



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission
Public Hearings

Calgary

Thursday, July 20, 2017
9 a.m.

Transcript No. 28

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission

Justice Myra Bielby, Chair

Gwen Day
Laurie Livingstone
W. Bruce McLeod
D. Jean Munn

Support Staff

Robert H. Reynolds, QC
Shannon Dean
Aaron Roth
Shannon Parke
Tracey Sales
Janet Schwegel

Clerk
Law Clerk and Director of House Services
Administrator
Communications Officer
Communications Consultant
Managing Editor of *Alberta Hansard*

Electoral Boundaries Commission Public Hearings – Calgary

Public Participants

Wayne Anderson, MLA, Highwood

Michael Connolly, MLA, Calgary-Hawkwood

Deborah Drever, MLA, Calgary-Bow

Gordon Elliott

Mashood Qazi, Vice-president, Calgary-Bow NDP Electoral District Association

Paisley Sim, Constituency Assistant, Calgary-Buffalo

Pat Stier, MLA, Livingstone-Macleod

Kelly Sundberg, Professor, Mount Royal University

Cam Westhead, MLA, Banff-Cochrane

9 a.m.

Thursday, July 20, 2017

[Justice Bielby in the chair]

The Chair: Good morning, everyone. Please have a seat, and we'll get going. Thanks very much for coming out today to assist us in the work of the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

I'll start off by introducing the commission. I'm Justice Myra Bielby of the Alberta Court of Appeal, resident in Edmonton, but at the moment I'm also chairing the Electoral Boundaries Commission. To my left is Laurie Livingstone from Calgary; to her left, Jean Munn from Calgary; to my right, Bruce McLeod, who is the mayor of Acme; and to his right, Gwen Day, who resides in Carstairs. Together we're the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

As many of you, I'm sure, know, the purpose of the commission is to review the constituency boundaries in the province of Alberta to determine whether recommendations should be made to the Legislature to change any of them prior to the next provincial election. This is a process that's undertaken every eight to 10 years. It was last done in 2009-2010. It's governed by the requirements of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, which is a piece of legislation passed by the Legislature most recently in 1990, but there's been some version of it since Alberta was created in 1905.

This has been a particularly interesting time to work on this project because we're dealing with the period where the largest number of people have moved into Alberta in history. We had the most rapid rate of growth over the last eight years than any other place in Canada, even taking into account the people who moved away due to the downturn in oil and gas. Over the last eight years we have gained 600,000-plus people. That's over 14 per cent population growth. The next-highest group or body to obtain that type of growth is the city of Vancouver at 6.9 per cent, so we have grown much faster even than Vancouver.

Of course, the people, largely from eastern Canada, who moved to Alberta did not move equally into each of our 87 constituencies. They moved disproportionately into some of them – no big surprise – Calgary, Red Deer, Edmonton, Grande Prairie, and Fort McMurray particularly. That means the growth rate in those communities has been much higher than 14 per cent and the growth rate, correspondingly, in other areas of the province much lower than 14 per cent. Virtually every constituency saw some growth. It's not that we've got a declining population anywhere; it's really just a comparison of rates of growth.

Whereas in 2010 almost all of the constituencies were within 10 per cent of the average number for population in the province – and that's the basis on which the constituencies were formed for the last election – at the moment there are significant discrepancies. For example, if we had an election today, a vote cast in Jasper, Alberta, would have three and a half times the effect of a vote cast in Calgary-South East. The growth has been so exponential in Calgary in particular.

The legislation requires us to adjust constituencies within certain maximum parameters, but we also have some discretion in doing this. We toured the province in January and February and met with a number of people in each of 14 locations, got their feedback on what they thought we should do, and prepared this – I'm just going to borrow your copy, Mr. McLeod – report, interim recommendations. It contained 87 interim recommendations, a recommendation for each constituency. I mean, some recommendations are: don't make any changes. It's not that we're suggesting that all need to be changed, but there are 87 recommendations in there.

Following the design of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, we published this. We tabled it with the Speaker of the

Legislature on May 24, and the legislation requires us to table a final version of those recommendations no later than October 23 this year. Then our work will be done, and the ball will be in the Legislature's court to enact legislation to implement those recommendations or otherwise as it sees fit.

The act requires us to have a second set of public hearings to gather feedback on our specific recommendations, and that's what we're doing right now. In addition to the information we have received and will receive from Grande Prairie, Edmonton, Calgary, Vermilion, Brooks, and Red Deer, which is where we're having this round of hearings, we've received over 500 written submissions via our website and through e-mail and the regular mail. We'll consider all of those comments and suggestions in our deliberations as to whether we should make any changes to our interim recommendations.

We've received, I have to say, some great suggestions as we've moved along, not just holistically on the philosophy of redistricting. Particularly helpful, I find, are specific recommendations about specific boundaries and even boundaries that were the same way as last time. People say: well, you know, it would be great if you could bump this out 20 kilometres in this direction or whatever because of access or what have you. We've received some terrific input as we've travelled around the province, and of course we're trusting that we're going to receive similar input here.

I want to go through the rules that are established under the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act for doing our work, for exercising our discretion in making recommendations, and how those rules have been interpreted by the Supreme Court of Canada and our own Court of Appeal long before I was a member of that Court of Appeal. That's the law that governs our work. We're required to comply with the law, and these are the rules.

The first step is to take the population of Alberta as produced by the 2016 federal census. That information was released on February 8, 2017. It shows that Alberta has a population of 4,062,609 people. We divide it by 87, and that creates an average population of 46,697 for each constituency. This is not relevant to the extent that it suggests that we should aim for this number for each constituency size; far from it. No constituency recommendations we have made yield this number, but it's the starting point in each of our 87 journeys on analyzing the current boundaries of constituencies.

We look at this number, and we compare it, for example, to Airdrie's current population, also as produced by Statistics Canada. Airdrie is now at 64,609, 38 per cent above the provincial average. According to the rules in the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act that has got too large a population. It has to be changed. The maximum deviance from this figure, 46,697, is 25 per cent. No matter what our discretion is, we can't go any higher than that, so Airdrie has to change in some way. There are other constituencies in the province that are above or below this 25 per cent figure where change has to occur, where there is no discretion.

But there are other areas where we recommend changes based on discretionary factors, and those are common community interests and organizations. This has probably been our most significant of the criteria in our actual work. We have attempted to look at each constituency if we are considering moving a boundary, to try to do so to avoid cutting up a common community of interest. That doesn't necessarily mean a town, village, or city although I'm happy to say that we avoided cutting up any of those. Also, we're trying to keep together, where possible, people who earn their living in the same way, where the nature of the economy is the same in that area of the province, people of the same ethnicity. Indigenous groups particularly we're instructed to try to keep together. That's been one of our primary considerations in doing our work.

The next specifically mentioned in the legislation is to try to avoid dividing up neighbourhood and community boundaries in Edmonton and in Calgary expressly. Calgary, like Edmonton, has a map of all of its different neighbourhoods, and – thank you, Bruce – it looks like this. This is what we’ve been given. Our goal in doing our work was to try to avoid cutting up any of those. Now, that’s not been completely possible. Calgary has amazingly dense areas. There are many areas of your fine city that have many more than 46,697 people in them, so it’s been impossible to honour that completely, but that is one of our efforts that we kept in mind as we were going through Calgary and Edmonton.

9:10

We’re to try to avoid crossing municipal boundaries if we can possibly avoid it. We can do it if necessary, and we have done it in those cities which have too great a population for one constituency but not enough for two. Examples of that are Grande Prairie, Fort McMurray, and Medicine Hat, where they’re each well above 47,000 people but well below 96,000 people. There are different models for how you can approach that, but except in those special circumstances I’m pleased to say that we were able to avoid crossing any boundary of any town, city, or village.

Now, that means that we haven’t recommended any blended constituencies for Edmonton or Calgary, so no constituency that would contain part of the city of Calgary and part of an area outside of the city of Calgary. That’s one of the options that is available, but during the first round of negotiations we received letters from the mayors of both cities saying: please don’t do this if you can possibly avoid it. And at our first round of hearings every speaker on the issue said: please don’t do that if you can avoid it because it poses extra problems for the MLA in effectively representing the people in the riding. That, of course, is the overall goal of this, not to help the MLA but to help the people in each riding to get the best representation they can from their MLA.

Our next criterion is natural boundaries. This is maybe a little less important because not every constituency has a major roadway or a river running through it, but where possible we’ve tried to use natural boundaries as one of the boundaries of a constituency, just to help people remember where their constituency is or to help people new to the area to know, perhaps, where the constituency is.

Additional factors we’ve considered. The act allows us to consider additional factors that aren’t specifically listed there but that may come to bear on effective representation over the years as things change. Because of the boom-boom growth rates here in Calgary particularly, we concluded that projected growth in the future was relevant to our task. There will be another eight to 10 years that pass before the next electoral boundaries review. It’s not a major consideration, but it is a consideration. That has led us, for example, in Calgary to try to leave a little extra room in the constituencies that border the city, where there are still neighbourhoods being developed, where single-family homes are being built, to allow a little bit of growth rate there. In the core of the city, where growth can only happen from infill housing or high-rise construction, we’re assuming that the growth rate won’t be as large as in the suburban areas, so we’ve perhaps gone a little bit over in the core areas of Calgary.

The other consideration that isn’t specifically listed in the act but that we’ve kept in mind is the need to communicate. Communication is important to effective representation, obviously, and we want to create communities where people can connect with one another easily and the MLA can connect with the constituencies and vice versa.

Those are our criteria that we’ve applied in proceeding through each of the 87 constituencies.

The final consideration is public input. That’s why we’re having this second round of public hearings. We’re looking for input from the public on what they think in relation to our specific recommendations. That input is not just on the big issues, the philosophy of how we’ve applied our criteria. As I say, we particularly welcome comments that tell us what adjustments to different boundaries, specifically at a local, granular level, would help, would make sense. We’ve received, particularly in Vermilion, some great ideas and suggestions on that.

Our goal, then, is to prepare and produce a final report with our finalized 87 recommendations. It has to be filed with the Legislature, actually, by October 23, the day before the fifth-month anniversary of the interim report. That then will, I expect, lead to the Legislature passing legislation to change the boundaries prior to the next election. That will very likely last for at least two elections – I suppose it could last for three, but likely it would only last for two – before there is another look at this.

Thank you very much for coming today to take part. I should let you know, before anybody comes to the mike, that *Hansard* is here. Every word we’re saying is being recorded, and audio and written transcripts of all of our proceedings are available on our website, usually within 48 hours of the hearing taking place. That’s abebc.ca. You can go there and read the proceedings or listen to the proceedings of any of our public hearings. Amazingly, some people have been doing this. That’s terrific. Just know that you’re being recorded as we proceed.

We’ll get going. Our first registered speaker is Cam Westhead. If you could start off, each speaker, for the record naming the constituency in which you reside.

Mr. Westhead: Well, thank you very much. My name is Cameron Westhead, and I’m the MLA for Banff-Cochrane. I live in Bragg Creek. I really want to thank the commission for the opportunity to present here today. Given the limited time I’m just going to jump right in.

To start off with, I largely agree with the recommendations of the commission. I’ve got one sort of somewhat significant amendment, one minor amendment, and a suggestion for consideration of the naming of the district. The significant amendment that I’d like to propose is to add Kananaskis Country and the southern portion of Banff national park back into the constituency, as it was previously. There are a number of reasons for this. I think it’s consistent with the commission saying that Bow Valley mountain communities should be kept together; for example, Kananaskis Village is a mountain community, and it’s got similar interests to others in the Bow Valley.

The Chair: I’m going to interrupt just because I don’t want to forget to ask this, and it’s important. What’s the population of the area you’re proposing to add back in?

Mr. Westhead: It’s 211 people.

The Chair: Okay. All right. Those are easier requests. Yes.

Mr. Westhead: I was getting there. Yes, exactly. It’s a small number of people, so there would be very little effect on the average population. It looks like a large geographic area on the map, but in terms of population density it’s extremely low.

In terms of Kananaskis Country itself it’s part of a larger economic region that shares a lot in common with the Bow Valley corridor, including Alberta residents and tourists alike. It’s part of a tourism corridor that includes Banff, Canmore, and that area. People often use the Trans-Canada highway and travel south along highway 40 to access Kananaskis Village, so it seems to make sense

in terms of community interest, which the commission indicated is an important consideration for it.

The provincial and national park management is based largely in Canmore and the town of Banff respectively . . .

The Chair: Just if you wouldn't mind – you've got the burden of being the first one, and I have to take this down or it'll be lost forever. I'm going to ask my fellow commissioners to slide over a bit so my computer isn't falling between these two tables. Okay. Go ahead. Thanks.

Mr. Westhead: Thank you. In terms of the management of the provincial parks within the Kananaskis region the management is based out of the provincial building, and that's located in Canmore. So it makes sense from kind of a reporting structure and ease of communication that Kananaskis be included in the Banff-Stoney proposed district. I think that because of the governance structure of Kananaskis and Banff – parts outside of the town of Banff are governed by the improvement district No. 9, so basically all of Banff national park except for the townsite is governed by that body. It makes sense also in terms of the southern portion of Banff national park, which was put into the proposed Highwood, in order to, you know, maintain an easier reporting structure in terms of the governance at the municipal level, to have improvement district No. 9 included in the Banff-Stoney area.

What I'm proposing is to use the boundary of Kananaskis as the southeastern extent of the new Banff-Stoney. I'd be happy to point it out on the map if that would be helpful to the commission. I don't have a map of it in front of me, but I'd be happy to point it out on the wall if that would be helpful.

The Chair: So you want to move the southern boundary of your constituency to the southern boundary of Kananaskis.

Mr. Westhead: Down to township 19 I believe it is. On the Highwood map you can see the southern portion right in the middle that goes straight along. That's township 19. And then there's a boundary for Kananaskis that goes north about halfway through that flat section at the bottom there.

The Chair: Unfortunately, you can see the map, and I can't, so I'm going to ask you to follow the noble tradition of the green marker, which we started yesterday in Edmonton. If you would take my copy of the report and mark your suggested change on – that's the Highwood map, but it would work either way.

9:20

Mr. Westhead: It goes something like this.

The Chair: So the eastern portion of that would be part of your constituency.

Mr. Westhead: No. It would be all of this. This would all be part.

The Chair: Oh, I see. Okay.

Mr. Westhead: Can I write "Banff-Stoney"?

The Chair: Yeah. Please.

Mr. Westhead: There are about 200 people living in that large geographic area.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Westhead: I've had the opportunity to speak to the municipalities of the town of Banff, the town of Canmore, the

municipal district of Bighorn, and the Kananaskis improvement district, which is the governance structure for the municipality of Kananaskis. They've all either have submitted or will submit written submissions that would support what I'm speaking about today. Also, I've had the opportunity to speak to MLAs Pat Stier and Wayne Anderson, who are here today, and they also agree with what I'm proposing here.

A minor amendment that I'd like to mention is that in the northeast section of the proposed Banff-Stoney there's a very small overlap with Mountain View county. I'd like to propose that that part of Mountain View county be removed from Banff-Stoney and put into whatever makes the most sense in terms of the geographic boundary for Mountain View county. The proposed Banff-Stoney already has about six municipalities in it, so to add Mountain View county for a small little overlap just seems to make it a bit too complicated both for the MLA and for the municipality.

The Chair: I'm going to make you stand up again and take you to page 150 of my report. If you'd just mark on exactly the part. I'm asking this particularly because we've heard from other people on this, actually on this specific point, and I don't want to be confused.

Mr. Westhead: I printed out a map that shows the overlap a little bit more clearly here, too. That's an approximate representation. That small area is part of Mountain View county.

The Chair: Just from your knowledge of the area where would you suggest it go into, which adjoining constituency? Either Olds-Didsbury or – that must be Rocky Mountain House.

Mr. Westhead: Yeah. I think either one. Rocky Mountain House seems to make the most sense because it had Sundre in it previously. I have this if you'd like to – this is kind of a more granular map of the counties.

The Chair: You bet. I'm going to ask Mr. McLeod to write the date and location, and this'll become part of the exhibit to your submission.

Mr. Westhead: Thank you.

The Chair: How many people live in that area? Do you know?

Mr. Westhead: I'm sorry. I don't know that number.

The Chair: Why do you think that change should be made?

Mr. Westhead: The proposed Banff-Stoney already incorporates about six different municipalities, so to add Mountain View county for such a very small portion of the county would make it difficult in terms of communication for the municipality to the MLA and vice versa. Also, in terms of travelling to that area, I believe you'd have to travel through about four other constituencies to represent folks in that area.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Westhead: On that change I've also had the opportunity to speak to MLAs Jason Nixon and Nathan Cooper. Those are the MLAs for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre and Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills, and they also support that change.

Finally, in terms of the naming of the district I would like the commission to consider naming equally recognizing the Tsuut'ina Nation. I agree that strong indigenous representation in the constituency is an excellent idea, but in terms of naming I would just like to see – you know, I don't know the iteration it might take,

if it would be Banff-Stoney-Tsuut'ina or something along those lines. I think that if there are two First Nations in the constituency, then both should have equal representation in the naming convention of the constituency.

The Chair: I'll just jump in again and say that under our recommendations for naming approaches we've got several things that we tried to honour. Looking at this, actually, we should have named this Banff-Tsuut'ina because it suggests the two communities furthest apart, rather than Banff-Stoney. If we were to follow along with our suggestion that we only use two names for simplicity for constituencies that have to be renamed, any problem with changing this to Banff-Tsuut'ina?

Mr. Westhead: I think to honour the representation of the indigenous nations and the First Nations, you know, naming conventions are symbolic of acknowledging those nations in the constituency, so I respect that the commission would like to have only two names as part of the constituency. In terms of accurately representing and honouring those nations that are in the constituency, I would respectfully suggest that the commission consider Banff-Stoney-Tsuut'ina as a name.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Westhead: That concludes my remarks. I'd just like to thank the commission for the work that they've done and the work that they will do. I want to thank everyone who's participating in the process. I think this is a very important process that people participate in, and I also would like to mention that it's been an honour to represent the people of Banff-Cochrane. You know, it's a very diverse community, and people there are very resilient. They've gone through a lot of natural disasters. I think it just speaks to what it means to be Albertan to roll up your sleeves and help your neighbours whether it's good times or bad times. We see those kinds of people in the Banff-Cochrane area.

That concludes my remarks, and I look forward to the commission's questions.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. McLeod, any questions?

Mr. McLeod: No. Thanks.

The Chair: Mrs. Day? Ms Livingstone? Ms Munn?

Thanks for a very clear presentation.

Mr. Westhead: Thank you.

The Chair: All right. The next registered speaker is Kelly Sundberg.

Dr. Sundberg: Good morning. I'm Kelly Sundberg. I'm a professor at Mount Royal University and also appointed at University of Calgary, a political scientist with a focus on political and social inquiry.

The Chair: You reside in what constituency?

Dr. Sundberg: I reside in Calgary-Northern Hills.

Just to start off, I actually wanted to echo the last speaker with the naming. I do understand the two names, but I think that was an excellent suggestion.

I know that we only have five minutes, so I'll be as brief as a professor can be, I suppose. From a more macro, provincial level one of the concerns or issues I had – I will actually preface this by

saying that some of my research has been around electoral boundaries, the folks in the United States, and I think that the commission and all of us in this room and the people of Alberta and Canada should be very proud that we don't have a system that would allow gerrymandering and that this process is something that truly ensures our democratic process and representations. It's a critical component of our system, and it's a real privilege to be able to speak. A total sideline, but I will continue on.

From a provincial level there are a number of constituencies where the proposals would be under the quotient, and I think that there are some problematic growth rates. When I was looking at the stats, the projected growth rates – and I do understand that there are some limitations on the resources and data sets that are available to the commission to more accurately project growth or decline. On a general term I do think that there are somewhat problematic aspects in the way that I would suggest that the projection or, I would more say, more guessing, on growth would be. I do understand that the commission was limited in the data sets. StatsCan has one, but there are many other ways and many other sets of data that are available that could assist in that, and I think that that would probably be more accurate if that were done. I mean, you have the population research laboratory at the University of Alberta, the Faculty of Sociology, that has amazing data sets. I'm not sure if they were actually . . .

9:30

The Chair: Have you brought those with you?

Dr. Sundberg: Oh, they're massive. It was established in 1968. It's a wonderful centre. It's just that the resources available there – it would be nice if the government perhaps accessed these types of resources that are available.

But that aside, the other aspect is that there's also decline and that when we have rural areas where decline, depending on socioeconomic conditions and how urbanization occurs in the province, will also have an impact – again, when we think about the importance of setting boundaries and think of elected representation, the importance of having very informed models that are based on more robust data sets, I think, is significant. That's actually just a comment that I wanted to say.

I wanted to speak of my own constituency. I wanted to speak of the Deerfoot. I live up in Calgary-Northern Hills, so I'm in the little island of bliss in the north there if you look at the one strange-looking riding that wraps around us. I am in full agreement that there needs to be changes to the boundaries in the area, but I think that the importance of Deerfoot Trail, highway 2, that cuts the city in two – there is significant difference in the social and economic makeup that exists on both sides of the Deerfoot. The Deerfoot itself acts as a boundary of access to people on both sides of it, to the west and to the south. I live roughly, just maybe around a kilometre to the west of the Deerfoot.

Then thinking of how Calgary-Airport, Calgary-North East, and then Calgary-North are proposed, I have great concern over the Calgary-North East boundary, where we see the Deerfoot and the changes in that area. I understand that there are new communities in that space, but there are also some significant new communities to the north of Coventry right now, and Deerfoot is a significant boundary. It is a significant boundary.

Then the other one is Calgary-Klein, and I understand Calgary-Klein, the new areas in that, much of it, is predominantly industrial space with a couple of little pockets – there are two little pockets – of communities. But as Calgary-Klein also is being cut by the Deerfoot or the Deerfoot is not considered in the expansion of it, where it's expanding west-east as opposed to either staying static or going north-south, which is the primary means when we think of

how our transit systems work here, I think it's incredibly problematic. There are significantly different communities in those two and access to services, and I think that there will be confusion for individuals if you think of where your kids go to school, where you play soccer or hockey, or different clubs that are in the community.

When we think of the social activities, the activation or programming of our city on a macro level, the Deerfoot is one of the boundaries that differentiates where activity happens. It was a very informative opening slide presentation and a very nice one, too. I think that you raised the aspect of cultural and religious groups within areas. They are diverse. There is quite a distinction between the east and the west of the Deerfoot. Though I think it's important to encourage as diverse communities as we can, I think that it is a significant change.

Then when I look at Calgary-Airport and we think of the developments, Calgary-Foothills, Calgary-North, and then Calgary-North East, my suggestion would be to consider moving the boundary lines over to the Deerfoot and then consider also moving the other ones west in that when we think of the projected growth in these areas, we have significant developments that are going on to the north and northwest as well as northeast of the communities, that in the coming years, depending on how things go, could be quite significant.

I think the importance of having consistent representation that reflects – your MLA being the same as your MP and as your councillor is also another important consideration.

Thank you. I saw a guy with a timer in the back. I thought that was fantastic. I would like to bring him back to the university with me, please.

The Chair: Okay. I have a couple of comments. We stood on our heads trying to avoid putting the Deerfoot through any constituency. We remapped the entire city at least three times before we concluded that that was not possible because of the high pockets of growth in Calgary-North East, you know, in particular. Do you have a map that you've created that would embody the suggestions that you're making? Have you got anything for us?

Dr. Sundberg: I don't have anything with me today, but I would be happy to build one for the commission and have it sent to you before your final aspects. I'd be more than happy to do that if that's possible.

The Chair: I'm sorry. Our deadline has passed for that.

Ms Livingstone: Yeah. Just to follow up on that, I mean, the choice that you'd have to make is that you'd have to create long, narrow constituencies that cut through many, many, many communities and split up individual neighbourhoods, or you've got to cross the Deerfoot to keep neighbourhoods together. So there's the forced choice that . . .

Dr. Sundberg: Yeah. I understand that, but we still have fairly, quite horizontally long ridings now although they're wider. It's really the two, Calgary-Klein and Calgary-North East. Like, I personally think we should actually add another riding in the city, but I get that that's a different thing. Those are two – there's quite a difference: Calgary-North East, significant. But Calgary-Klein is also, you know – I mean, because of the areas to the east of the Deerfoot being predominantly industrial, I get that that's not as big an issue, but Calgary-North East is a significant change.

Ms Livingstone: We completely understand what you're saying. It's just that what you're proposing is literally not an option. Like,

we tried every conceivable way to not cross the Deerfoot, and the forced choice was to either cut through neighbourhood after neighbourhood after neighbourhood, dividing them up, or to keep neighbourhoods together and cross the Deerfoot.

Ms Munn: Your comment, which I don't think we should go over too quickly, about there being another riding in Calgary would have solved some of these problems.

Dr. Sundberg: Yeah.

Ms Munn: Calgary's population is such that we're over in every constituency. So we're 25,000 or 26,000 people over. That's not quite enough for another riding, and given the need to deal with other parts of Alberta, especially surrounding Calgary, we didn't think it was justified to give another seat to Calgary at this time. I think that by the time the next commission happens, that will change, but for now we were stuck with jumping the Deerfoot in two constituencies to balance it out.

Dr. Sundberg: Another riding would have solved the problem.

Ms Munn: Yes. Another riding would solve the problem, the Deerfoot problem.

Dr. Sundberg: Yeah.

Ms Munn: Yeah. But it would create other problems that might be more serious, so we couldn't do it.

The Chair: We would have had to take another riding out of somewhere else to make that happen. We've tried, believe it or not, to moderate the effect of these recommended changes by erring on the side of not adding, because there's an additional half riding's worth of people in Calgary. In Edmonton, just by total chance, 46,697 divided equally into the population – amazing – but not so in Calgary. It was 50 per cent of a constituency's worth of people over. So we elected to bump up the average size of the constituencies in Calgary by 860 people each to accommodate that. We could have gone the other way and made each constituency in Calgary under by adding another constituency, but then where would we get that other constituency's worth of people in the province?

So that was our approach. I'm interrupting Ms Munn – and I'm sorry – but I didn't want to miss that opportunity.

Also, you should know that we've received significant representations in the interim hearings, in the first hearings, to the opposite of what you're saying. One of the MLAs came and said that he found the Deerfoot very handy. It allowed him to access both sides of his constituency very easily and urged us not to move it out of his constituency.

Dr. Sundberg: Hmm. That's interesting. It would have been in the south.

9:40

The Chair: Nope. I don't think so.

Dr. Sundberg: Really.

The Chair: Okay. Ms Munn, anything else?

Ms Munn: No, I don't have anything else.

The Chair: Ms Livingstone? Mr. McLeod?

Mr. McLeod: No, thanks.

The Chair: All right. Thanks so much.

Dr. Sundberg: Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you.

Wayne Anderson and Pat Stier, are you going to present together?

Mr. W. Anderson: Thank you once again, folks, for listening to the MLA for Highwood. My name is Wayne Anderson. To the left of me is the MLA for Livingstone-Macleod, Mr. Pat Stier.

Just before we start, I wanted to understand a statement made in your interim report just for clarification and on the record, if I may. “This second series of hearings will allow the Commission to receive feedback on the recommendations made in this interim report, in advance of finalizing its recommendations, and tabling its final report no later than October 31,” as in your slide presentation. So that’s an accurate fact; in other words, the interim report is not a fait accompli, if I may ask.

The Chair: Absolutely not.

Mr. W. Anderson: Well, thank you very much, because some statements have been made by certain board members that it was a fait accompli, and I want to just highlight that.

“Now that the Highwood River is [no longer] in the constituency, new naming suggestions would be more than welcome.” That sounds like a fait accompli comment.

The Chair: What are you reading from, sir?

Mr. W. Anderson: I’m reading from a local newspaper report. One of your board members made a statement to a press person when they interviewed me regarding the boundaries, and I had suggested that the Highwood River should remain in Highwood as a natural boundary as per your comments. That comment was made by one of your board members, so I just wanted it to be noted that that was interpreted as potentially being a fait accompli. I don’t think it was, so perhaps it was just a misstatement.

The Chair: We’re not responsible for the accuracy of the press. I have to say that I think the press coverage has actually been quite good as we’ve gone along.

Ms Livingstone: I’m going to respond to that because I said that. The person asked, “If the Highwood River is not in the riding, should the riding be named Highwood?” And I said: “No. If the Highwood River is not in the riding, then another naming suggestion would be welcome.” That’s the context of that, so that’s my response to that.

Mr. W. Anderson: And I accept your interpretation of it. Again, it may have been a misprint, or it may have been misinterpretation, but as long as we’re aware that this is not a fait accompli, that the interim report is not a fait accompli – I just want that on the record.

The Chair: There’s no point in coming around and doing all of this if it was a fait accompli.

Mr. W. Anderson: Absolutely. I agree.

After referring the interim report of May 2017 – with respect, first, to the northeast boundary of the Highwood riding in my first round of submissions I stated that it’s tradition that electoral boundaries for the Highwood riding be set using natural boundaries as per your parameters, yet the natural boundaries of the Bow River and the Highwood River don’t seem to be in play at this time. Let

me just explain to you the impact of that. You’ve now transferred the eastern boundary of Highwood to highway 2, which completely eliminates what they call the Davisburg plain area, the Artesia, Davisburg, Dunbow Road area, which are natural boundaries by the Bow River and Highwood River.

You might not recall – and I’ll just refresh your memory – that during my first submission earlier in the spring I mentioned that the Bow River and Highwood River could be used as natural boundaries, and that would give up a significant portion of population on the other side, the east side, which is the Gladys Ridge area, which would have reduced the number of constituents within a constituency to meet your target mark.

But taking that whole Davisburg plain area out really has a huge impact on the representation. It states that you wanted to put in a north-south corridor so that people would not have to go through certain constituencies to get to their designated point of reference. Well, if you take the Davisburg plain out, people from that area now have to drive to Macleod Trail or Deerfoot and go through three or four other constituencies to get to the Chestermere area. There’s no way across the rivers. And if you go south of it, you have to drive another 60 kilometres around to the next bridge that goes over the Bow River that gets you into the Chestermere constituency.

So I’m asking – I just want to give you a brief history lesson on the Davisburg plain, if I may, and indulge you on this. High River was incorporated in 1906, Okotoks in 1899. I think it was John A. Macdonald who provided the first funding for the first school in the Davisburg plain, in 1883. So Davisburg has been a part of it – and it reduced and worked with the folks in Highwood, in the Davisburg plain; of course, the church and the North West Mounted Police came afterwards – because it’s the natural confluence of the two rivers, the Bow River and the Highwood River.

Ironically enough, in the Second World War the Davisburg airport was put in place to help Allied pilots train from all over world right there in Davisburg, about four kilometres from my home. The natural reason for that is because the geographic confluence of the two rivers helps junior pilots to navigate certain areas. I know this because I’m a pilot. That makes it a lot easier to manipulate and manoeuvre. So that’s the history of Davisburg.

The real history here is that the Highwood River has been part of that constituency for over 112 years. That’s why I’m telling you the influences. The Bow River and the Highwood River are a natural north-east boundary. If you take the same map that I proposed earlier, draw it down 128th Street alongside the Bow River down to exit 447 and take it across the original Aldersyde corridor, then you’d be able to incorporate Davisburg.

It also mentions in your report, if I may quote, regarding the highway 2 eastern boundary, “This recommendation respects the Highway 2 corridor, as was requested in various submissions, and leaves some room for . . . future growth.” Well, I went through every report, verbal and written, and we only found one request for that, and it was somebody north of Airdrie, for highway 2. Nobody requested that highway 2 be the eastern boundary for Highwood. We didn’t find that in anything. Maybe it’s a misprint. Maybe I’ve been misinformed – I’m not sure – but I just want you to consider that. So I’m asking: move the eastern boundary back towards the Highwood River and the north river, which is the Bow River, which is a natural corridor. That’s where the city of Calgary ends, and that’s where the Highwood constituency should begin on the eastern boundary.

The Chair: I’m going to ask you, if you don’t mind, to come forward, like a previous speaker – because he’s already written on the Highwood constituency map, use a yellow pen this time – and show where you would propose the boundaries of the Highwood

constituency be set. Maybe if you're just suggesting that they remain as they are, then, you know, we'll know what that means.

Mr. W. Anderson: No, I'm not suggesting that.

The Chair: Okay. Then would you mind?

Mr. W. Anderson: Sure. What I've done in conjunction with the mayor of the MD of Foothills, the mayors of High River and Okotoks – we've actually had the MD draw up a new constituency map as per my original presentation, but I'll draw it.

The Chair: Okay. Well, we'll enter that as an exhibit, which really means just hand it to us and we'll look at it during deliberations. If you'd draw on this, that would help us when the time comes.

Mr. W. Anderson: You know what will be better?

The Chair: On Livingstone?

Mr. W. Anderson: No. I'm going to show on my map because your map is way too – this is what I'm talking about. Right now Highwood is here. We're proposing that you move it further east, which takes care of the population of the Gladys Ridge area. This is the Highwood River. This is 128th Street, which is the natural boundary. It takes you down below High River. That's what we're looking at.

The Chair: Okay. Could you look – I know this is a small map and it's not as specific, but could you draw on the part here that you think should be added back in? Do you want to go do it on the Livingstone map?

Mr. W. Anderson: Well, you can see right here.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. W. Anderson: Heritage Pointe. I think this is the natural boundary you've got here. I think the river comes around here, and then it would come across. That takes it down to there.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. W. Anderson: Okay. That's what I'm proposing for that boundary, but I'm also proposing to come along under here, too.

The Chair: To take in High River as part of the constituency?

Mr. W. Anderson: Yeah. Then take it back up to 552, which is approximately here.

The Chair: Okay. This part would remain part of Livingstone-Macleod in the middle?

Mr. W. Anderson: Livingstone-Macleod as was in the past.

The Chair: So this is a noncontiguous constituency that you're recommending?

Mr. W. Anderson: No. The population of High River, Turner Valley, and Black Diamond are identical.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. W. Anderson: I'm just suggesting to swap this back into Livingstone-Macleod, put High River back into Highwood, and use the natural confluence of the rivers as your eastern boundary. I'm first talking about the point of this area right here. You've taken this whole area here.

The Chair: Okay. You're way ahead of me here. What happens to this part here on your suggestion? Is it still part of Highwood, or it becomes part of Livingstone-Macleod?

Mr. W. Anderson: That is currently part of Livingstone-Macleod and will remain part of Livingstone-Macleod.

The Chair: Okay. The yellow part you've marked on here would be the entirety of Highwood?

Mr. W. Anderson: That's correct.

The Chair: Okay. Got it. All right. Thanks.

Mr. W. Anderson: Right now I'm just talking about this Davisburg plain area, the Highwood River and the Bow River being a natural confluence and not using highway 2, which we've not found anybody to recommend that.

9:50

The Chair: What would the population be of your proposed constituency?

Mr. W. Anderson: Approximately 52,000, which is about plus or minus 9 to 10 per cent.

The Chair: About 52,000. Are you saying that as a result of this change the population of Livingstone-Macleod as amended would remain roughly the same as well?

Mr. W. Anderson: That's correct.

As I said earlier, I was talking originally about the Davisburg plain, the two rivers, the confluence of the Bow River and Highwood River. I strongly recommend that we put that back into the Highwood constituency because access to Chestermere is not available easily. Secondly, the MLA for Chestermere also recommends the same thing and is in agreement with me. The eastern portion on the other side of the river: that can be given to another constituency. That's the Gladys Ridge area, which I said would cut back the population by approximately 4,000 people from my original proposal.

Now, with respect to the town of High River, I also found in the first round of submissions my request or recommendation that the town of High River be removed from the Highwood riding – I'm not sure why – in your interim report. I'm saying: please include the town of High River back into the constituency of Highwood. The rationale for that is quite simple. The same thing was argued in 2010, and the MLA George Groeneveld did the same thing. He said: you have to keep High River, Aldersyde, and Okotoks in the same corridor. As I mentioned earlier, High River was the first town initially incorporated in 1806. Approximately 90 years later Okotoks came into play, so High River has always been the focal point as a town for that whole area.

A classic example of how these three towns co-operate and work together unfortunately was the 2013 flood. When High River was devastated in 2013 almost all of the people had their economic corridor and their business requirements and their needs provided by Okotoks and the Aldersyde corridor. The Aldersyde corridor provided facilities for temporary housing for the flood victims for two years, and Okotoks provided the hardware, the necessities, and all the goods and services for the folks of High River to provide their goods and services or south Calgary. There's no natural economic corridor from High River down to Lethbridge, down to that area. They go north to Okotoks or north into south Calgary.

To take Highwood out of that economic corridor makes very little sense. There's a natural synergy. The MD of Foothills is located in

High River. The town of High River, obviously, is located in High River, and the town of Okotoks. Moreover, the Foothills school division operates out of High River in through my whole constituency, the whole constituency of Highwood. They all work in collaboration. Pulling High River out and changing the population of that to substitute for Turner Valley and Black Diamond makes very little sense. The population of those two towns are approximately the same. High River, unfortunately, because of its economic situation has only grown 300 people in the last three years. This town is going to take another 10 years to grow and come back to where it was before the flood. Because of that there's a natural economic corridor, an industrial corridor, which you state is part of the economic culture, in the Aldersyde area that services both High River and Okotoks. They're only 18 kilometres part, so I strongly recommend that you keep High River as part of my exhibit in the constituency and remove Turner Valley and Black Diamond and put it back into Livingstone-Macleod.

Those are basically the two recommendations that I'm making right now based on my submission at this time, and I'm open for questions.

I apologize. I'm going to let my fellow MLA Pat Stier speak for a moment.

The Chair: You're over your time limit, but that's okay. We haven't been religious about that, but we do have a lot of people yet to get to. Before I leave you, I don't want to forget this. I understand what you're saying. This is our one chance to talk to you. If at the end of the day we decide that we are going to recommend something that removes High River from the constituency, what's your preference for a name? I was trying with Kananaskis-Okotoks, but if we follow Mr. Westhead's recommendation, then Kananaskis is gone. What would be the best name for your constituency?

Mr. W. Anderson: The best name for my constituency is Highwood.

The Chair: Okay. But any other suggestions?

Mr. W. Anderson: I have no other suggestions at this time.

The Chair: Okay. Thanks.

All right. Mr. Stier.

Mr. Stier: Yes. Thank you, and thanks to the board for the work you've done. I know from my past experience – and Wayne mentioned the previous MLA George Groeneveld – there was a lot of work done the last time, and I know how a push on one side goes the other way on the other, so I've appreciated the work you've done. There's a few problems that I'm here to talk about today with the adjustment that was made. Both ridings are interconnected, so that's why we're here jointly with you.

As I said in the Lethbridge meeting, I had indicated to you – and it was on the record – that the Turner Valley-Black Diamond area, Millarville, et cetera, et cetera did belong in a more northern riding, if that was to be allowed at some point, just simply because that's in the Calgary marketplace and with Okotoks and High River, too. Having said that, it was not my intent to ever see High River brought into Livingstone-Macleod. That was a change that I was not in favour of. When I got the new suggestion, I was quite surprised about that.

I am, by the way, the MLA for Livingstone-Macleod, but I reside in the Heritage Pointe area over on the east side of highway 2. I've lived there all my life, since the '50s. I went to school in Okotoks. I've been around High River and Okotoks all my life. I agree with Mr. Anderson. To separate Okotoks from the High River area

would be a catastrophic idea. I can't imagine why anyone would do that. The Bow River has always been the boundary to the north for the MD of Foothills. It's been the boundary to the north for the Foothills school division. It's been the boundary to the north for the local councillor's riding there as well. That's the usual thing. To bring Chestermere down on the east side down and south of the river, which is a natural boundary, makes very little sense. People do not try to travel from the east side of the highway in our area and go into Chestermere. They usually travel over to Okotoks or they travel into the south end of Calgary.

Similarly, the Chestermere riding therefore, I'm suggesting, needs to have the boundary pushed back to where it was, to the Bow River. That is a natural boundary that has been there for years and years and years and decades. People to the east of Calgary travelling to Chestermere, they travel over to Strathmore, but they do not have a bridge that's convenient for them to come across in the riding from the Chestermere area down into the southern area, as you've put on. We're looking at – I would draw your attention to the map on page 156, which is the Chestermere map.

The closest bridge from the Deerfoot bridge to the east is 60 kilometres away, more or less. So there's a natural boundary there that's been more or less omitted from your discussions or whatever you've had. I'm not sure why you did that. But anyway, I would like to point that out to you. That's why we're advocating jointly here to push that boundary back up to where it belongs, to the Bow river, bring the east side of the Highwood riding back up to the boundary where it has always been, and include High River with Okotoks.

By the way, as a former councillor for the MD of Foothills I'm very well aware of all the planning and all the other kinds of things we have done over the decades with Okotoks and Aldersyde. We have a joint-use agreement on emergency services. We also have in the area the Aldersyde industrial corridor between High River to Aldersyde. There's actually an area structure plan that's a joint area structure plan for industrial growth just to the north of High River that ties in those communities as well.

The Chair: I'm just going to interrupt you. Again, would you mind coming and drawing on a map for Chestermere, on page 156 of my copy of the interim report, the part of our proposed Chestermere that you suggest be moved back into Highwood? Is that it?

Mr. Stier: Yes. It matches Mr. Anderson's idea.

The Chair: Right. Okay. So is it just the chunk below the Bow River, or is ...

Mr. Stier: Beyond that. I'm insisting at the same time to adjust the whole thing up to the river.

The Chair: No, no. I understand that. Just looking at Chestermere, though, the part we take out of Chestermere would be the part below the Bow River, that entire piece?

Mr. Stier: Correct. Exactly.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Stier: Yeah. There's no common market business attachment to the north side of the river whatsoever. It's been inconvenient for years. It's always been a natural boundary. People from the Langdon, Chestermere, Cheadle, Strathmore area: if they don't get their services in the small towns, they naturally go to Calgary. They never have tried to go find a bridge to get down to High River.

The Chair: Sure. And how many people live in that area? That includes Gladys.

10:00

Mr. Stier: I don't have the exact figures for that. I'm sorry. I've never calculated that. I would imagine that you folks might have had that in your deliberations.

The Chair: We can find that out, but there's a group of people who live there, clearly.

Mr. Stier: Those are all acreage areas. There's no major town in that area.

The Chair: Okay. So where do you suggest, or do you suggest, how we expand Chestermere to pick up the population you've taken out?

Mr. Stier: In my opinion, having lived in the region for all these years and been on a municipal council in the area that interacts with the other municipalities – and I'm aware of the South Saskatchewan regional plan – the natural boundary for Chestermere should always stay north of the river. If it expands anywhere from where you've set the west boundary now, I guess, if you were going to expand, I note in your ideas that you have got the Drumheller-Stettler riding tied into the Strathmore area. I believe that Strathmore has more to do with Langdon, Chestermere, and all those points in that area as compared to Drumheller-Stettler.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Stier: That would be my thought. Now, having said that, I have discussed that with the Chestermere-Rocky View MLA, and she concurs in that respect. If there was an expansion, that would possibly be where it should go versus the area that was put way down to the south of the river. It didn't make sense to her either.

The Chair: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Stier: Now, I would just like to say – I'm not finished – if I may, therefore, recognizing that High River should not be in the Livingstone-Macleod area, I'm quite happy to retract my statements I made from Lethbridge. Include Turner Valley, Black Diamond, Millarville, and all those areas to the west back into Livingstone-Macleod, as it is currently, and carry on with business as it has been. It's more important, in my view as a person that has served in a local government there and as a citizen all my life, to have High River not separated from the Okotoks area. I think that with Mr. Anderson's proposal – we worked on that exhibit that you have now, the new drawing that we've put together. We have collaborated on that heavily, and I think that the new western boundary for Livingstone-Macleod will be quite fine due to that factor alone.

Is that clear for everyone? I'm here for questions.

The Chair: I've got it, absolutely.

I'm going to turn to Mr. McLeod and ask him if he has any questions.

Mr. McLeod: No. I'm good right now. Thank you.

The Chair: All right.

Mrs. Day: Well, I guess, I just appreciate you folks that know your area really well coming and sharing what you have today. It lines up with the submissions that I've read so far, the 500 and some that we've received to date, last Friday. Thank you, and the map will help immensely.

Mr. Stier: Thank you. We've taken the time to talk to the municipal leaders, the school division, et cetera, et cetera. Further, I would like to agree with Mr. Westhead's comments from earlier. He brought up the point about Kananaskis. We've agreed on that, too. I didn't mention it in my submission at this time, nor did Mr. Anderson, but we concur with what he has said.

Mrs. Day: Okay. Good to know.

The Chair: Thank you for that.

Ms Livingstone: I just have one question. You guys have brought up school divisions a couple of times. What school division are Turner Valley and Black Diamond in?

Mr. Stier: Foothills. Foothills school division manages the public system in the MD of Foothills, basically, from the river south. I'm talking about the Bow River south. Similarly, there's a Catholic board . . .

Mr. W. Anderson: Yes. That's correct.

Mr. Stier: . . . and they, too, have a similar boundary.

The Chair: Thank you.
Anything else? Ms Munn?

Ms Munn: I have no questions.

The Chair: Thanks very much.

Mr. Stier: Thank you for your help today, thank you for your patience, and thank you for the work that you do. We really appreciate that.

The Chair: Thanks.

All right. I'm going to invite our clerk to move the current map of Calgary from the wall onto that easel and move that easel up somehow and put it beside without blocking the *Hansard* reporter. This is going to require some agility, but see if you can get them up there so we can both see them. Thanks.

All right. Our next registered speaker is Mashhood Qazi. Sorry; I've missed Gord Elliott. I apologize. Mr. Elliott.

Mr. Elliott: Thank you, Madam Justice. I've put together a presentation. I believe each have just received a copy of it. There's a map at the back which helps make it a little easier to understand the points that I'm trying to make. I want to talk about the electoral divisions outside Calgary and Edmonton.

To make every voter's vote as equal as possible, each electoral division should have as equal a population as possible. In the commission's interim report there are 14 electoral divisions that have populations greater than 50,000 while Lesser Slave Lake has 28,000. In those 14 electoral divisions each voter's vote has about half of the weight of a voter in Lesser Slave Lake. I suggest that the commission rectify this imbalance by increasing the population of Lesser Slave Lake.

The commission has created 41 electoral divisions outside Calgary and Edmonton. These 41 electoral divisions have an average population of 46,082, with a standard deviation of 5,184, or 11.3 per cent of the average. I have divided the 41 electoral divisions into five groups, and you can see that on the map. It's basically trying to draw an east-west line moving south to north or north to south within the province.

The north group has seven electoral divisions and a total population that is 45,409 less than if all seven electoral divisions

had the average population. In essence, the commission has created seven electoral divisions in an area where the population warrants only six. The Edmonton-north group has eight electoral divisions and a total population that is 7,529 more than if all eight electoral divisions had an average population. The Edmonton-to-Red Deer group has nine electoral divisions and a total population that is 24,484 people more than if all nine electoral divisions had the average population. The Red Deer-to-Calgary group has nine electoral divisions and a total population that is 14,702 people more than if all nine electoral divisions had the average population. Finally, the south group has eight electoral divisions and a total population that is 1,305 less than if all eight electoral divisions had the average population.

To bring the population of the north group up to the average, 45,409 people need to be moved into it from the Edmonton-north group. A cursory look at the map of the province suggests moving the town of Swan Hills, with 1,300 people; the portion of Big Lakes county in Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock, that I've guesstimated at 200 people; the town of Whitecourt, 10,204; Woodlands county, 4,754; the portion of the municipal district of Lesser Slave River in Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock, and I've guesstimated that at 100 people; the city of Cold Lake, 14,961 from the census; the northern portion of the municipal district of Bonnyville along highway 55, and I've guesstimated that at 4,000 people; and the town of Grande Cache, 3,571 from the census. That would add about 40,000 people to the north group.

I suggest the following changes for your consideration. Move the city of Cold Lake and the portion of the municipal district of Bonnyville along highway 55 from Bonnyville-Cold Lake to Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche. Move the town of Athabasca and Athabasca county from Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche to Lesser Slave Lake. Move the portions of the municipal district of Lesser Slave River and Big Lakes county from Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock to Lesser Slave Lake. Move the town of Whitecourt and Woodlands county to Lesser Slave Lake. Move the town of High Prairie to Central Peace-Notley. Move the town of Sexsmith to Central Peace-Notley, and move the town of Grande Cache to Grande Prairie-Smoky.

Changes would need to be made to the boundaries of the electoral divisions in the Edmonton-north group to add 32,500 from the Edmonton-to-Red Deer group. I've identified a couple of changes that would help to do that. Add St. Paul county to the portion of the municipal district of Bonnyville south of highway 55. Move the town of Drayton Valley in Brazeau county to West Yellowhead.

Further changes will need to be made. The electoral division boundaries will not be reviewed again for another eight to 10 years, as you have said, so I think it is very important for the commission to equalize the populations of the 87 electoral divisions as much as possible to make all voters' votes as equal as possible.

Thank you for your consideration of my suggestions.

10:10

The Chair: Thank you, and thank you for providing us with a map. A picture speaks a thousand words.

Mr. Elliott: Sure.

The Chair: Mr. McLeod, any comments?

Mr. McLeod: Does your proposal take into consideration the potential growth in some of these areas, especially the city of Calgary, the city of Edmonton, Red Deer. Red Deer-North, for example, has got quite a construction program going on currently.

Mr. Elliott: Uh-huh.

Mr. McLeod: Does your proposal take into consideration that outward looking?

Mr. Elliott: It does not with respect to the city of Calgary and the city of Edmonton. I've excluded those because you have created electoral divisions within the formal boundaries of those. I did not get specific with a riding like Red Deer-North because I do not have access to the population numbers that you do, but that would be something to consider if you look at the recommendations that I make to you, because I agree with you. You know, what happened in Calgary-Southwest, getting to 93,000 people, could have been anticipated eight to 10 years ago, so it's important that you do that.

Mr. McLeod: Thank you.

The Chair: Mrs. Day?

Mr. Elliott: Sorry. I forgot to mention that I live in Calgary-North West.

The Chair: Yes. Okay. Thanks.

Mrs. Day: Well, I appreciate your thought and suggestions. There is, I'm sure, some viability to what you're suggesting. However, at this stage there are a lot of areas you're impacting, and we don't have another chance to go out to those people and ask how they felt about those suggestions you're making from within the city of Calgary, where you reside. It's an interesting concept. I'm not negating the work you put into that, but my concern would be, at this stage, those people living in those areas being moved drastically and not another chance to come back and give us any feedback of how they feel about those things. That's just my perspective.

Mr. Elliott: That's certainly true although you do have three months before you have to issue your final report.

The Chair: We've discovered that it takes seven weeks to get the maps drawn and get it to the printer and get it out.

Mr. Elliott: Oh, okay.

The Chair: I was surprised as well.

Mr. McLeod: One follow-up question. I'm noticing a lot of movement in from Lac La Biche and then into Lesser Slave and stuff. We've heard consistently throughout the province in our travels that the MLAs are clearly stating: my constituency is too big right now; it takes me three hours to go from one point to another point or two and half or probably five, for example. To me – am I misunderstanding this? – when I look at this, like, Morinville and Westlock into Slave Lake would actually add more travel time to that particular constituency in that kind of area.

Mr. Elliott: Sure.

Mr. McLeod: Okay. That's a concern only because I've heard it so much over the province.

Mr. Elliott: Uh-huh. Well, you'll also see that I proposed moving High Prairie into Central Peace-Notley. That would eliminate the travel to the very western end of Lesser Slave Lake. I think the map of Lesser Slave Lake is a little deceptive, because when I look at it, there isn't a lot of population north of Lesser Slave Lake itself. There are a number of Métis settlements and Indian reservations – well, that's what they're still formally called – but the total

population in the electoral division of Lesser Slave Lake north of the lake itself is not very much. It's quite small.

Mr. McLeod: Yeah. I'm understanding that, but we also had one concern from an individual that as an MLA lives in the Hinton area going to Whitecourt.

Mr. Elliott: Oh, yeah.

Mr. McLeod: And I'm just going: that's a two-hour drive; that is, to me. But he says that it's the weather and stuff like that and the different highways.

Mr. Elliott: Sure.

Mr. McLeod: We're trying to be aware of those things also and to take those into consideration. So thank you very much for your presentation. Thanks.

Mr. Elliott: Well, this proposal would help him because it would put Whitecourt in Lesser Slave Lake and add Drayton Valley and Brazeau county into West Yellowhead. So that is a . . .

Mr. McLeod: But, then, that's a different – down the back side of highway 22, I think it is.

Mr. Elliott: Sure. But, you know, it's the reality of the work you're doing that the population is where it is, and to get more or less equal population in each electoral division necessitates some of that in the electoral divisions outside Calgary and Edmonton.

Mr. McLeod: Thank you. Appreciate your time.

The Chair: Ms Munn?

Ms Munn: I have no comment. Thank you.

The Chair: Ms Livingstone?

Thank you very much for coming, and thanks again for the map.

Mr. Elliott: Sure.

The Chair: All right. I'm sorry; I was misreading my list here. The next registered speaker is Michael Connolly.

Connolly: Good morning. I'm Michael Connolly, the MLA for Calgary-Hawkwood, and I reside in the neighbourhood of Citadel, which is in Calgary-Hawkwood. Thank you very much to the commission for allowing me to speak and appear here today.

I had the chance to review the commission's interim report and the recommended boundaries for Calgary. I know the commission did a lot of work in trying to look at Calgary and add a new riding to the city, which is not easy. Well, I guess it's better than not being able to add any riding. I think it was a good choice overall. As many of the written submissions reinforced, it is important to try and balance population between the different areas of Alberta and to reflect where most people are living.

However, we have to look at the people within the new ridings not only as numbers but as people who are part of specific communities and who have a history of being served by their MLAs. In the case of Calgary-Hawkwood I think the 2010 boundaries actually did a very good job of keeping communities together.

The communities of Silver Springs, Arbour Lake, Ranchlands, Hawkwood, and Citadel have a lot of similarities. There are a lot of young families in these areas, and the communities share a lot of similar services. For instance, Silver Springs, Arbour Lake, and

Citadel share a grassroots soccer program that is run in co-operation with each community association. That's only one example of many of the connectedness of these five communities. They have community services and organizations, including multiple sports leagues, Guides, Scouts, that collaborate with the neighbouring communities. Because these communities are so connected, they should also stay in the same constituency. The existing riding boundaries should stay the same because communities such as Arbour Lake and Ranchlands share a number of the same issues and concerns because of the similar socioeconomic makeup of both communities as well as the fact that all of these communities are in the same federal riding.

Now, the proposed boundaries, for example, would move the Citadel community into Calgary-Foothills while the Hawkwood community is being put into the new riding of Calgary-Edgemont. These communities share a monthly newsletter, community events, and event facilities. It's going to be much harder for these constituents now to come together in any meaningful way to contact their MLA because they will be under two different ones.

Silver Springs and Ranchlands are two communities that are very interconnected through social housing and the fact that they both share a low- to medium-income range. These communities are much older than the communities of Arbour Lake and Citadel and are both going through a rebirth phase, with many of the older members of these communities moving out and younger families moving in. These communities are also very similar to the young families that are currently living in Citadel, Arbour Lake, and Hawkwood although Hawkwood is starting, I would say, a rebirth phase as well because it's a bit younger than Ranchlands and Silver Springs, however not as young as Citadel and Arbour Lake.

I probably don't have to tell the commission that communities are incredibly important to Calgary and that our community organizations are strong, organized voices for the people in their neighbourhoods. It is not a step forward in effective representation to split these five communities apart or communities apart in general. The 2010 boundaries did a good job of following natural boundaries and keeping these communities together.

The proposed new boundaries also cut the community of Dalhousie in half.

Numbers are important, but they shouldn't be the sole determinant in establishing electoral boundaries. Talking about numbers, I think the current population of Calgary-Hawkwood is just about perfect at approximately 47,500 people. This is slightly above the average, but since most of the area is built out, it shouldn't increase that much, if any, before the next review. There might be very small areas where they would be destroying a house to build a larger building, but I only know of one in Silver Springs because it's a Habitat for Humanity build. That's the only real area in any of the five communities where there will be growth, and that's only of between five to 20 people more.

10:20

I understand and respect the commission's mission to change the boundaries where it is necessary and when it's better to do so for constituents. In the case of Calgary-Hawkwood I respectfully suggest that keeping the boundaries the same as in 2010 would meet the needs of the constituents better, would adhere to the major considerations that the commission has taken to consider, and would have no negative impact on surrounding constituencies.

I would also suggest that if you are to leave it as Calgary-Hawkwood, you might want to change the name from Calgary-Hawkwood to Calgary-Crowfoot as Crowfoot is the area that kind of surrounds all five constituencies. It has several shopping centres and things like that. Hawkwood is just one of the communities of

the five in this riding. I'm not a hundred per cent sure if it's the largest. I believe that it's about the same size as Silver Springs although Silver Springs might be larger, but at least Crowfoot is a very central area to all five of the neighborhoods. It's where most people do their shopping. Some people in Citadel will go to Royal Oak; however, the majority will still go to Crowfoot.

I think that's the end of my presentation.

The Chair: All right. Thank you. I'm just going to use you as an opportunity to do a little preaching because Calgary-Hawkwood is a good example of what happens when you leave a fully built-out constituency with a variance of over 17 per cent above the provincial average. That's what happened in 2010. You were left at 17 per cent above the provincial average, and in fact over the last eight years you've dropped to being 2 per cent over the provincial average, and you're one of the very few constituencies that have shrunk in size. You're 200 people smaller than you were eight years ago. That reflects some of our strategy and our recommendations for our proposed guidelines.

I appreciate that you're saying: don't change your constituency boundaries; change the name. But assuming that we only wanted to deal with Dalhousie, which you say has been cut in half, do you propose that we move all of Dalhousie into your riding or all of Dalhousie out of your riding?

Connolly: If we're looking at the current boundaries, then I believe that if we leave it in Calgary-Varsity, it'll make the population about, say, the same. If we move it into Calgary-Hawkwood, which would include Citadel, Arbour Lake, Hawkwood, Ranchlands, and Silver Springs, it would be, I would say, vastly over the population because with those five communities it is already at 47,000 people.

The Chair: Is all of Dalhousie right at the moment in Calgary-Varsity?

Connolly: It is.

The Chair: Okay. And if we did that, by how much would the population of your riding drop on our map? Can you say? Maybe you can't because you don't have that. Okay.

Connolly: Sorry, I – sorry; go ahead.

Ms Munn: Well, if we're looking at the proposal, Calgary-Hawkwood is not on the proposal.

Connolly: No. It does not exist. It's changed into three different ridings.

Ms Munn: Okay. So with respect to just Dalhousie it would be moved into Calgary-Edgemont if it were to be united.

Connolly: I believe that half of Dalhousie as proposed is put into Calgary-Edgemont. However, the other half is left in Calgary-Varsity.

Ms Munn: Right. But given that the numbers are 44,000 in Calgary-Edgemont and 49,000 in Calgary-Varsity, it would make more sense to put the other half of Dalhousie into Calgary-Edgemont. Isn't that right?

Connolly: Possibly. However, it would really depend on what you're doing to Calgary-Varsity. If you leave Calgary-Varsity close to where it is now, cutting out Silver Springs and leaving it within Calgary-Hawkwood or at least with Ranchlands, as I'm proposing, then Calgary-Varsity would be able to hold all of Dalhousie.

Ms Munn: Okay. So if we look at the new map, what you're saying is that Hawkwood and Ranchlands should be united?

Connolly: Yes. Well, Hawkwood and Ranchlands are united within the proposed. I'm saying that Ranchlands and Silver Springs and Hawkwood should stay together.

Ms Munn: So you would move Silver Springs out of Calgary-Varsity and into Calgary-Edgemont?

Connolly: Yeah. As I said, Silver Springs and Ranchlands share a lot of amenities together. They both have social housing. They're both helped by BowWest, which is a community association.

Ms Munn: And that would be more important than reuniting Dalhousie?

Connolly: Well, I believe that Dalhousie should stay together, however in Calgary-Varsity.

Ms Munn: So we move Silver Springs back into Calgary-Edgemont and reunite Dalhousie in Calgary-Varsity. That's the proposal?

Connolly: Yeah, so that Calgary-Varsity would have neighbourhoods of Dalhousie, Brentwood, Charleswood, Varsity, university sector, Banff Trail, St. Andrews Heights, I believe.

Ms Munn: Have you looked at the numbers at all for those communities?

Connolly: I don't have them off the top of my head.

Ms Munn: No? Okay.

The Chair: Did you bring a map with a sketch of what you're proposing? Or you're just saying: "Status quo. Just look at the current map."

Connolly: I'm saying status quo for my riding. However, I believe that Calgary-Foothills will be better with Edgemont, Hamptons, Sherwood, Sage Hill, and Nolan Hill.

The Chair: But you don't have a map to show us with that drawn on it?

Connolly: I wrote it down on this map.

The Chair: Well, would you mind giving us that map?

Connolly: Sure. It's a very rough map. I have one on my phone, but it's not printed off or anything either.

The Chair: Okay. It helps to see a picture, so if you'd pass that up to me now. All right. If you could point that out.

Connolly: This would be Citadel, Arbour Lake, Hawkwood, and then I believe that Calgary-North West should stay the same. Calgary-Foothills or Calgary-Edgemont could be Edgemont, Hamptons, Sherwood.

The Chair: Sorry to be peremptory here, but just draw the line around the constituency that you think should be other than the status quo in your northwest corner of Calgary. Or are you saying that they should all be left as is?

Connolly: No. I think another riding would be beneficial for northwest Calgary.

The Chair: Okay.

Connolly: Then again, I live in northwest Calgary, so I could be biased.

The Chair: You're saying that we should add an extra constituency over and above the new Calgary-North East, or just that we should move Calgary-North East to Calgary-North West?

Connolly: No. Currently we have Calgary-Foothills, Calgary-Northern Hills, and Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill, and that doesn't really work, so I'd have another one up here with Evanston, Carrington, Panorama Hills and then another with Nose Hill park, Huntington Hills, Sandstone Hill, Beddington Heights, Hidden Valley, as one. Calgary-Foothills as it is currently could be Edgemont, Hamptons, Sherwood.

The Chair: Just so I understand, you're not suggesting an increase in the number of constituencies in northwest Calgary, just the reconfiguration of everything except your own constituency?

Connolly: Well, Calgary-North West as well.

The Chair: Okay.

Connolly: Sadly. I like that one.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

All right. I'll pass this to Mr. McLeod. He's been good enough to be marking my exhibits here, as we say in the courtroom.

Mr. McLeod, any questions?

Mr. McLeod: Yeah. I always have a question. I've asked this quite a bit. We've heard over the province, again, a lot of people saying: well, this coalition and this will be different because maybe now we'll have two MLAs or it will just change. You talk about the community associations and how good they work together. Do you think that by changing the constituencies, that working relationship will change?

Connolly: No, but it will be much harder for the MLAs to represent the riding effectively. Like, in the case of Hawkwood and Citadel because they have a monthly newsletter that they're in together, they have the MLA, the MP, and the councillor. You would have to have double the amount of space, double the amount of everything in this one newsletter, so it would cost the newsletter more to print as well. On top of that, it's harder to go to events in the constituencies if they're working together. Then we have to have both MLAs there, and that's more difficult because then you have to explain to constituents: "No. I'm not your MLA. Your MLA is over there." Or you have to figure out exactly where they live in the constituency to let them know. That does happen now. However, it does not happen as often because I know that I represent one neighbourhood. Especially if we cut up something like Dalhousie and have it in two, then it's going to be very difficult for the constituents there.

Mr. McLeod: We've had kind of an interesting conversation with the rural folks saying: "I have 12 graduations this year. Some MLAs in Calgary don't have any because they don't even have a high school, but I have 12 I have to go to." I'm trying to weigh this all out in my mind.

Connolly: That's the rural-urban divide. It's going to happen no matter how we redraw the map unless we make every rural constituency as small as constituencies in Calgary. Like I only have

one high school. I believe I have two or three middle schools and then several elementary schools.

The Chair: Do you go to the graduations? Is that the practice of urban MLAs?

10:30

Connolly: If I am in Calgary, yes. I try to. Usually I try to go to all the grade 6 graduations. I give out certificates, and they enjoy that. Last year I did several. This year my office was able to only do one. I work with the high school a lot because the one high school services my entire constituency, well, not my entire constituency, because it is only Calgary public. Robert Thirsk high school is a fairly new high school as well, so it's still building up. But because my constituency, with these five neighbourhoods that are already completely built – their population is not diminishing at all. In fact, it's growing because of all the elementary schools that we have.

The Chair: Okay. Thanks.
Any others?

Mr. McLeod: No. I'm good now.

The Chair: Mrs. Day? Ms Livingstone? Ms Munn?

Ms Munn: I don't have any.

The Chair: Thanks so much for coming and addressing your ideas with the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

Connolly: Perfect. Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. The next speaker is Mashhood Qazi. Thanks for waiting, Mr. Qazi. Sorry. I called you earlier by mistake.

We'll have a five-minute break at the end of this next presentation.

Mr. Qazi: Good morning, and thank you for the chance to appear today. My name is Mashhood Qazi, and I reside in Calgary-Bow constituency. I am the vice-president of the NDP electoral district association of Calgary-Bow. I have spent a lot of time volunteering in this district and surrounding communities. I'd like to thank the commission for its interim report.

On behalf of my fellow members of the board I confirm our support for the commission's recommendation for Calgary-Bow to inherit the community of Montgomery. I have volunteered at a number of events in Bowness as well as hosted them in our riding, and I can confirm for the commission that we often attract residents from the community of Montgomery. Whether it's a Stampede breakfast, a barbecue event, or an information session, generally people from Montgomery area come to our constituency meetings and programs. For some people it is simply the close proximity. I have heard others say that they like to keep up with the happenings in Bowness because they feel that the issues there impact them as well.

Thank you for the opportunity to bring the views of the NDP electoral district association of Calgary-Bow before the commission this morning. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you. It's nice to hear somebody say: we agree.

Mr. Qazi: I tried to make it simple.

The Chair: Thank you. I don't really want any questions in case you want to modify that view, but I will turn to Ms Livingstone to see if she has any.

Ms Livingstone: No.

I just want to say thank you because usually silence means or we hope it means that people are content. It's actually a rare treat to hear that someone approves.

Mr. Qazi: We truly appreciate it, because when we met in our EDA, we all, you know, appreciated that this, the proposal, is the right direction.

Thank you very much for your time.

The Chair: All right. Ms Munn, any questions?

Ms Munn: I don't have any comments.

Thank you for coming.

The Chair: Mr. McLeod?

Mr. McLeod: Oh, gosh. No.

The Chair: Mrs. Day?

Okay. Thanks very much.

We'll take a five-minute break.

[The hearing adjourned from 10:33 a.m. to 10:45 a.m.]

The Chair: All right, ladies and gentlemen. If you could take your seats, we'll get going again. Our first speaker after the break is Deborah Drever.

Drever: Good morning. Thank you for the chance to appear today. I currently represent the constituency of Calgary-Bow, and I reside in the community of – sorry; I had too much coffee today – Bankview, which is in the constituency of Calgary-Currie. It's been a real pleasure working with the communities in my area for the past two years.

I think keeping communities of interest together is an important consideration, and I was glad to see that it was one of the things that the commission took into account as you are making your interim report. In the report the commission has recommended that the community of Montgomery be moved into Calgary-Bow. I've talked with a number of organizations such as Carya and the Bowness Seniors' Centre as well as the new children's cottage, which is going to be in Montgomery, and they have told me that their operations in Bowness and Montgomery are very interconnected and that it makes sense for both of the communities to be represented by one MLA. I've also spoken with MLA McLean, and she also supports the change.

I know from travelling around the area that there's a strong connection over the Bow River with both a vehicle bridge and a pedestrian and bicycle bridge. They're both really active neighbourhoods, and they have lots of common interests, services, and activities.

I do have one question in regard to the boundaries. In the southeast area there's an odd recommendation along 37th Street and 38th Street. If that could be fixed so it could just run along 37th Street, it would be more clear to everyone.

The Chair: Do you have a map that you've brought with that drawn on it?

Drever: I don't have a physical map, but I can send you one.

The Chair: No. Perhaps if you just come forward and draw on page 105 of my copy of the interim report and identify that little jog.

Drever: You see how it goes 37th Street then 38th Street? I'm just asking for it to go straight down 37th Street and then connect to Bow Trail.

The Chair: Okay. That brings in about a block, does it?

Drever: Yes.

The Chair: Okay. Thanks. Any idea how many people live in that block? Not many? It's not a big high-rise or anything there?

Drever: Not many. No.

The Chair: Okay. Thanks.

Drever: If that brings the population of Calgary-Bow up too high, it might be a good idea to move the community of West Springs into Calgary-West as they have a lot in common with their neighbours to the south of them such as the community of Aspen.

The Chair: Sorry. What's that neighbourhood again?

Drever: West Springs.

The Chair: West Springs?

Drever: Yes. It would help balance out the populations of the two ridings. For West Springs, they do share a monthly newsletter. I do in fact know that a lot of the constituents who live in West Springs, a lot of the students go to schools in Aspen such as Calgary Academy school. West Springs has a lot of newer homes, newer developments, as does Aspen. It has a lot more in common with that community than it does with the rest of my constituency.

The Chair: Sorry. I'm taking the advice of a Calgarian as to where West Springs is.

Drever: Okay. I can outline where it is.

The Chair: Would you mind? Okay. Sorry. Ignore my marking because I put it obviously in the wrong spot.

Drever: Sorry. Can I just grab a different pen? I could just outline where we would cut out.

The Chair: Could you put it approximately, just approximately?

Drever: Approximately, I believe, this, but I can give you the actual co-ordinates.

The Chair: Okay. Thanks.

Drever: If you want me to put it on record, the actual co-ordinates that would be cut out, I could also do that.

The Chair: Sure.

Drever: The recommendation in the interim report says that the boundary should follow Old Banff Coach Road S.W. west-east and then carry south to Coach Hill Road S.W. to 69th Street. Those would be the co-ordinates to cut out West Springs.

The Chair: Do you know how many people live in West Springs?

Drever: It's 9,086 people.

The Chair: All right. If we moved that out of Calgary-Bow, under our proposed map that would be about 21 per cent of the constituency, so instead of 10 per cent above, you would be about

10 per cent below, and Calgary-West instead of being about 1 per cent below, would be about 10 per above.

Drever: Well, the reason I'm suggesting this is . . .

The Chair: That's not a bad thing. Just so I understand.

Drever: Oh. Okay. I just want to also be clear that I'm inheriting two new communities, Wildwood and Montgomery, and my constituency is growing, actually. There is going to be Trinity Hills and Greenwood Village. They're under construction right now. It is growing by a lot, and it just would make sense for West Springs, too, to go into Calgary-West as, as I said, they do have a lot of similar interests and similar amenities.

The Chair: Okay.

Drever: But I am very happy with the proposed changes to inherit Montgomery and to inherit Wildwood.

The Chair: Okay. Thanks.

I'm going to ask if there are any questions. Ms Livingstone?

Ms Livingstone: No.

The Chair: Ms Munn?

Ms Munn: I don't have any questions for you.

The Chair: Mr. McLeod?

Mr. McLeod: No. I think I'm good. I understand where you're going with this. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mrs. Day?

Thank you so much.

Drever: Thank you for allowing me to present today, and thank you for all your hard work.

The Chair: That's what we're here for.

All right. The next registered presenter is Paisley Sim.

Ms Sim: Hi. My name is Paisley Sim. I'm a nonpartisan staff member working for the Legislative Assembly. I'm a constituency assistant in Calgary-Buffalo, which is where we are right now. As a constituency assistant I have a pretty good sense of the communities and the work of the MLA. I've been in that role for just over two years now.

I want to address three things: the projected population growth in Calgary's core, the natural boundary of the river, and then communities of interest. In submission 551, Kevin Allen – he's the returning officer for Calgary with Elections Alberta, I believe – notes that East Village is going to add 12,000 residents over the next few years. What I've looked at is that there are at least 19 condos and high-density housing developments that are either under construction or starting to fill up now, and those have gone up since the 2016 census. Many remain unnamed but are under construction in the areas of East Village, Downtown West, and Beltline.

The Chair: They're all in Calgary-Buffalo, are they?

Ms Sim: Yes. They are now. Yeah.

These new developments will be occupied before the next provincial election in 2019, assuming it's in 2019. So based on the number of units and average of two people per unit, the

constituency will add another 9,000 people from these developments alone. I mean, that's not perfect math. You can say that not every condo will have two occupants, but the projected growth in the next eight to 10 years will see a significant increase to the East Village area. Then there's the proposed entertainment district right now that CMHC is working on that's north of the Stampede grounds and south of East Village, which right now is older row houses that are by all accounts probably not long for the world.

10:55

Per the interim report Calgary-Buffalo is projected to have 49,907 occupants, which is 7 per cent above the provincial average, with the interim average being 46,698, based on the East Village inclusion alone, and core densification, which is new buildings that are under construction or will be occupied. We can expect, using that 9,000 number, approximately upwards of 51,959 occupants, thereabouts, by 2019, which is above what the interim report has projected, and that doesn't include the new areas of Inglewood and Ramsay, which are part of the recommendations.

The river itself serves as a natural boundary from the downtown area into the Inglewood, Ramsay areas, which are to the east of downtown. Calgary-Buffalo by all accounts is the geographically smallest riding in the province because it is built upwards. It's dense and vertical. It's my understanding that Inglewood and Ramsay are tightly connected communities and that they vary in quality greatly from the dense areas of Beltline and Connaught, which are the largest areas in Calgary-Buffalo. As a born-and-raised Calgarian my feeling is that incorporating the East Village into Buffalo makes sense. There's an argument to be made for the demographics, the community characteristics, and the proximity to the city core. It's very much in line with what Buffalo looks like now, and the interests of the community are consistent with other areas of the constituency.

There is a natural divide created by the river between the East Village and the Ramsay, Inglewood communities, and that offers an easily identified boundary for the constituency. Including Inglewood and Ramsay and other communities that the commission has suggested would ignore population pressures and the different community interests of those two areas. They're quite different in quality. They're mostly single-occupancy homes whereas East Village, Chinatown, downtown, and Eau Claire as they exist now are mostly condos and apartment buildings. There are some single occupancy, but for the most part it's different living quarters. So I would suggest that Inglewood and Ramsay not be included because of the character, the natural river boundary, and the population pressures as they exist now.

The Chair: Where should they be included, then?

Ms Sim: I don't think Calgary-Fort is a constituency anymore, but whatever the constituency to the east is, I would suggest – is it called Calgary-Peigan?

The Chair: Calgary-Peigan.

Ms Sim: Yeah. Either in Calgary-Peigan or in Calgary-Forest.

Ms Livingstone: Just to be clear, you're proposing that the Elbow River is a larger barrier than the Bow River?

Ms Sim: No. Pardon me. I'm proposing that the East Village be included in the new boundaries of Calgary-Buffalo but not anything to the east of the East Village, which is Inglewood and Ramsay. Once you cross, you go past the Fort Calgary area and cross the

river into Inglewood and Ramsay, there's a significant change in the quality of the neighbourhood, and I don't feel like they share necessarily the same interests or concerns of the downtown communities that Calgary-Buffalo represents now.

Ms Livingstone: I'm just wondering if you can show me on the map where you think we crossed the Bow River.

Ms Sim: Yeah.

Ms Livingstone: Because my map doesn't show us crossing the Bow.

The Chair: Okay. This is on page 106 of my copy of the interim report.

Ms Sim: As it exists now, this is the existing boundary in this little hived off corner, and then it's the Elbow River. This is the Stampede grounds, which is largely unoccupied, but it will be developed in this entertainment district. This is the East Village, and my recommendation would be that this be the natural boundary. This is the natural boundary of the Elbow River.

Ms Livingstone: That's my question, though. You're telling us to cross the Bow River, not the Elbow River, with the Inglewood community, because the rest of where you're proposing it go, for Peigan, is on the other side of the Bow River.

Ms Sim: Right.

Ms Livingstone: So I'm just being clear that you think the Elbow River is a greater barrier than the Bow River.

Ms Sim: In terms of the quality of the communities yes, but I understand what you're saying and how that could present a conflict for the Calgary-Forest or the Calgary-Peigan area. I would suggest that the characteristics of the housing and the communities in this area to the east of the Elbow are significantly different than the East Village area.

The Chair: How many people live in these two neighbourhoods?

Ms Sim: I only have the population projections for East Village. I don't have them for Inglewood and Ramsay, but I can find that out.

The Chair: I think we can find it out, too. I just wondered whether you had them handy. But that would lead to this question. Assuming that some people live there, obviously, probably, just guessing, some thousands of people, Calgary-Forest is already 12 per cent over. To add 2,000 people would make it 17 per cent over. Peigan is already 9 per cent over. To add 2,000 people would make it 13, 14 per cent over, and it would leave Calgary-Buffalo 2 per cent above. Why would that move assist people to reach and communicate with their MLA? Why would that improve the constituents' access to their MLA in Peigan and Forest by increasing their populations even more over the provincial average?

Ms Sim: I would suggest that the projected population of Buffalo, including Inglewood, Ramsay, and East Village, the new recommended boundaries on the east of the constituency – they have it listed as being 7 per cent above the average, but I don't think that takes into account the buildings that are the densification of the core and the unoccupied buildings that are coming online now and in the next two to three years, which our returning officer projects to be 12,000 new residents in East Village alone. I think that Buffalo will be significantly over the existing interim average now.

The question of: how would adding these communities to Peigan or Forest make sense for the MLA in terms of representation? I think that Inglewood and Ramsay are historic communities that have been in the inner city and have long-established community associations and identify and work very closely together, so I think that keeping them grouped together makes sense for the residents, and it would make sense for the MLA to forge those connections with those communities. In terms of representation, I can appreciate that reaching out to those communities, be it by direct mail or at events, is going to just be more costly, and there may be a reason for more casework, more community contact, and more pressures on the MLA's office on the whole.

I can't necessarily speak to the percentage over the interim average, but I do think that keeping those communities together makes a great deal of sense because the quality of the neighbourhoods, being single-family homes for the most part, differs greatly from the quality of the condos and apartments in the inner city.

I think that the concerns of the folks in Inglewood and Ramsay are significantly different from those, say, in East Village, where you have – if you've looked at the demographics of Calgary-Buffalo, they're quite different from any other constituency in the province. They're closest to Edmonton-Centre in that there are very few families with kids, like, young kids. There are a high number of older adults and a number of younger families, so it makes sense that those families are – there's just not necessarily the space to raise a family in the downtown core. Most people will be there for a time and then find themselves elsewhere.

The same goes for new residents of Calgary. We found that people will land in Calgary-Buffalo and then find themselves in another part of the city because it's very accessible, walkable, very close to all the things you would need to start a life here.

I think that the concerns and what the MLA is responding to in Calgary-Buffalo as it exists now, from what I understand, are quite different from those of Calgary-Fort. To keep those communities of interest linked together east of Calgary-Buffalo would make sense, and it may be easier for the MLA to represent those similar communities.

The Chair: All right. Thank you.

I'm going to turn to Ms Livingstone and ask if she has any other questions or comments.

11:05

Ms Livingstone: No. I just again want to clarify that we heard earlier today a presenter talking about the huge impediment that Deerfoot Trail presents and crossing Deerfoot Trail. What you're proposing is that the Inglewood and Ramsay communities be connected to a constituency that's on the other side of the Bow River and the other side of Deerfoot Trail as being a better connection for them than the rest of Calgary-Buffalo.

Ms Sim: Or connected to the Calgary-Peigan constituency or Calgary-Forest.

Ms Livingstone: Calgary-Peigan exists completely on the other side of the river and the other side of Deerfoot Trail.

Ms Sim: Yeah. I recognize that, like, looking at it with the river could be seen as an impediment, but I think the communities are similar enough in quality and in demographic that it would make sense for the MLA to represent them whereas having them connected to the inner city, to the absolute downtown core makes less sense to me given the population pressures and the natural boundary of the river.

Ms Livingstone: Am I correct that Calgary-Buffalo extends over to 14th Street on the western side?

Ms Sim: Yes, it does.

Ms Livingstone: There are a lot of single-family homes when you get to the west side of Calgary-Buffalo, aren't there?

Ms Sim: There are a handful in the Beltline area, but there aren't many until you get into the Sunalta area. Even Sunalta, which is to the west of 14th Street, is pretty dense, but that's where you start seeing typically older homes or some more – you know, those neighbourhoods are coming alive and being renovated. But then when you get further west up the hill to, say, Bankview, where I grew up, or Scarboro to the west, that's where you do start seeing more families.

Ms Livingstone: Thanks.

The Chair: Ms Munn?

Ms Munn: I don't have any questions. Thank you.

Mr. McLeod: Can you just define quality? You used that term several times, and it almost put me off a little bit. I have a brother that lives in Inglewood, and he's of a good quality as far as I'm concerned. He's got a single home, and he lives there, and there are brand new apartment buildings going along 9th Avenue and other areas. That whole area is changing rapidly. It's almost coming – like, boutique stores all along 9th Avenue. The demographics, if you want to use that term, are changing. A lot more young families and young executive types are living there. So can you please describe for me your definition of quality?

Ms Sim: I'm sorry if I misused the word "quality." I meant that to be the quality of the housing stock and, certainly, no comment on the individual or the residents. I would suggest that you're absolutely right, that along 9th Ave there are many more boutiques and there's, like, a real renaissance in that neighbourhood in terms of small business. They're seeing densified main streets, and, yeah, plenty of condo developments are coming online there.

I would suggest that what I mean more by the quality of the housing stock is that East Village, being almost entirely new – they're midway through a 20-year plan to develop the area, and there are some older buildings that are mostly seniors' residences, but the majority of that housing stock is very, very new. That differs greatly from, especially in Ramsay, some of the 1912 houses and the original character of the neighbourhood. It's a different demographic, from what I understand.

But I absolutely take your point that along 9th Avenue you're seeing the main street densification where you see density along the main streets and then sort of tapering out into the communities.

I hope that speaks to your point. It was certainly not a comment on the residents at all. It was more on the housing stock. You know, the experience of, say, driving or cycling or walking through Inglewood and Ramsay is very different than East Village as it stands now.

Mr. McLeod: Thank you.

Mrs. Day: Well, I think I'll just take an education moment and take us up above Calgary and look at the province of Alberta. I'll give you an example of a riding north of Edmonton that takes in a part of St. Albert, a very urban area and very established city, and then high-end acreage homes outside of that all the way to Smoky and a small community and massive agricultural and oil and gas in between.

We're saying that effective representation is possible in that hugely diverse region of our province. We had to make huge ridings in some areas because we had to put ridings back in Edmonton and Calgary to offset the population. Diversity is looked at as, with the right MLA, very possible. We're talking a riding there about three hours' drive, and your riding is about 10 minutes apart, probably, from one end to the other. Yeah. Just taking it up one level.

I'm not saying that you don't have some valid points, but I just wanted to make a point that there are lots of considerations, and I'm just not seeing where this urban community can't find a way of working with the diversity, rather than the word "quality," of your people and with the diversity of the housing. But I understand what you're saying.

Ms Sim: Okay. I would come back to the population pressures and the number of condos that are coming online.

The Chair: But aside from that, you're really just saying that the constituency should be left at the status quo.

Ms Sim: No. As it exists now, it doesn't have East Village in it, which a lot of residents just assumed is included in Calgary-Buffalo, whereas as it exists now, it's included in Calgary-Fort because, you know, Macleod Trail is the boundary, and it seems very arbitrary. For East Village to be included makes absolute sense, especially given that there will be between 9,000 and 12,000 new residents in that area in the coming years. That's based on the number that's coming from the returning officer for the area and our own assessment of the number of new buildings that are being constructed or filled now.

The Chair: Thanks very much. Thanks for coming along today.

All right. Mr. Elliott, I understand that you want to make a brief comment, and seeing as we have some time here, I'm going to offer you the opportunity to do so.

Mr. Elliott: Thank you, Madam Justice. I've been thinking about the feedback from Commissioner Day, that what I've proposed here, you don't have the opportunity to solicit feedback on.

In the handout that I presented to you, there are some things that are relatively minor in nature. Number 3, where at the moment you have split Big Lakes county in two: some of it's in Lesser Slave Lake; some of it is in Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock. I would encourage you to put all of it into Lesser Slave Lake.

The same is true for – the municipal district of Lesser Slave River is split in two, so you have the opportunity to put all of it into Lesser Slave Lake.

Woodlands county is split in two, with some of it in Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock, some of it in West Yellowhead. I would encourage you to put the portion that's in Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock into Lesser Slave Lake.

And then recommendation 7, about the town of Grande Cache, putting it in Grande Prairie-Smoky: I think it has more affinity with Grande Prairie-Smoky or the town of Grande Prairie than it does with West Yellowhead, which is further to the south.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Any questions or comments, Mr. McLeod?

Mr. McLeod: No. I'm okay.

I think understand where you're going, because Grande Cache up to Grande Prairie, even though it's a difficult road – I see where you're coming from on that. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Elliott: Sure.

The Chair: Mrs. Day? Ms Livingstone? Ms Munn?

Ms Munn: I don't have any questions.

The Chair: All right. Thanks very much.

Mr. Elliott: All right. Thank you.

The Chair: We'll adjourn now, then, till 1 o'clock.

[The hearing adjourned at 11:14 a.m.]

