communities in terms of socioeconomic, linguistic, cultural similarities, as opposed to some newer areas and some central city areas where there are greater social demands, if I can use that terminology. We've suggested amongst ourselves – and I think it's a common theme – that representing an area where you have a more homogeneous population could allow for a greater variance above the quotient than an area, say in Calgary centre, where there are a number of demands on the MLA, have a lower number there and still have effective representation for the constituents in both areas.

I don't recall whether you made any comments about that in September. Do you have any comments that you'd like to put in front of the commission on that issue of the variance from the quotient? You did start off your comments by speaking to the issue of effective representation. I'd like to have your comments about what that really means to you.

Ms Aizenman: Well, I know it's difficult to adhere to the required

formula to represent an equal population distributed within Calgary. I still believe that homogeneous communities should be kept together because of what I call their social and cultural features. In some parts of Calgary it's very easy to do; in other parts it's difficult. I'm familiar with the southern end, the area where I live, more so than anywhere else. If I go to Calgary-Buffalo or Calgary-Currie, there's a very different population there because of the nature of development, the historical background of development. It's inner city; it's higher density; it's a very good mix of different types of populations, which is good for the quality of life in that area. That's how I look at it.

I don't know if I've answered your questions, Mr. Evans.

Mr. Evans: Well, you have, in a sense. The point I was trying to get to was, you know, that if you put yourself in the chair of the MLA representing Calgary-Elbow and you're looking at a population variance from the quotient that is, say, higher than the quotient and then you put yourself in the chair of the MLA representing Calgary-Buffalo and you have the same variance above the quotient, would that in your view be an equal kind of challenge for the MLAs? The point that I'm trying to make is that I don't think it would be because the demands of that Calgary-Buffalo MLA are greater per constituent. The more you add above the quotient, you know, you're putting more pressure on that MLA than you would the MLA representing, say, Calgary-Glenmore.

Let's take something in the northwest, as you heard when you were here before, Calgary-Varsity or Calgary-North West or Calgary-Hawkwood. You know, in Hawkwood our numbers are much higher. We're above the quotient quite considerably, but we've identified that as a homogeneous area, more or less, and not as difficult and demanding per constituent as it would be in the inner city.

Ms Aizenman: I can see the demands of an MLA who represents an area like Calgary-Buffalo or Calgary-Currie. I'm using Calgary-Fort as much more demanding than the demands on an MLA representing Calgary-Elbow or Calgary-Glenmore because the population is different. That's just the way it is. If you place Kingsland into Calgary-Glenmore, I would respectfully suggest that you look at the northern area, the very north end of the constituency, where the population has stabilized. I'd have to do some map work to move it over into the neighbouring constituency.

Mr. Evans: Okay. Thank you very much for the comments.

The Chair: Well, thank you very much, ma'am. That was very helpful and very interesting. We appreciate your input, and we'll certainly consider it.

Ms Aizenman: Thank you again, Mr. Chairman.

Ms Friesacher: Our next presenter is Ms Pinky Nantais with the Sandstone MacEwan Community Association.

Ms Nantais: When I was first asked to do this, I was under the impression that this was a town hall type of meeting. I didn't know that I was supposed to do this stuff ahead of time, so you'll have to bear with me here.

The Chair: Could I just ask you first – everything is being recorded. Would you please identify yourself, and then we can move ahead.

**Pinky Nantais, Vice-President
Sandstone MacEwan Community Association**

Ms Nantais: My name is Pinky Nantais. I'm with the Sandstone MacEwan Community Association in the northwest. We're in the Calgary-Mackay riding. I'm here on behalf of our community association. I have been on the board of directors for over 20 years right now. We've been discussing this at our board meetings for the last little while, and we've concluded that changing the boundaries for our community association would really have a big impact.

We're two communities but one association only. The way the new boundaries are being done up, MacEwan would now be in a different riding than what Sandstone would be. We've had issues of this in the past with different levels of government, and it just is a bloody nightmare for us. Any time that we need to have help from any of our elected members of any level of government, if we've got two different people representing us, we've got two people that are paid elected officials working on the same issue for one community association.

Shaganappi Trail is on the boundary of Nose Hill park, and we're just thinking that that's more of a natural boundary. Between MacEwan and Edgemont there's quite a bit of space, and we really don't have a lot of association with each other. The demographics are very, very different from that area over to our area as well. We'd also like MacEwan Sandstone to stay in the same area with the Beddington Heights Community Association. We do a lot of work together as a group. We host the biggest minor soccer in Calgary, the MSB soccer, which is MacEwan, Sandstone, and Beddington. So, again, we don't want MacEwan outside of that as well.

That's about all I really have to say here. I tried to keep it short and sweet for you. We can keep moving on here and have more breaks.

2:10

The Chair: Bryan.

Mr. Evans: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you very much for your presentation, Ms Nantais, but unless we have a map or unless you can show us on a map . . .

Ms Nantais: It's on page 64.

Mr. Evans: Yeah, I'm looking at page 64, and we can actually put it up here as well. I think our team has already done that. So specific suggestions would be what?

Ms Nantais: Currently our one boundary is Shaganappi Trail, and it's being proposed to be moved over to 14th Street, which would cut off the entire community of MacEwan from Sandstone.

Mr. Evans: So you'd like to see it continue down Shaganappi Trail to Berkshire Boulevard?

Ms Nantais: Yes.

Mr. Evans: Okay. The population in MacEwan is 5,233.

Ms Nantais: Then if you look on the map where MacEwan is situated, the way that it would go into the new boundaries, they're really, really isolated from every other community that would be in there with them, so it's kind of an unnatural union for them. Plus, like I said, we are one community association, two communities.

Mr. Evans: On either side of Shaganappi is a bit of an escarpment, isn't it?

Ms Nantais: Yes, it is. That's part of Nose Hill park.

Mr. Evans: So that's the division between the two communities.

Ms Nantais: Yeah.

Mr. Evans: Right. Is that the only change that you and your association are recommending?

Ms Nantais: That's the only change that we're concerned with, yes. We just want to keep MacEwan Sandstone together under one representative.

Mr. Evans: Okay. When you look at the rest of the proposed electoral division, are there any other areas that you identified that might be better suited in another constituency? Just in terms of numbers.

Ms Nantais: The way I'm looking at Calgary-Mackay as it is right now, it's actually pretty good the way it's set up presently, and the new changes are all going to be good, all except for the Shaganappi Trail part, Shaganappi and 14th.

Mr. Evans: See, the difficulty, of course, is that Calgary-Mackay now is 12.15 per cent over the quotient, so 45,846. So if you were to add another 5,000 people, you're up at 50,000. There's a fair bit of growth potential in Mackay. All those taken together make it pretty difficult for us to add anything else in there. That's why I asked the question about whether there's any logical deletion from what we have proposed. You know, there's a fair chunk of population up here, as you know, in Calgary-Country Hills, as we're proposing, and certainly in Calgary-McCall as well and Calgary-Foothills. So it is a difficult area to move things in and out without having a pretty significant impact.

But now it's much clearer to me what you're proposing, so thank you very much for that. If you review this again with your community association and have any other suggestions of, you know, how we might be able to keep – even at 12 per cent it's fairly significant over and above the quotient. If we can get closer to that and still deal effectively with your recommendation on MacEwan, that would be very helpful for us. Thank you.

Ms Nantais: You're welcome.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you very much for your presentation. I think Bryan has covered off a lot of what were questions in my mind. The only thing I would add is: in which boundary change or at what point – you mentioned that the two communities have been split before and it's been a problem. Were they split last time, or was it the commission before?

Ms Nantais: I can't remember if it was federal or provincial. I know that at one time we did have different wards for aldermen, and that was a huge, huge headache. Every time we had an issue that we had to bring up, we had to have two representatives come out.

Ms Jeffs: Well, you're not the first group we've heard from where there's sort of a joint community association, and we certainly would want to accommodate that if at all possible. Our issue with Calgary-Mackay is really the growth there and the numbers now. Are you comfortable that both communities sort of properly belong in Calgary-Mackay, that that's the appropriate constituency?

Ms Nantais: Oh, absolutely.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. There's no question about that.

Ms Nantais: No question at all, no. The only problem I can see is that where Calgary-Foothills is, there's no room to put some of ours over into theirs, either. That whole area has just exploded in the last couple of years.

I understand trying to keep everything even, but I think that splitting a community association is not really doing anybody any favours.

Ms Jeffs: No. And I don't think we'd like to do that if we can find an alternative. I would just reinforce what Brian said, that if you can think of another way we could tweak that boundary to make that shift, that would be very helpful to us.

Ms Nantais: I think that if I can get a map that's a little more detailed about where exactly all these boundaries are and what communities are in there, that might be a little bit helpful for me. I'll take that back to the community association and see what we can do in that way.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you very much.

Ms Nantais: I know that the far north part of Calgary-Foothills is not as populated as the core area there. Where Shaganappi Trail ends and then south of there, that's pretty populated, but going towards Symons Valley Road, just a little past that, it's not that crowded at all.

Ms Jeffs: It's not that crowded. All right.

Well, thank you again, and leave that with us to work on.

Ms Nantais: Thank you.

The Chair: The problem that both Brian and Allyson referred to is that we are not allowed to have a variance beyond 25 per cent from the average quotient. With what you're suggesting, we very likely will be slightly over the 25 per cent, and we can't do that at law.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you for the presentation. One of the problems I have is that I don't know the neighbourhood names. If I look at Calgary-Mackay, the easternmost neighbourhood below Country Hills Boulevard, is that one community or two? Between the CP Rail line and the north boundary of Country Hills Boulevard, what's the name of that community?

Ms Nantais: Below the CP line? I think that might be part of Harvest Hills. Actually, that's all park area there.

Dr. Archer: Which area are you looking at?

Mr. Dobbie: Right in this area. I'm looking at Country Hills Boulevard.

Ms Nantais: I believe that that is all parkland there right above Beddington Trail, over to the CP rail, and up.

Dr. Archer: This area here I think is what Peter is referring to.

Ms Nantais: Okay.

Dr. Archer: Country Hills Boulevard over to Harvest Hills.

Ms Nantais: Are there street names right below any of those?

Dr. Archer: No, there are no street names on any of these.

Ms Nantais: Okay. I'm just trying to get my bearings as to where that is.

Dr. Archer: I think this is Harvest Hills, isn't it?

Ms Nantais: That's what I'm thinking because there's a lot of green space there, and there's a golf course there. I'm thinking that could very well be.

Mr. Dobbie: We do have neighbourhood numbers. Again, if we were to accede to your request to add this community back in, it strikes me that we will have to take part out. I know you're not sure where that might go, but I just was wondering if this was a definable neighbourhood. Does Harvest Hills cross Country Hills Boulevard north and south?

Ms Nantais: Yes, it does. Wait. No. North and south? I'm just wondering if that's Coventry.

Mr. Dobbie: Again, if you're not sure, we'll be able to look at it as well.

Ms Nantais: Yeah. I will check that out, and we can get back to you on that.

The other concern we have, too, if we change the boundaries is that as far as school boards and whatnot go, with the public schools for the elementary kids we would have people in two different areas again.

The area that we're talking about is Harvest Hills, yes. Thank you.

The Chair: Anything further?

Mr. Dobbie: No. That's fine.

Thank you.

2:20

Dr. Archer: I guess my comments, Ms Nantais, are similar to what others are saying, that I think your argument is a compelling one. You know, if you have two communities that have a lot in common, it's useful to have them together. The challenge that we're confronting here is just making the numbers work.

Ms Nantais: Right.

Dr. Archer: It's kind of a twofold problem because if the community of MacEwan is taken out of – what is it? In Calgary-North West right now?

Ms Nantais: It's in the northwest.

Dr. Archer: Sorry; out of Calgary-Foothills. If it's taken out of Foothills, because Foothills is right on the average up until this point, then it turns out to be – oh, I don't know – 12 or 13 per cent below average, and because the populations in the northwest generally are fairly large, having one so low really just complicates the issue for us.

Ms Nantais: Right.

Dr. Archer: So we couldn't have Calgary-Mackay up at 51,000 or something like that. The challenge is to find an area that we could not only take out of Calgary-Mackay, but take out of Calgary-Mackay and put back into Foothills.

Ms Nantais: The only one I could think of would be Hidden Valley, but I think that the numbers are probably too large.

Dr. Archer: One of the issues that we've avoided to this point – but, you know, on this second round it's probably useful to get some comments back from people – is whether it's useful to take half of a community from one riding and put it in another riding in an effort to ensure that where there is a strong community of interest across a couple of communities, you're able to reflect those but also to work within the population figures that we have at hand.

Ms Nantais: I think that would bring up the same type of problem that we're addressing right now.

Dr. Archer: Yeah. Exactly.

Ms Nantais: If we split Hidden Valley in half, I mean, it's the same type of thing.

Dr. Archer: People would not be happy with that.

Ms Nantais: No.

Dr. Archer: I guess my comment to you is that if your community association can think of any solution for this issue, how we could both bring MacEwan in and find some way to address the population imbalances that would result, that would be really helpful.

Ms Nantais: So we're looking, basically, at a transfer of about 5,000 people over to probably Calgary-Foothills or over to Calgary-Country Hills.

Dr. Archer: Well, Calgary-Foothills is going to be the one that's quite a bit under now if I take MacEwan out.

Ms Nantais: Okay. We'll see what we can come up with.

Dr. Archer: Thanks.

The Chair: Well, thank you, ma'am. We appreciate your presentation. Not sure we have an answer to it, but we'll certainly look at it.

Ms Nantais: Great. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you.
Yes, ma'am.

Maureen McLeod
Private Citizen

Mrs. McLeod: Hello. My name is Maureen McLeod. I'm currently in Calgary-McCall. If the other people's presentations were informal, mine is casual. I wasn't planning on saying anything today.

In looking at the maps for our area, which involve both Calgary-McCall and Calgary-Montrose, and listening to what Peter said earlier about, first, do no harm, you will automatically notice, I hope,

that my community, Saddle Ridge, is cut right in two. Half of it will be in Calgary-McCall, and half of it will be in Calgary-Montrose. Now, I looked per what Brian was saying about numbers, and it would be easy to move the other half of Saddle Ridge somewhere, one way or the other. Saddle Ridge is north of 80th. If you look on your map, you've cut Saddle Ridge right in two, right through that big circle, that is really a traffic circle around an area of shopping. Saddle Ridge actually goes right out north of 80th and then ends. It sort of disappears into empty space.

Mr. Dobbie: If I could just ask Karen to bring you a copy of the interim report so that we could have you turn to page 65 in the maps, it might help us to follow you.

Mrs. McLeod: Yeah. Well, it's right up there. I don't speak for anybody but myself, so this isn't any community association or anything.

What page did you say it was?

The Chair: Page 65.

Mrs. McLeod: Okay. If you look at Falconridge Boulevard, it goes straight north to 80th Avenue, and then it cuts off on 80th Avenue. On the map that I looked at on the Internet, Calgary-Montrose went further north. Has it been changed since I looked on the Internet?

Mr. Dobbie: It depends what site you were looking at. Were you looking at the electoral boundaries site?

Mrs. McLeod: The new one, yeah.

Mr. Dobbie: It should be consistent with this map. We have not made any changes since the interim report.

Mrs. McLeod: Okay. In that case it looks okay, but I'm sure I looked on the map before. Maybe I was looking at a different site. Is there more than one site on the Internet? Is it possible?

The Chair: There's only the one site that the commission is on.

Mr. Dobbie: But other people have made submissions and attached their own maps.

Mrs. McLeod: Okay. Maybe that was it, then, because this one looks better than the one that I looked at online. So there's no problem, perhaps. This one looks better.

The Chair: Well, that's a great achievement, then.

Mrs. McLeod: Yeah. We did it in five minutes.

Mr. Dobbie: We've accommodated your request.

Dr. Archer: Is Falconridge a sensible border, then?

Mrs. McLeod: Yeah. Taradale is the one that's south of 80th, and we're north of 80th. So Montrose goes south from 80th, right?

Dr. Archer: Yeah.

Mrs. McLeod: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you so much.

Is there anyone else that would like to make a presentation? Our next presenter is at 3:30 p.m.

There being no one, we'll adjourn, then, until 3:30. Thank you, all.

[The hearing adjourned from 2:27 p.m. to 3:16 p.m.]

Ms Friesacher: Our next presenters are Mr. David Hartwick and Mr. Mark Scholz with the Northern Hills Community Association.

The Chair: Gentlemen, since we are being recorded, would each of you identify yourselves for the record?

Mr. Hartwick: My name is David Hartwick. I'm a director for the Northern Hills Community Association.

Mr. Scholz: Mark Scholz, past president of the Northern Hills Community Association.

The Chair: All right.

David Hartwick and Mark Scholz
Northern Hills Community Association

Mr. Hartwick: Our association already submitted a written response to the interim report, but we thought it was important today to kind of present things to you with a little bit more of the numbers and give you the opportunity to ask us some questions. We've done quite a bit of research on this based on the time that we had.

It raised a lot of concern for us, the primary things being the misleading name of Calgary-Country Hills when the community of Country Hills isn't even going to be in it – we have enough confusion in our area already with names like that and people trying to figure out who their representatives are; it's just adding confusion – the apparent dissection of our community for no apparent reason that we can see; the lack of fair and effective representation for our communities, particularly when Calgary-Mackay currently exceeds the rest of Alberta, the term that you use, average by 50 per cent already and all indicators suggest that our area will continue to grow at a similar pace; to us the lack of fair and effective representation for all Calgarians based on the population numbers provided in the interim report. So we do have some concern.

We're not here to debate the success or failure of the previous commission, but we think there is some historical information that's important, and we want to share that with you. According to the 2006 census Calgary grew by 128,000 people in the five-year period there. The commission determined the average population per district was 35,951. At the time the population of Calgary-Mackay was already exceeding that at 37,803, with two of the fastest growing communities, Coventry Hills and Panorama Hills. Coventry grew 55 per cent between 2004 and 2008, Panorama by 108 per cent between 2004 and 2008. We have a great deal of concern that this is going to happen again. Calgary-Mackay right now is at 61,669 people, based on last year's census, already 71.7 per cent above the average and well above the 25 per cent variance, clearly suggesting we're lacking effective representation. I'll go into that a little later.

Naturally, the commission couldn't predict the extreme growth that Calgary saw, particularly in 2005 and 2006, but a reasonable growth of 2,500 per year actually shows in the census going back the previous five years, so it should be an expected reasonable growth for those communities.

The Chair: Could I just interrupt you to ask: are you using the numbers that were used by this commission in its interim report, where the average quotient is 40,880?

Mr. Hartwick: I was just about to get to that. That's my next statement. All of these numbers came right out of your report and the 2002-2003 commission report on your website. I've pulled all this data right off your own information.

The Chair: I have Calgary-Mackay at 12 per cent over the quotient.

Mr. Hartwick: That's for your commission. I'm speaking of what 2002-2003 did. I'll be going into your report momentarily here.

This is where we're at now based on what the average is out of – I used the number in the interim report of where you said currently we're at. Right now we're currently sitting 50 per cent above that number already in Calgary-Mackay, based on today's numbers, not on the interim report, your recommendations, but where we actually are today as a result of the 2002-2003 commission. Already, the way Calgary-Mackay sits today, we're very underrepresented, and we don't want to see that happen again. We foresee that's going to happen within one year of now based on the 12 and a half per cent. Okay?

The interim report has the average for this time at 40,880 people, which puts us at 12.15 per cent. Our concern is that there are the growing communities of Evanston and Panorama Hills, which historically for the last few years have shown a growth of 3,000 people per year. Sage Meadows, a new community that'll fall into Calgary-Mackay, has also just started development. As such, we believe that Calgary-Mackay will exceed the 25 per cent average population by the time we reach next year's census. We're pretty sure it's going to be pretty close as soon as this year's census comes out, so Calgary-Mackay will already be underrepresented by the time your final report comes out, based on our estimation of historic growth in this area. Having driven up in those areas, they're booming. They're selling houses. In fact, two builders don't even have any lots right now in Panorama. They're waiting for more. So the growth is there.

One of the biggest concerns is that when I used your numbers in the report – and it was alluded to throughout the report a couple of times – the population based on 40,880 showed Calgary should have 26 districts. The rest of Alberta should have had 41.8. All the others lined up: Edmonton matched, St. Albert matched, Airdrie matched, Red Deer, Lethbridge, Grande Prairie. In every other city I looked at, the number of districts and representatives they had lined up with the population based on that 40,880. The rest of Alberta, instead of having 41.8, rounded up to 42; they have 43. Calgary, instead of having 26, has 25. Again, this becomes important because Calgary as a whole is underrepresented going forward, and where that matters is in spending. I'll cover that in just a second.

It's important that you understand how it has affected us for eight years. With the difference in population, us having 61,669 people here, that's 50 per cent more than what the average is right now. It's hard for us to have the same representation as somebody else when we don't have the same number of representatives in the Legislature.

The big thing is spending, as I said. Based on your recommendations, I believe north Calgary is going to be penalized again. I took all the communities that lie north of the Bow River and 17th Ave, basically drawing a line across the city of Calgary. When I took all of those districts and added them up, every single district north of the Bow River exceeded that average number of 40,880. In fact, when you added the communities together, it was a total of 38,963 people, another entire district. That alone shows where Calgary is

short a district here because already you have 39,000 people that aren't going to be fairly represented compared to other parts of Alberta, in fact, compared to all the other cities in Alberta and, in particular, the rural areas.

3:25

This is of great concern to us. Our area has seen some significant downfalls in provincial spending in the last eight years. The LRT, which was originally on our list and we had the LRT parking lot built with our community: we're now number four. The west leg got approved even though it was considerably more expensive, more controversial. The southeast leg is now forecast to come ahead of ours, and then a new downtown tunnel is forecast to come ahead of ours. All of this is funded by provincial money.

We had an Alberta health care diagnosis and treatment centre planned for our community. It's been planned there as long as I've lived there, which is 10 years. It was in the 2005 budget. It has now been taken out, doesn't exist anymore. There is no budgeting for it anymore. Why? We don't have a representative to carry the population.

The Stoney Trail interchange at Harvest Hills Boulevard. There's a community down the way called Sherwood, 1,200 residents. They have an interchange that's built there off Stoney Trail. Our community of 46,000 people that borders onto Stoney Trail and Harvest Hills Boulevard did not get an interchange. They're finally building it now. A further insult to us: 96 Avenue N.E., which doesn't exist yet, still had an interchange built for it, again, because they had appropriate representation.

In our area we have two ice rinks serving 61,669 people. Not only that, but there's another 16,710 in the communities of Hidden Valley, Kincora, and Sherwood that have to share that ice rink as well. Again, provincial funding goes towards ice rinks, and the city has a standard of one per 18,500, so at two rinks you can see we're quite short on capacity. We have kids going as far as Carstairs and Beiseker to play community hockey because there just isn't anything for us. The city of Airdrie, in comparison, with 38,900 people has three indoor arenas. We're drastically short.

Schools are another big issue. For the 46,000 residents we have, we don't have very many schools. We had a proposed high school that was in the CBE's plan going forward. It got cancelled, and it got moved to the northwest. Again, we have to believe the lack of representation weighed on us losing a high school. The argument they gave was it was going to serve 70,000 people in the northwest. We already had 70,000 people living, not forecast, that that school would have serviced.

Airdrie alone has way more schools than we do: five elementary schools compared to our four, three middle schools compared to the one that's proposed for us, and three high schools compared to the one separate school that we have in our community now. Again, this is provincial spending. We're not seeing any of it. We believe the reason is because we don't have proper representation, and the interim report recommendations are going to keep us not having proper representation.

You also asked on your website that when we did our presentation today, we talk about the boundaries and slicing things up and communities of interest. The biggest thing that we've found – and we've included a map for you – is that we have all that, and it was ignored in the recommendations. We have Nose Creek, that runs on the east of us right down to the south of our community. We have West Nose Creek, that joins from that and covers the west side of our community. It basically forms a V shape surrounding our entire community of Northern Hills. That includes Coventry Hills; that

includes Country Hills. It's all encompassed into one area. We also have the road boundaries that have been created: Deerfoot Trail, Stoney Trail, and Beddington Trail. Again, all those communities are encompassed within that triangle.

The biggest thing that we really found was that Coventry Hills socially is very different from the communities that we were grouped with as part of Calgary-Country Hills. Coventry Hills has very different social and economic needs from Thorncliffe and Huntington Hills. We have different spending needs, and we have different programming needs because we're in a different phase of life. Those are older communities, generally 50, 60 years old. Our community is around 10 to 20 years old, depending on which part of the Northern Hills you're looking at, so we have very different needs. As I've demonstrated, we're very much lacking on spending on infrastructure that we need. Those communities have that infrastructure. They're actually looking at closing schools, when we need schools.

Finally, I just want to cover the solutions. We believe Calgary needs to have 26 districts. It's demonstrated in the numbers that you've provided within the report. It's demonstrated in the numbers for north Calgary and the districts that the commission has recommended. We also believe that by changing to the districts we've designed, it better serves all the people of Calgary. It better serves the objective for common interests, needs, and boundaries. Our communities – whether in Coventry Hills, Panorama Hills, or Country Hills – play together. We have the same community sports leagues. We have the same recreation centre. We shop at the same stores. We use the same roads. Everything about us is common interest. We don't have anything in common with those other communities.

The final thing is that on the last page we've provided a map that shows our proposal. That map is also in our written submission, which gives a lot more detail on what I've said today. We believe that that map will allow for considerable growth, particularly in the growing areas out in Evanston, Sage Hill, Sage Meadows, Kincora, and anything else that happens to grow out there in the next eight years. We've actually created a district that protects for that.

Thank you very much for your time.

The Chair: Do you wish to add to that?

Mr. Scholz: I have nothing more to add. We'd be delighted to answer any questions that you have.

Dr. Archer: Well, thanks, gentlemen. That was a very detailed presentation and set of recommendations. You know, it's pretty clear that the core idea on which the argument hinges is whether there are 26 ridings in Calgary or 25 ridings in Calgary, and I think you've put forward the argument for 26 constituencies.

I guess I'd like to get your feedback on the way I interpret where the commission is on that issue. We tried to be as up front as we could in the interim report on sort of the large options that were under review, and we put out three options. The majority of the commission went with option 1, and that provided us with an opportunity and provided Albertans with an opportunity to reflect on those three options and provide some input to us. I was expecting, coming into this stage of the process, that we likely would hear a fair bit about that issue, and surprisingly we have heard not all that much about that issue. The absence of feedback on that trade-off that electoral boundaries commissions inevitably are asked to consider between population equality and effective representation defined by criteria other than population equality, not excluding it but defined by that in addition to other criteria, would lead me to think that

Albertans are saying that we may have gotten it right by recommending 25 constituencies for Calgary, which is not to say that if one just did the math and divided the population of the city by the electoral quotient, you would get 26.

Again, we put that out to Albertans, and we just haven't gotten that much feedback, Dave. I wonder if you could tell me how you would suggest that the commission interpret both the fact that we put it out and the fact that we didn't get much response back to that.

Mr. Hartwick: To be honest, I believe a lot of it has to do with a really poor, lack of media coverage. I did a search back through the *Calgary Herald* from when the commission report was released. There hasn't been a whole lot on it. There were stories about: maybe this will happen; maybe that will happen. There were stories that it was out, but nobody really jumped on the fact that Calgary should have had 26, and they only got 25. There hasn't been any media coverage, and that's reflected in this room today. I listen to the news stations in town, and they're not even talking about you being here. Nobody knows. The bottom line is that nobody knows, so nobody is speaking up.

I mean, we didn't even find out about this until another constituency association other than our own called us three days before the deadline. There just hasn't been the media coverage of it, and this was a pretty serious issue for us to not know about. I read the paper every day. I listen to the news stations every day. It hasn't been promoted. It hasn't been discussed in our media, unfortunately. I really honestly don't believe anybody realizes the situation other than the city of Calgary, who I believe put in a submission saying the same thing.

3:35

Dr. Archer: Again, I think the commission had a fairly vigorous advertising strategy to ensure that Albertans were aware that the process was under way. Our website has been up and running from the start.

While the question of attentiveness may be an issue, I would suggest that one of the other ways to interpret the nonresponse is that people have looked at the information and decided that with 25 seats in the city of Calgary the kinds of issues that you outlined need to be addressed by a community – its transportation system, its arenas, its schools – can be articulated by the group of 25 MLAs that will be going to the provincial Legislature from Calgary. That's an alternative interpretation I guess I would offer for the situation.

Mr. Hartwick: I think there are two ways to look at it. One would be that I could hand this to the media tomorrow, and we'll see what kind of reaction there is. I suspect you'll get a reaction then because I think a lot of people would be really surprised by these numbers. I think they'd be really surprised. If they saw that there was an entire district here of people just north of the Bow River that weren't being represented, I think you'd hear from Calgarians pretty fast.

I guess the other side of it is that even if we only had 25 districts, the districts that we've proposed out of Calgary – Nose Hill, Foothills, Mackay, and whatever ours is called – we believe still better serve the community and Calgarians, whether there's 25 or 26. We believe it still better serves growth and the people that live in those areas.

Dr. Archer: I'd like to take up that question if I could. Again, I just want to put on the table the larger context for your comments. If it would help to generate more attention to our report by providing your comments to the media, that would be very much welcomed as well. Again, we're in a very public process, encouraging input from people across the province.

Mr. Hartwick: And we know that. You guys have done a good job. Really, to me, it was that the media hasn't really done anything with this. I found that your website told me everything I needed to know once we were aware the report was out, and we had an opportunity to respond. Your information has been good. It's really the lack of media representing what's going on.

The Chair: Could I just help you there a little bit? We've received over 470 submissions across Alberta, more than any other commission has ever received. We've advertised in 99 weekly newspapers. We've advertised in nine daily newspapers. We have the blogs. You mention the newspapers in Calgary. The *Calgary Herald* was here this morning listening. Interviews: we've had TV; we've had radio. It's pretty hard to say that the media hasn't picked up on this because they have.

Listening to some of the issues of schools being cancelled in yours and moved to others and roadways and you not having effective representation: a lot of those are municipal matters. Besides having provincial funding, they're municipal matters.

Mr. Scholz: If I could just say something, with all due respect, Dr. Archer and Judge Walter, we're not here to debate the issue of the media or the communications strategy. I don't think that's the purpose of us being here.

The Chair: That's certainly the point you were making, and if it wasn't, then you'd better get on point. All right?

Mr. Scholz: If I could, I think that the larger issue we wanted to bring up, regardless of the fact of what kind of publicity was made about it, is the underlying issue of the underrepresentation of Calgary. We feel it should be 26.

The second issue is that the current boundaries don't represent the realities of our community to the degree that we would like. Certainly, as former president of the Northern Hills Community Association, we represent the communities of Coventry Hills, Panorama Hills, Harvest Hills, and Country Hills. Certainly, the areas up in the north that we represent as a community association have very common interests and common goals, I think, as a whole.

Currently what we see here in the new proposals is one of our communities being removed, which is a younger community of Calgary, you know, very different demographics, particularly when you look at some of the more mature neighbourhoods that the proposal is trying to incorporate: Country Hills or, I guess, Coventry Hills as we will call it. Whoever represents that area I feel would be challenged, I think, because of the difference of demographics and the fact that as a whole I think if you included the four areas that we're asking for, we would anticipate a greater level of understanding and representation in Edmonton.

I think that's what we're trying to get across here, that we'd like to maintain the unity of our community, and we'd like to see that both municipally, on a ward level, as well as on a provincial level with the electoral boundaries as well.

Dr. Archer: I guess just two comments. One is a question. You made the point about the name of this constituency, Calgary-Country Hills, that we probably got that wrong, and even if the constituency were to stay in its current configuration, that's not the right name in all likelihood. I take it that your group is favouring Northern Hills. I see, you know, that you have an association of communities that go by that name, so I take that as a suggestion that the area in this part of Calgary should have a constituency with the name Northern Hills.

The other, I guess, is a request more than a question at this stage, and that is that you've made a pretty compelling point that there's a group of communities up here who have an identity, who have a lot of commonalities and that with our interim report some of those communities were broken up, and we picked up other communities and put them with part of your broader community. I think one of the reasons for that, quite frankly, is that we started looking at the maps in Calgary. We started in the northwest and began to move eastward. Part of the challenge for us is making the population numbers fit when you're dealing with fairly large units. You know, you have communities that have 11,000 and 12,000 people, and you're trying not to divide the communities into two constituencies, and every time you make a change, you're moving 11,000 and 12,000 people in and out. Those are very large changes for constituencies of 40,000.

My request, then, is that if we were to assume that Calgary has 25 ridings and that it makes sense to keep these four communities together in a riding – I guess I would ask for any assistance that you could provide, obviously not today but in the days and maybe weeks that follow, as to how that configuration could look in northern Calgary that keeps your communities as a unified whole and enables us to deal with the need to ensure that populations remain sensitive in all of the Calgary ridings.

Mr. Hartwick: The written submission we gave you will have that information. I do have the numbers in front of me. To make us one group instead of the proposed Calgary-Mackay is a difference of 500 people. Based on the one we drafted up over what was in the interim report, it's 500 people.

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

The Chair: Now, when you say your first report, this is in?

Mr. Hartwick: We sent it in back two weeks ago.

The Chair: And there is no change in this one?

Mr. Hartwick: No. There are no changes. It's supplementary information. Some of the charts, the maps are the same. It's basically the presentation we gave you today with some supplementary information. That map is the map that we submitted with ours.

3:45

The Chair: This is the same as this over here?

Mr. Hartwick: Yes.

The Chair: Okay. So we could work from that to look at refiguring it and that sort of thing.

Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Chairman, and thanks very much, gentlemen. You've obviously put a lot of time and effort into this, and you're representing your communities. We admire you for doing that, and we thank you for your presentation. Please don't take any comments that we're making negatively.

We're trying to do our best to ensure that we do have effective representation for each and every part of Alberta. As Keith Archer has said, we looked at the entire province, and we travelled the entire province. The balance that the majority of the panel, of the commission, felt was the best was 25 seats for Calgary. I live in Calgary, and, you know, I had to grapple with that. Keith Archer works in

Calgary. So believe me, we as a commission don't feel that Calgary was underrepresented in terms of recognition of the realities of the growth in Calgary.

That said, I'm looking at your initial presentation, and I'm looking at the proposed changes with the population changes. It looks like Calgary-Mackay with what you were suggesting could be 18.58 per cent under quotient. Is that correct?

Mr. Hartwick: That's correct, but that will change as soon as the census comes out a month from now because that is a rapidly growing area right now.

Mr. Evans: Well, our numbers, though, are from the end of August or the first part of September. They're the numbers that the city provided to Municipal Affairs because it is important in terms of per capita funding. So, I mean, I'd be really surprised if there was a vast difference, Mr. Hartwick, in terms of those numbers in that short a period of time, given that Calgary has slowed down in the interim period.

Mr. Hartwick: These areas have not. When I created these, I actually based that information on real historical numbers. A conservative number of 2,500 people a year moving into these communities will actually push that up significantly as of this year's census. There are two brand new communities that are being developed out there, and I can tell you they're not keeping up.

Mr. Evans: Okay. That would apply to Northern Hills as well, about the same amount or percentage, or does Northern Hills not have as many brand new developments?

Mr. Hartwick: Panorama Hills was sitting at that type of rate. It's nearing completion now. They're down to three phases left, so there is not a lot of growth left. When we originally found out about the commission, we thought we were going to have to break up our community, and how would we do that? When we actually looked at the development out there, Panorama is getting very close to completion. We believe that with that completion we're going to be much more in line with the average and probably better represented for the next eight years because there isn't anywhere else for us to go.

Mr. Evans: Okay. Just looking at the populations that we have identified on page 16, you can see that there is quite a variance in the whole west and north parts of Calgary. You have, for example, Calgary-Mackay at 12.15 per cent over. We've tried to deal with Calgary-North West, 9.95 per cent over. Then we've tried to deal with some of the surrounding communities and kind of balance that off, recognizing, for example, that Calgary-McCall is a very fast-growing area as well. We've basically put that right at quotient. Calgary-Foothills, again, right at quotient.

As Keith Archer was saying, I know this is going to be difficult for you to intellectualize, but if you could try to sit down with the rest of your community association and create the model based on 25 constituencies and identify where that highest growth is and keep at quotient or below quotient in those very, very fast-growing areas and try to present something to us that as a second choice would at least be palatable if we stay at the 25 seats for Calgary, recognizing we're hearing you loud and clear that you feel that that creates underrepresentation for Calgary. If you could do that at 25 seats, it would be very, very helpful to this commission in addressing the needs of your community. Please give that your best efforts.

Thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Hartwick: Thank you. We can certainly look at that because what we did give you was based on 25 districts, and we believe it allowed for growth. I didn't look at the growth in other districts currently like our own, but to see that we were almost 72 per cent above the average that was recommended by the last commission was pretty serious to us. There could be other communities that are facing the same thing, so we tried to find a way of balancing that out so that nobody else had to see the type of growth that we saw. SkyView Ranch out in Calgary-McCall is a perfect example. I can't believe how fast it's going up. Right now it's only 117 people out based on the interim report, so it has allowed for growth whereas I don't believe Calgary-Mackay as it exists in the interim report has allowed for any growth. It's already at 12.15 per cent. It doesn't have the room.

The Chair: If I could just ask one other thing of you, we do have timelines that we're faced with. Do you think you could get this in to us in a couple of weeks?

Mr. Hartwick: I think so. We've done all of this in the last 14 days. I suspect we could probably do that fairly quickly. I've done, I think, six or seven of the districts in the north already.

The Chair: Okay. If you could get that in to us in the next two weeks, it would assist us in relooking at this. All right?

Mr. Hartwick: I would have done all of that originally, but getting some of that population data is pretty hard.

The Chair: Okay. Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you, gentlemen, and thank you, Mr. Chair. Just following up a little bit on the numbers that you are putting forward with respect to Calgary-Mackay and with the growth, are those numbers that are projected by the city of Calgary? I know the city of Calgary typically does an annual census, and they're pretty good at forecasting where the growth has been in neighbourhoods. I say that, recognizing that if you're using historical numbers, there has been a slowdown, certainly, in Calgary as a whole. In fact, Edmonton actually outgrew Calgary last year. Maybe Calgary-Mackay is an anomaly, but is there any information available?

When you talk about going census to census, your point about where the riding sits currently is well taken. I think that was an issue with the use of the national census data, which simply wasn't keeping pace with growth in a lot of communities in Alberta. We have been using civic census, so our population data is based on the official population list put out by Municipal Affairs, and I think that has the 2009 census data from the city. Is the city forecasting that Calgary-Mackay is going to grow that fast when you talk about actually having it over 25 per cent within a year of this report coming out?

Mr. Hartwick: On the city of Calgary website they have community profiles. I pulled up the community profiles and looked at how much growth they've had year from year, and 2007-2008 was actually one of the busiest years. They haven't got the comparison for 2009 yet. Using that information, I just took that information at face value, and I actually used the lowest number out of the five years that they had covered there.

Ms Jeffs: You're saying this was for the communities in Calgary-Mackay?

Mr. Hartwick: This was for all the communities that I've talked about here.

Ms Jeffs: For all of the communities.

Mr. Hartwick: I used that information.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. But it seems that there was a slowdown between 2008-2009, certainly, in the city as a whole. I'm just wondering if that's getting factored into here.

Mr. Hartwick: Well, the numbers I used for Evanston and Panorama and Kincora were actually the differences between the 2008 census and the 2009 census. Those numbers may have been low because they reflected the actual growth between 2008 and 2009.

3:55

Ms Jeffs: Does the city information that you're using provide sort of a look ahead? It's been a long time since I lived in Calgary. Sometimes their planning department used to put out those sort of forecasts for communities because they used it for their own planning purposes.

Mr. Hartwick: The one I was on didn't. It was actually a full profile of each community, so it talked about socioeconomics, single parents, and population growth. It was all the different factors that applied to each community.

Ms Jeffs: All right. Just very briefly returning to the issue of the 26 seats. As you're aware, that kind of configuration, with the limits that we have in the statute, would mean having no net increase in seats in the rest of Alberta. Had you thought about where a seat would be amalgamated? We have added one in the Fort McMurray area; under the law I don't think we could avoid doing that. So had you given any thought to the ridings you would amalgamate to provide that seat to Calgary?

Mr. Hartwick: No. Unfortunately, we actually saw the report three days before the deadline, so this was a very rapid submission for us. We didn't look too far into where we could amalgamate. It was more a case of comparing us to the others, so looking at the other cities and what they had: looking at Grande Prairie and seeing how their representation lined up, at Airdrie and how their representation lined up. We didn't look at what the other options were. We really focused on Calgary and particularly the north because we could demonstrate the lack of infrastructure that's been built, and we believe that has a lot to do with the lack of representation.

Ms Jeffs: Just finally – I apologize; I'm a bit confused – the communities that you're talking about: Country Hills, Harvest Hills, Panorama Hills, and Coventry Hills . . .

Mr. Hartwick: And Country Hills Village.

Ms Jeffs: And Country Hills Village. Under the proposal that is in the interim report, which of those communities are in which riding? Can you tell me just briefly?

Mr. Hartwick: Coventry Hills is proposed to be moved into Calgary-Country Hills, and the remainder of our communities – Panorama Hills, Harvest Hills, Country Hills Village, and Country Hills – would stay in Calgary-Mackay.

Ms Jeffs: So it's Coventry Hills . . .

Mr. Hartwick: Coventry Hills is the one that would be removed. It actually makes things really awkward for people because Harvest Hills sits in between Coventry Hills and Thorncliffe-Huntington. So you'd have a community that's part of Calgary-Mackay sitting right in the middle of the north part of Calgary-Country Hills and the south part of Calgary-Country Hills.

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

The Chair: Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, gentlemen, I appreciate the work. Knowing how quickly you put it together, I'm even more impressed. Backing up to the larger question of the allocation of seats, we faced a number of challenges, not the least of which was a strong representation by both the city of Edmonton and the city of Calgary that they would not in any way support ridings that extended beyond the city boundaries. We've accepted that type of representation. In my review of these submissions we did not receive any submissions from the city of Calgary with respect to the number of seats after the interim report.

In reading your initial paper, one of the arguments you appear to make is that effective representation and equal representation are sets that pretty much overlap, that they mean the same thing to you.

Mr. Hartwick: To a degree. Actually, when I first looked at the report, equal representation was my thought. Then when I read the additional information from Allyson Jeffs and the term "effective representation," I actually liked that term a lot better. When we're talking about misrepresentation or underrepresentation, to me that really comes down to effective representation. Equal is an easy way to line that up and say: yes, we want to be treated equal. I think we all want to be treated equal – we all remember that from our history lessons in school – but the bottom line is effective representation.

Where we sit right now, with almost 62,000 people, we don't have that. We really strongly feel that we don't have that, and that's such a huge issue to us. When we look at the infrastructure spending we haven't had, effective representation is far more important than being equal. We actually in our proposal have suggested to you being very high on that list. Rather than saying that we want to be at 40,880, we said we'll be at 46,000 just so we can be together because we have that many common interests and that many concerns together. We were willing to go right up to the edge of what your limit was to protect our area and our needs, to ensure that we stay with the other communities that are common with us.

Mr. Dobbie: One of the other issues that we have grappled with is weighting competing criteria, so keeping communities together, for

example, versus having adjacent electoral divisions having differing numbers. In your view is it better for the communities to remain undivided so that a community of 6,000 or 11,000 people, as Dr. Archer has alluded to, stays within one constituency? Or can you support dividing certain of the communities? Sometimes that appears to be a way to get the numbers to work but at the cost of dividing what appears to be a community. That is something that at some point we may have to trade off if we accept your suggestions because if it's not within your proposed constituencies, it's going to be somewhere to make the numbers not get too far out of line. So is it a nonstarter for you to consider dividing what are called neighbourhoods in Calgary?

Mr. Scholz: Well, maybe I'll just speak to that. I think initially what drove us to these hearing was the fact that our community was divided. We've faced these battles on a municipal level as well when they reviewed the electoral boundaries and we had a piece of our community removed. Maybe I'll let David comment on some of the issues from a resident's perspective that he has heard.

Certainly, as the Northern Hills Community Association we had made it very clear that at the municipal level we were concerned that we were losing members of our community. So this, again, is going on the provincial side here. Whereas, you know, I think on the municipal side it was about 3,000 people, this is quite a significant addition in terms of removing not just half of Country Hills but an entire district of our community, Coventry Hills.

So to answer your question and to stop rambling here, I think one of the major issues we're here for today is to maintain the unity of our community first. I think that is communicated quite strongly within our proposal.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you.

The Chair: All right. Thank you both very much. It's been very informative. We need that information. If you can do it in two weeks, it would be much appreciated.

Mr. Hartwick: We'll work on that.

The Chair: Good. Thank you both very much.

Mr. Hartwick: Thank you very much for your time.

The Chair: Now, is there anyone else here who wishes to appear or say anything?

There being none, and we don't have anyone further scheduled until this evening, we will then adjourn.

[The hearing adjourned at 4:04 p.m.]

