



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission
Public Hearings

Calgary

Thursday, July 20, 2017
12:59 p.m.

Transcript No. 29

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

David Hartwick, First Vice-president, Northern Hills Community Association
Sylvia Hawkins, President, Calgary-East NDP Constituency Association
Nancy Janovicek, President, Calgary-Fort NDP Electoral District Association
Anam Kazim, MLA, Calgary-Glenmore
Brian Malkinson, MLA, Calgary-Currie
Alan McNaughton, Calgary-Varsity NDP Electoral District Association
Ricardo Miranda, MLA, Calgary-Cross
Michael Mooney
Brandy Payne, MLA, Calgary-Acadia
Don Ray
Alex Shevalier, President, Calgary & District Labour Council
Graham Sucha, MLA, Calgary-Shaw

12:59 p.m.

Thursday, July 20, 2017

[Justice Bielby in the chair]

The Chair: Good afternoon. I'd like to welcome you all to this hearing of the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

I'll start by introducing the commissioners. I'm Justice Myra Bielby of the Alberta Court of Appeal, a resident in Edmonton, but at the moment I'm also chairing the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province. To my immediate left are Laurie Livingstone from Calgary and your own Jean Munn from Calgary as well; and to my right, Bruce McLeod from Acme, the mayor of the town Acme; and to his right, Gwen Day from Carstairs.

We were appointed in late October to form this commission with a view to recommending changes to the boundaries of the provincial electoral constituencies in Alberta as needed to comply with the requirements of a piece of legislation called the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act. This legislation was passed in its current form in 1990, but there's been some version of it since the time the province was created, in 1905. It reflects the concern that as population grows and changes, there may be need to review constituency boundaries to make sure that the principle of one person's vote being relatively equal to the votes of other people remains in place. That doesn't mean, necessarily, mathematical equality, but it does mean that over time there are changes that occur. Our job is to take a look at what has happened since 2010, the last time when boundaries were reviewed, and to see whether we believe that changes should be considered based on shifts in the population.

This has been a kind of exciting time to engage in this work because in the last eight years Alberta has grown by more than 600,000 people. That's the highest growth rate in its history and the highest growth rate in Canada. The city of Vancouver comes in next, at 6.9 per cent. When you think of how much Vancouver has grown, we've grown more than twice that amount in the last eight years, and that's net of the people who may have moved out because of the downturn in the oil and gas industry. However, not all of these people who have moved into Alberta, largely from eastern Canada, have moved in equal numbers to each of our 87 constituencies. Rather, a majority of them have moved into Calgary, Red Deer, Edmonton, Grande Prairie, or Fort McMurray. That means that while the population in virtually all of our 87 constituencies has grown, in some areas it's grown at a much faster rate and number than in other areas. While in 2010 most of the constituencies in Alberta had pretty close to 40,000 people in each one, now we've got a situation due to huge growth rates that a vote cast in Jasper, if we had an election today, would have 3 and a half times the effect of a vote cast in Calgary-South East because of the huge growth rate in Calgary-South East.

Those are the sorts of things that we've been considering when we toured the province the first time, in January and February of this year, had a series of meetings with Albertans, and also received 749 written submissions on the issue of electoral boundaries, which was extremely gratifying to have, that level of uptake on our invitation to participate. The commission then met. We drafted recommendations for each of the 87 constituencies. Now, for some of them we recommended no change. It's not that we're recommending change just because we can. Those recommendations are contained in this book, which we tabled with the Speaker of the Legislature on May 24 of this year and which is available to the public online at our website of abeabc.ca.

Pursuant to the requirements of the act we then went on a round of consultation with the people in the province again, specifically in relation to the recommendations that we've made. It was more general the first time. We made our recommendations taking into

account, we hoped, what people said the first time around. Did we get it right? What do people think about it? That's our job now. We tabled our report. I should say that the report contained a minority opinion, a different set of recommendations from Mrs. Day, one of our commissioners, so there's a majority report and a minority report as well on what we should do with our boundaries.

The first step on our journey, the task set out by the act as interpreted by the Supreme Court of Canada and the Alberta Court of Appeal – long before I was a member of the Court of Appeal, they set out some rules for redistricting – we calculate as a first step the average population of each constituency. That's relevant not because we're aiming at trying to hit this number in our changing of boundaries but, rather, that it's a starting place for the rest of the analysis. In fact, none of our recommendations result in exactly 46,697 people being in any constituency. We've arrived at that number by taking the population of the province as produced by the 2016 Canada census, which was made available to the public on February 8 of this year. It tells us that Alberta has 4,062,609 people in it. We divided that by 87 to produce the average constituency number of 46,697.

1:05

Then the act lists a series of criteria that we should apply to that number as we go forward. The first step is to compare that number to the actual population of each constituency. I'm going to start with Airdrie because it's right on the back wall and the writing is big enough for me to see it from here. We know that in 2010 Airdrie was 2 per cent above the provincial average, but now it's 38 per cent above the provincial average. The population has grown to 64,000 and some-odd in the last eight years in Airdrie. That's, in fact, above the maximum allowed because the act says that notwithstanding our discretion to make different recommendations, we can't go more than 25 per cent above or below the provincial average. We know that in Airdrie, for example, the boundaries are required by law to be changed not simply as an act of discretion but because it needs to be split because it's above 25 per cent above the provincial average.

For every constituency we start by looking at the actual population as revealed by the 2016 census, compare it to our average population number, and see if it's over or under and by how much. We then go on to consider whether we should make any changes to either increase the geographic size to catch more people to bring it closer to the average or reduce the size by moving the boundaries in to bring it closer to the provincial average. Meanwhile, we don't want to do any of the following things. We don't want to cut up common community interests and organizations. This isn't simply geographic common community interests. It can be ethnicity, source of income, local economy. While most constituencies have many common community interests represented in them, we don't want to cut them in half if we can avoid it. Specifically, we're directed to try to avoid cutting up Indian reserves. That's an example of an organization or a common community.

The next thing: community and neighbourhood boundaries. In Edmonton and Calgary specifically we know that there are many individual neighbourhoods or communities. I have this, for example, colour map of Calgary that shows all of your neighbourhoods in Calgary. The act tells us to try to avoid putting constituency boundaries through neighbourhoods if we possibly can. Now, we've discovered that Calgary is incredibly densely populated in certain neighbourhoods. In fact, a number of neighbourhoods are much larger than 47,000 people, so it's not been possible to avoid dividing some of them into two, but it's one of our goals in assessing each individual constituency.

We then are directed to consider municipal boundaries, to not cut across the boundaries of any city, town, or village. Our 87 recommendations achieve that result. That means that we aren't recommending for Edmonton and Calgary any blended constituencies; that is, a constituency that's part in the city and part rural. We do in certain specific instances cross those boundaries in the sense of Grande Prairie, Fort McMurray, and Medicine Hat because each of those cities is too large to form one constituency – the population is much larger than 47,000 people – but not large enough to form two constituencies, less than 96,000. We have got some different possible models to deal with that situation, but in each of those cases we've had to create a blended constituency in our recommendations. In fact, that exists at the moment. Each of them are growing. Well, certainly Red Deer and Grande Prairie are growing. Red Deer is already there, but Grande Prairie and Fort McMurray are growing, and I'm confident that they'll be at two constituencies fairly soon.

The next consideration is following natural boundaries, so where there is a major roadway, a highway, for example, or a river, often that is available to be used as a boundary for a constituency. I think the drafters of the legislation thought that if we use that type of boundary, people would more readily understand where their constituency ended and where it started. These natural boundaries aren't available for all constituencies, but where they are, we've tried to use them.

Now, another consideration that we've made here which is not specifically listed in the act – but the act says we can consider any other thing that we think bears on effective representation, on an MLA's ability to represent constituents, and the constituent's right to be effectively represented in the Legislature. We have considered to a degree growth projections. This is the reason why, if you look at the Calgary projected map, you'll see that in many of the constituencies on the outer rim of the city, where there are still single-family homes being built and room to grow in that fashion, we've left a little growth room, and we've brought in recommendations that would leave those constituencies a little bit under the provincial average size.

To balance that off, then, in the core of the city, where constituencies are fully built out and where growth can occur only through infill or building high-rises, we're assuming that while growth will continue in those areas, it won't match the rate of growth in suburbia. So we've left those core constituencies a little bit higher than the provincial average in the expectation that over the next eight years, before this is done again, everything will again move closer to the provincial average.

Another consideration in our work is effective communication. We're attempting to consider how people communicate with their MLA and with each other in each constituency and honouring that to the degree we can in devising our constituency boundaries.

We've applied each of those factors to each of the 87 constituencies and come up with 87 recommendations. Today we're here getting public input on our suggestions, which is another factor that we're to consider in going forward. The next step of our task is to finalize our recommendations and table our final recommendations with the Speaker of the Legislature, in fact, a day before October 24. The last day we are to do it is October 23 of this year. Our final recommendations will go into a report that looks like this. It will be tabled. Then the Legislature in normal course will consider it and decide whether to enact legislation to accept those recommendations or accept them with some variations or what have you so that the province is ready for the next provincial election. It seems like we're very early doing this, but apparently the returning officers need a good lead time to be able to set up their work. The

goal of this legislation is to do it kind of mid-term in a government's term of office.

That's our task. That's why we're here today. Thank you very much for attending and participating.

Please be aware that everything we say is being recorded by *Hansard*. It will be posted on our website in aural form – you can listen to it – or as a written transcript within the next 48 hours, approximately. I have been gratified and perhaps mildly surprised at how many people actually tune in and listen to us after the fact. Just know that if you speak, it's going to be available to the public.

Our first registered speaker is Brandy Payne.

If everybody could start by saying the constituency in which they live, that would help us.

Ms Payne: Of course.

Sorry. I just have a couple of things to set up here. I want to keep an eye on the time. When you have a politician in front of a microphone, we have a bad habit of using up the time ahead of us.

My name is Brandy Payne. I am the MLA for Calgary-Acadia. Additionally, I live in that constituency. I'm very pleased for the opportunity to join you here today and to share my feedback, particularly on the constituency of Calgary-Acadia, though I do also want to take a moment and acknowledge that the commission has had a monumental task in front of them to balance all of those competing needs to come up with the best map possible for our province. I have not envied you this work, and I would like to truly thank you for the integrity and dedication that you've brought to this task.

With that in mind, speaking of the kind of competing interests, I think one of the key ones that is really important both as an MLA and as a citizen is the concept of equality of votes across our province. I think that that's something where the commission has done a remarkable job, trying to address the balance and fairness for the size of the ridings so that an Albertan has a similar weight of their vote regardless of where they live in our province. I think that that is just such an important, key point to our democracy.

Additionally, keeping together communities, be it communities of interest or geographical communities or community associations or community leagues, as they're called in Edmonton, that have formed together and maybe in some cases have two separate communities that are working together as one association. For example, in the current iteration of Calgary-Acadia we have Willow Park and Maple Ridge, that for eons have been the Willow Ridge Community Association. Keeping those two communities that work so closely together as part of one riding is really important. In fact, that is also acknowledged in some of the work that's been done with the redraw and some of the communities that are recommended to be added to Calgary-Acadia.

Another thing that I would note is that, you know, the Calgarians that I speak to and the folks I talk to in our riding talk a lot about the value of having an MLA who they recognize as being their MLA, having someone who's geographically proximate to them, and where it makes sense for those drawings of the map to exist.

1:15

I want to, for a moment, highlight one community in particular in the current iteration of Calgary-Acadia, and that is the community of Riverbend. Riverbend is across two major natural boundaries from the rest of Calgary-Acadia. It's on the other side of Deerfoot Trail as well as the Bow River. It's hard to think of larger geographical boundaries in our city, so I wanted to commend the commission for the decision to move that community to one that is more geographically proximate to its neighbouring communities. I have been honoured to serve the residents of Riverbend and look

forward to continuing to do so until the next election. However, I think that this is an unusual holdover from previous commissions, so I wanted to take a moment to commend you for addressing that as you adjusted the map.

Likewise, the proposed boundary brings together the community of Southwood, which had been separated because two streets of the community are north of Elbow Drive. The community association and community residents of Southwood have been represented by two separate MLAs for some time, which is confusing, to say the least. Frankly, when I'm at a community event in Southwood, I shouldn't be wondering which side of the street someone lives on while I'm talking with them. I should be there talking to them and hearing their concerns. So I wanted to say thank you for that.

I wanted to also say that, overall, the changes to Calgary-Acadia make a lot of sense, fitting in with the priorities set out by the legislation as well as the commission and bringing in new communities to the riding that are similar in character and feel and history and demographics to the existing parts of the riding, so thanks for that.

Two points that I'd like to focus on with my remaining time, though, speak a little bit more to that piece of the quotient in equity, and the second point is around growth projections. Very quickly around the quotient, I recognize that balancing the voters is very important, but ensuring there's that consistent application across the province is, I think, really key. Looking at the map of Calgary right now, seeing the variance in percentages, we have some that will be minus 14 per cent and others that will be as high as, I think, plus 8 per cent. That looks like the highest. While I recognize that those are intended to take into account the growth that is coming, I am concerned that in 2019 the vote of a voter who lives in Calgary-Acadia will not be weighted in the same way as a voter who lives in Calgary-North East or Calgary-South East. Frankly, I, as the MLA who represents the citizens of Calgary-Acadia, am concerned about the equity that comes with this current redrawing.

Dovetailing into my point about growth projections, I recognize that the commission is trying to solve the current problem of the imbalance across the ridings as they currently exist. My fear is that we're looking at growth projections too much in the drawing of the boundaries, that the commission may be overcorrecting the problem. As I said, we do have an election coming up in about two years, and that election and the subsequent election and any others that happen in the intervening decade-ish of time – that's not quite the number – are ones that will be based on this.

Frankly, as a lifelong Calgarian I have seen our city have projected growth that craters when our economy has a rough point. Certainly, if one was to have looked at the projected growth for our city in 2014 versus our actual growth in 2015 and 2016 during the recession, one would find a massive slowdown in the influx of population. I think that given that the economy is so far out of all of our hands in terms of what the price of oil does, it is a concerning precedent to be setting to project what might be happening with the economy.

Additionally, in Calgary we often see that development is delayed by many years or cut in half from what it is projected to be based on changes to the economy, so I would really encourage the commission, as you are considering projected population, to look very carefully and closely at the city's projected populations based on development permits that have been received and avoid predicting too far beyond development permits that have already been filed. If someone has not yet filed a development permit for a high-rise building, they are not likely to begin the construction or complete the construction of said building during the mandate of this commission's report.

The Chair: And have you brought information as to what development permits have been issued?

Ms Payne: Yes. I do not have the list of development permits, but what I have brought, that I think is helpful – and I brought the copies for the communities that are in the projected and future riding, but I would refer the commission to the city of Calgary community profiles. It's a great source of demographic information, but additionally, as you click on each individual community, it has these very handy charts that predict the population growth. Now, it is based on 2014 – that was when these were put together – so it is a little bit dated. However, there is information going on to 2042, which would, then, I think help to support some of that information and give a little bit of an idea.

The Chair: That's building permits issued?

Ms Payne: No. This is around the population projections done by the city of Calgary, which take into account planned development as well as any of the planning that the city does, which, of course, ties into that issue. Certainly, I think that's a helpful bit of information to take into account as you're moving forward with your deliberations.

The Chair: Would you like to have us take that into account?

Ms Payne: Yeah. I'll be tabling this with you.

The Chair: Okay.

Ms Payne: As well, I also brought from the Community Planning Association of Alberta's website – I've got the URL written out here for you – Planning for Growth at the City of Calgary, which was presented at the CPAA conference on April 15, 2015. It is a 52-page slide show, but I would recommend to the commission the latter half, which goes through priority populations and areas as well as some of the growth index expected for the city. I will leave those with you for your information.

The other piece that I would say relates to that is that, you know, you did mention in your opening remarks the projected density, and I wanted to add that higher density buildings have a larger impact on population growth than single-family units. I know that that's a really obvious statement to make. However, speaking specifically of the community of Manchester, that's in my riding, we're referring to neighbouring communities such as the East Village in Calgary. A high-rise tower being built in any of those communities is going to have a much larger increase in the population change than a similar footprint or, in fact, entire communities being planned for parts of southeast Calgary, and a number of those have cranes on the ground at the moment. I'm sure that the commission has considered some of that as you've moved forward with your deliberations, but I just really wanted to take a moment to highlight the importance of working with the data that's publicly available through the city's websites when considering population growth.

That, I think, has taken me towards the end of my time. I'm happy to answer any questions or, at the very least, stop talking.

The Chair: Thank you.

I'll just turn to my panellists and see if they have any questions. Mr. McLeod?

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

The Chair: Mrs. Day? Ms Livingstone?

Ms Livingstone: Not a question, but just if it makes you feel any better, I think the words “growth projections” have been used, and that’s really, probably, not an exact description of the process we used. We were looking at the rates, generally, of change since the last boundaries were set as well as the communities that are already, you know, there, named, marked on a map, shovels in the ground. So it was less about anything the cities had produced with sort of decades into the future. It was things more like: we know stuff is happening in the East Village, and we know that the community of Livingston on the north end of the city, literally on a day-by-day basis, has more and more people pouring into it. So it’s less of that long term and more of where we sort of know stuff is already on the move.

Ms Payne: Wonderful. And just kind of dovetailing with that, I would like to say, you know, that ultimately it’s hard to predict, and I think that everyone in this room is very hopeful that the Calgary economic growth continues on the progression it started and that perhaps it will even outpace what we are anticipating at this point because our province is being so successful.

The Chair: Ms Munn, do you have any questions?

Ms Munn: I have no questions. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you so much.

Ms Payne: Now, whom shall I leave these with?

The Chair: Mr. McLeod is being our registrar; we’ve decided to call him that.

Ms Payne: Thank you. It’s good to have someone in that role.

Mr. McLeod: Well, it’s better than some of the things you call me.

Ms Payne: Thank you so much for your time.

The Chair: All right. Thank you.

Our next registered speaker is David Hartwick.

1:25

Mr. Hartwick: I have copies of what I’m going to say. Would you like that in advance?

The Chair: Yes, please. Thanks.

Mr. Hartwick: Good afternoon. My name is David Hartwick. I’m the first vice-president for the Northern Hills Community Association, the largest community association in Alberta, with about 57,000 people. The north-central Calgary area, as you recognized, is fast growing. We’re comprised of Coventry Hills, Country Hills, Panorama Hills, Country Hills Village, Harvest Hills, Evanston, Kincora, Sage Hill, and Hidden Valley. We have natural boundaries, the Deerfoot Trail and Shaganappi Trail; we’re north of Beddington Trail, Country Hills Boulevard; and our combined population for north-central Calgary is a hundred thousand people.

We have no public high school, no urgent-care clinic even though land was purchased in 2005, no community health centre, youth services, lab services, or senior services. Vivo for Healthier Generations is the smallest facility of its kind in Calgary with the largest catchment area, now up to 150,000 people, and is overdue for expansion. As you know recently, we also have no LRT coming, and transit service is poor in some areas. Schools are needed in these communities. Some are as old as 25 years and without a school. An interchange needs completion connecting Panorama

Hills, Evanston, and Carrington to Stoney Trail. It was partially built 10 years ago and still hasn’t been completed.

For us, we looked at the mandate and the factors to consider: common community interests and community organizations. The Northern Hills communities all fall within the boundaries of the Northern Hills Community Association, being Coventry Hills, Country Hills Village, Harvest Hills, Panorama Hills, and Country Hills. The Calgary-Northern Hills constituency, however, also includes Hanson Ranch, which is actually part of Hidden Valley. Our recreation centre, Vivo, sits in the middle of these communities, as do our shopping centres, our transit hub, our health centre site, our own office, and our Catholic high school.

The existing community boundaries within the cities of Edmonton and Calgary are to be considered, and these boundaries already exist as Northern Hills and as the constituency of Calgary-Northern Hills. In fact, the city of Calgary is just coming through with a change in this fall’s election where they’re going to move the boundaries west of Deerfoot Trail. This was a proposal originally made in 2009, recognizing that the needs west of Deerfoot are very different than the needs east of Deerfoot. So ward 3 will now move and will include the Northern Hills communities and Hidden Valley.

In the report it says that the majority of the commission chose the recommendation to create “only one additional electoral division in Calgary, 26 in total. That choice was made to respect the legal requirement that municipal boundaries be respected.” We understand that blended constituencies were an option, but for a lot of us, Airdrie is closer to us than east Calgary is. That’s where we go for lab services, diagnostic services, even restaurants.

Geographical features, including road systems. There are many features separating the north-central part of Calgary from the communities east of Deerfoot. Not only is Deerfoot a major divider; so are Nose Creek, Stoney industrial park, and the airport, separating Country Hills and Harvest Hills by 40 blocks from the next closest community in Calgary-North East. To the south Beddington Trail and Nose Creek as well as a vehicle trap divide us from the communities and easy access to the south. To the west Beddington Trail and Shaganappi Trail are both major road system dividers.

There’s also the desirability of understandable and clear boundaries. As mentioned, the roadways and natural geographic features provide simple, understandable, and clear boundaries. We believe designated boundaries across Deerfoot Trail or Beddington Boulevard go against this and the former mentioned criteria in the mandate.

We presented to the last commission to create Calgary-Northern Hills. During that commission meeting we argued the benefits of having our own district. We were used to being underrepresented, and we believed that having our own district and MLA could provide us a stronger voice. The commission agreed. Many of us still feel that way. With the average districts in Calgary having 47,661 people, keeping Calgary-Northern Hills without Hanson Ranch puts us right about the 25 per cent or slightly under.

We also recognize that this dilutes our voting power or fair representation, but it might be more favourable than the destruction of Calgary-Northern Hills, as you’ve proposed, in the three districts. The Northern Hills communities need to be grouped with other communities with similar needs in north-central Calgary. We do not believe there is a need across the geographical boundaries to the south or to the east.

Designating Coventry Hills and Harvest Hills to Calgary-North East makes no sense to us. It creates confusion, that we finally resolved at a municipal level and with the creation of Calgary-Northern Hills seven years ago. Our recreation centre, Vivo,

desperately needs expansion, and we're still hopeful for a north green line LRT. However, if Harvest Hills and Coventry Hills are represented with communities east of Deerfoot that already have LRT, a brand new high school, and a newer recreation facility as focal points, it may be difficult to engage an MLA to represent our needs or to argue for another high school within the district.

The interim report, in defining the Calgary-North district, states that because most of the communities bearing the Hills name have been moved to the electoral division of Calgary-North East, the name of the constituency should change to Calgary-North. However, Panorama Hills represents over 25,000 people in the hills, and Country Hills is not being moved to Calgary-North East. The Calgary-North East explanation does not provide any logic in moving Coventry Hills, Country Hills Village, and Harvest Hills into a district where other closest communities are actually further away than Balzac.

Designating Country Hills to Calgary-Beddington abandons this community. For the last seven years Country Hills was designated to ward 4 municipally and was essentially ignored. The ward 3 councillor addressed all issues and concerns of the Northern Hills Community Association to do with Country Hills. As of this October's election Country Hills is being relocated into ward 3 with the rest of Northern Hills. In addition, the 3,829 people of Country Hills that contribute to the proposed Calgary-Beddington district exceed the average by 8 per cent, so they're not even needed there.

The interim report recommendations will strain the resources of our community association, a volunteer organization having to work with three different MLAs, with so many different, pressing needs. We also need to provide space in our newsletter for each, and we have three MLAs we have to accommodate at our monthly meetings. The workload this would put on our organization is significant, particularly if none of the MLAs lives near our community or has an office nearby.

There's very limited office space in north-central Calgary, so it would be quite likely that our MLAs will not be near the community or easily accessible. Each director that needs to meet with an MLA will instead now have to meet three MLAs in three different offices in different parts of the city. How does this meet the mandate? Last week, as an example, was the Calgary Stampede. The MLA for Calgary-Northern Hills hosted a Stampede breakfast. Based on the interim report a Calgary-North East MLA would have to hold two different events or ignore half their district. This clearly fails to meet the mandate.

I've included in your copy three different recommendations. They're my personal recommendations. Our board has not approved them, but they are considerations that you can take into account when you're looking at this.

The Chair: And what are they?

Mr. Hartwick: One is to leave Calgary-Northern Hills as it is except for taking out the community of Hanson Ranch, which actually falls under the Hidden Valley Community Association. That takes about 2,700 people out of the Northern Hills district.

One is to adjust north-central Calgary into two districts, one being Country Hills Village, Coventry Hills, Harvest Hills, Livingston, Carrington, and Evanston, which would be 41,998 people, which accommodates the growth in Livingston and Carrington, which are currently under development. Another is Panorama Hills, Country Hills, and Hidden Valley, with a total of 41,427, or if it helps the numbers more, add Kincora to that for a total of 47,593.

The other proposal that I came up with was the district of Livingston, Coventry Hills, Country Hills Village, Harvest Hills,

Country Hills, and Hidden Valley, which is a total of 43,432 and also provides for the growth that's coming in Harvest Hills. The other one is Panorama Hills, Carrington, and Evanston, for 39,993, which allows, again, for the growth in Carrington. Adding Kincora makes it 46,159, which is almost exactly your number.

The Chair: All right. If I may ask a question, do these proposals, these three ideas, take into account all of the land in Northern Hills right up to the Deerfoot? Does it go as far east as the Deerfoot?

Mr. Hartwick: Northern Hills is considered to go as far east as the Deerfoot. It's all industrial land to the east of Coventry Hills.

The Chair: Sure. So it takes in part of our proposed Calgary-North East riding, the new riding we've added to Calgary.

Mr. Hartwick: Yes.

The Chair: Right. So if we accepted one of your proposals, are you suggesting, then, that we just not have that additional riding in Calgary, that you maintain your 25 ridings rather than the recommended 26?

1:35

Mr. Hartwick: Oh, I think that there's still a need for 26.

The Chair: Okay. So how do you handle the fact that Calgary-North East, then, would be below the legal limit of population size if you took out what you're suggesting and didn't put anything back in?

Mr. Hartwick: I haven't looked at the other districts on the east side of Deerfoot Trail and the population distribution there because my focus was the north-central part of Calgary, where there are 100,000 people with a lot of need right now.

The Chair: Sure. But you appreciate that this is a puzzle that has to add up to 100 per cent. If we make changes in one constituency, it has a ripple effect over all of the other constituencies, potentially, in the province because we're looking at the city of Calgary and not crossing boundaries. So any modification to one boundary affects 26 other constituencies' boundaries.

Mr. Hartwick: I recognize that.

The Chair: I'm just saying – I'm really preaching, and I'm using you as my platform – that it would have been helpful if you'd brought a map showing how you would have dealt with the impact on other constituencies.

Mr. Hartwick: We actually have a high school committee now with over 200 members, because we're that left behind by the province, that will be doing a presentation at the 7 o'clock session, and they've actually redesigned the entire city.

The Chair: All right. This evening, maps. Thanks very much.

Mr. McLeod, any questions?

Mr. McLeod: The future growth, though: when I look at Calgary-North as we're proposing here and Calgary-North East, there was a reason that we left them at minus 16 and minus 14. I mean, the previous speaker talked about building permits. Anybody driving in those areas can see that the streets are there, the houses are going in, and it's going to be continuous. That's why it was part of this. Do you see a slowdown, though, from what is currently shovel in the ground in your area?

Mr. Hartwick: We've actually seen a slowdown. Harvest Hills golf course was approved for redevelopment last year, and they were expecting to open up their first show home next month. They're not even close. The development there has pretty much stalled. We don't know if that's the economy. They told us that they would build as fast as people were interested, and we don't know if that interest has waned.

Looking to Carrington and Livingston to the north, they're definitely still growing, and they are building. We've recognized that there are another 60,000 people there. What may not have been taken into account is that just north of Evanston and Kincora is Glacier Ridge, which has also been now approved for another 58,000 people.

To us, it's pertinent that north-central Calgary stay together in two or three districts because we all have the same issues and the same concerns. Deerfoot really does separate us by half a city. We don't go to those parts of the northeast for anything, and I think an MLA will be extremely strained trying to cover the two sides of Deerfoot when there are 40 blocks in between any residences.

Mr. McLeod: But you did state earlier that you have a tendency to go more to Airdrie than others for your services.

Mr. Hartwick: Yeah. In fact, if you go on Airdrie's website, it will actually tell you that 50 per cent of their population growth comes from north Calgary. Because we got so tired of having to go to Airdrie for basic services, a lot of us moved there.

The Chair: Are you suggesting that we tie Northern Hills in with Airdrie as a blended constituency?

Mr. Hartwick: I'm not saying that. I'm just saying that east of Deerfoot I think the strain is so much. In particular, dividing us into three districts provides so much strain on our organization.

Ms Munn: I understand that, but to pick a hot-button issue in Northern Hills, the fact that for 25 years there should have been a high school there, and there's no high school there: we're not talking about one particular government's lack of attention. With one MLA that hasn't been able to happen. Do you think that with three MLAs it might be put higher on the priority list?

Mr. Hartwick: We discussed this quite a bit, and the answer is no.

Ms Munn: Why is that?

Mr. Hartwick: I'll give you the best example of how we are today. There's a high school site directly north of Coventry Hills on Stoney Trail that sits up on the hill. Ironically, our high school sits right on the south side. They are less than a kilometre apart, but those are the two proposed schools. When we look at Seton high school being approved this past year, with a population of zero, and the people in McKenzie Towne, who have fought for 20 years for a high school, not being able to go to that high school, we see the same in our future. Our high school is on the list. It's on the list to be approved this year. However, the province has no money. Our fear is that if it doesn't get approved before the new capital plan comes out in March, we'll be battling to get it back on the list over another high school such as the one proposed for Livingston.

Having three MLAs, if none of our MLAs actually lived near our district, which is possible in this plan – we could have one that lives, say, in Huntington, where they already have a high school that meets all their needs. We could have one that lives somewhere over east of Deerfoot, where they have a brand new high school, and we could have one that lives out in Evanston or Kincora or Sage Hill

who wants to get the one built in Livingston because that benefits their kids. Our kids will never get to go to it.

For me, right now my kids bus all the way to Crescent Heights, which is downtown. It's about a 50-minute ride each way. They actually pass two other high schools in order to get to that high school. That's how big the population is up north and how much the need is, but I think three MLAs are going to have the same problem in that they're competing against each other for who gets the high school. Ultimately, because two out of the three would already have high schools in their district, they wouldn't have the same fight, particularly when they only have a small portion of their representation living within those districts.

The Chair: Okay. Ms Livingstone.

Ms Livingstone: Just one question. You've done some projections here. What was your data source for the population numbers?

Mr. Hartwick: I used the city of Calgary's census. I tried to get into the federal census for their numbers, and it was very difficult to find by neighbourhood, so I used the city of Calgary's census.

Ms Livingstone: Yeah. We have to use the federal one. I can tell you, from different experiments that we've run, that they don't always line up as well, so don't presume, if we can't accept your suggestions, that it's because we're ignoring them. The numbers are not always the same when you look at the municipal and the federal.

Mr. Hartwick: Yeah. We recognize that in keeping Calgary-Northern Hills as is, that is a possibility because the numbers may be different. But we do feel that three districts is absolutely unacceptable. It puts so much strain on our volunteer organization.

Ms Livingstone: Yeah. I understand that, but as Justice Bielby said as well, we have to deal with the whole city. Where you are now, Northern Hills is 28 per cent above. That's an illegal number. Mackay-Nose Hill is 11 per cent above. McCall is 38 per cent above. Foothills is 16 per cent above. Across that whole piece movement has to happen. That's the issue that we face, that we have to deal with the whole city.

Mr. Hartwick: Right.

The Chair: Mrs. Day, any questions?

Mrs. Day: I'm just interested in listening to you on having three MLAs as opposed to having one MLA. We've heard this across the province, and the opinion of many people is: if we have two MLAs, we have half of one; we'd rather have just one whole MLA. You're stating the same. It's an interesting thing because at first glance you think: well, I have three voices now in the Leg; it's better than one. It's interesting to hear you articulate in the way you have.

Mr. Hartwick: We did consider that.

Mrs. Day: Yeah. It is something to really think hard about. We've talked a lot about it.

The other thing I'm hearing you say. Again, you heard the MLA before you zealously speak about voter parity and the importance of that. What I'm hearing you say is: if we're left way under, we're okay with having a lighter weight to our vote in order to have our community stay whole.

Mr. Hartwick: That's my personal opinion. We've discussed it at the board. We didn't approve one way or the other, but we talked a lot about voter disparity and what that meant and how it looked. We

recognize that there may be a benefit to having a second MLA. It would be, “How is that divided?” which is why I’ve provided some personal ideas on how that could be done. But with three MLAs we don’t see anything other than a lot of work for us as a volunteer organization.

Mrs. Day: Just to be clear, what we’re looking for is: how do we provide what the Charter of Rights tells us? That’s effective representation for each person, not voter parity, not ease of access or work. How do we give effective representation? What you’re saying to me is that not only does it increase the workload, which – I’m sympathetic to your organization, but are you saying that your area will not be effectively represented, if we divide it the way it is, by their MLAs?

Mr. Hartwick: My personal feeling is that, no, it won’t because having three MLAs, with the potential that none of them actually live near Northern Hills, could cause a lot of difficulties for us in trying to make our points. Right now we have an MLA who gets it. He lives there. He breathes there. He plays there. He works there. He gets it. That’s been a huge change for us, having an MLA that actually lives within our district, who has to live it every day and sees what happens in our area.

1:45

Mrs. Day: So you can access him, and he can access you . . .

Mr. Hartwick: Correct.

Mrs. Day: . . . which leads to good, effective representation for your area, is what you’re saying.

Mr. Hartwick: Very much so.

Mrs. Day: Thank you.

The Chair: Any further questions? Anybody?
Okay. Thanks so much.

Mr. Hartwick: Thank you.

The Chair: All right. Our next registered speaker is Nancy Janovicek.

Ms Janovicek: Hi. Thank you. My name is Nancy Janovicek. I’m a constituent of Calgary-Fort, and I’m a Ramsay resident. We call ourselves Ramsayites. I’ll also let you know that I’m the president of the Calgary-Fort NDP EDA.

I want to begin by thanking the commission for its work and for this opportunity to provide feedback on the interim report. I also want to take a moment to commend your goals. I especially want to commend your goal to amalgamate the First Nations and Métis communities into constituencies of community interest to increase their political influence. I want to commend your goal to make population equality your primary goal as well, and I also want to commend your attempts to keep communities of interest together.

I have some feedback on the changes that you’ve proposed. I suppose it’s no surprise that I’m a little bit concerned about the proposal to divide Calgary-Fort into three different places. The proposed changes to Calgary-Fort kind of divide what I see as an affinity between southeastern Calgary communities that are bounded by the rivers. I also feel like they’re out of sync with the recent municipal changes that have gone on at the municipal level. I know that that’s not part of it, but I want to speak to that as part of an argument about thinking about communities of interest and why I see these as communities of interest.

In the report there’s a proposal to move Ramsay, Inglewood, and the East Village into Calgary-Buffalo. The argument there is that that brings the riding in line with the proposed changes that are going on. I also kind of see it as something that kind of puts my provincial riding in line with what’s going on with my federal riding, but not exactly. I know that’s not how you were thinking about the boundaries, but as somebody who lives in those communities, the provincial riding of Calgary-Fort has always made more sense to me because it’s more in line with ward 9, which is where I live municipally, because, as I said earlier, it brings together those east Calgary communities. These are east Calgary communities that have historically had sort of this light industrial and working class foundation in their histories. I see the communities of Calgary-Fort in some ways having more in common with a lot of those communities and older communities east of the Deerfoot that we’re currently connected to.

The recent changes to the municipal ward boundaries were a very deliberate effort to bring together Ramsay and Inglewood with the greater Forest Lawn communities, and it confirms my sense that we have more in common with those communities than we have with those north of the Elbow. The rationale in those negotiations at the municipal level was that it was very important to keep these communities together because of the municipal revitalization plans in the southeast. Now, I also understand and realize that population equality is your primary goal. I want to think about the communities of interest and projected populations which, you know, are difficult to project, but I want to make a case for how effective representation of these southeast Calgary communities that are in transition needs a united voice of the constituents at the provincial and municipal levels. It’s particularly important right now.

From my perspective we should be returning as close as we can to the boundary from 2010. There are a lot of natural boundaries that went into those decisions that worked really well. There are others that we could use to keep alike communities together. There’s the Bow to the northwest and the Glenmore to the south and the Elbow River between East Village and Ramsay-Inglewood. With the rivers in mind it doesn’t make sense to include Riverbend in this constituency given that including it would also cross a natural boundary. I think that Riverbend should probably be grouped with communities further south.

As for communities that should be in Calgary-Fort, there are some natural groupings throughout Calgary-Fort that exist today. I live in Ramsay, and I know that Ramsay and Inglewood are very common communities, you know, that are at the convergence of the Bow and Elbow rivers. There are obvious choices to keep those communities together, but I’d make a case for keeping them in a community that’s connected to other southeastern communities. There’s a lot in common with those communities as the original town. We have a connection to the railroad historically and today, and we have a commitment to heritage and fostering local entrepreneurship. We’re also very much committed to revitalization, not gentrification.

The rationale in the report to move Ramsay and Inglewood with the East Village is to connect those eastern downtown communities. My understanding is that it’s based on the argument of one presenter who argued that it would fit into traffic patterns, and that’s true. But as a resident I think it ignores the connections that we have with those Forest Lawn communities. I know that Deerfoot is being considered a boundary here, but I think that with the connectivity that the revitalization of Forest Lawn is trying to make, it’s deliberately trying to make those communities more connected to Ramsay and Inglewood, and that includes bike and foot traffic as well.

Also, the revitalization that's going on right now on International Avenue makes me question the rationale of, you know, the way that a 12 per cent increase above the average population would work. The rationale was based on the assumption that the populations of these communities will decrease. Given what city plans are and what's going on there, my understanding is that there's a hope that those will be revitalized and that the density will increase in those areas as well.

I'm out of time, so I'm going to stop there.

The Chair: Okay. Thanks very much.

Mrs. Day, any questions?

Mrs. Day: First of all, I'm looking at a map of what the proposals are, and you said Calgary-Fort. I don't have Calgary-Fort on here. What are we talking about, Acadia?

Ms Janovicek: No. Calgary-Fort would become – I'm sorry; I should have said that at the beginning.

Mrs. Day: Sorry.

Ms Janovicek: Ramsay-Inglewood goes into Calgary-Buffalo, and then it's the proposed new ridings of Calgary-Forest and Calgary-Peigan. Sorry. I should have said that at the beginning.

Mrs. Day: Okay. Thank you. I didn't have both to compare to. I knew there was a Calgary-Fort, but I just wasn't really catching up. Thank you. That helps clarify what I thought you were talking about.

Mr. McLeod: We sort of had a discussion this morning about whether or not the communities of Ramsay and Inglewood actually belong with East Village in that whole kind of spread. There was a person that put forward an argument that there was a quality of residence that's different. I personally took exception to that because I also own a house in Inglewood, so I went, you know: I don't care. But I argue that it's a better flow because of, just as you said, along 9th Avenue there, how it's changing, how the new boutiques and things are changing there. I thought it was a better fit, and it seemed to work for us while the Forest Lawn area and the Deerfoot Trail and kind of that break seemed to fit a lot better when we were designing this. But you're giving us a different argument, and I'm impressed.

Ms Janovicek: I mean, I think I agree with you. I would argue against that there's a different quality of life in East Village. I see East Village as being something very different from Ramsay and Inglewood because it's a new community. It's a new community that is going up, and it doesn't have that traditional, historical kind of heritage importance to it. I'm not saying, and I hope I didn't – I know that there is a flow between Ramsay and Inglewood and going into the East Village, but I also think that for me and the people who I know and talk to, there's a flow that goes to those east Calgary communities as well.

I guess for me as a Ramsay resident, I was going to talk about the alignment of the green line, but I ran out of time. As you know, that was a pretty heated issue for us in Ramsay when there was a proposal that the train was going to go right through our community. I guess for me it brought me more in line with those communities, you know, east of the river. I didn't feel like I had much in common with those communities in the Beltline who thought, "Well, this is better for downtown, so Ramsay can lose a chunk of houses and be divided because this works better for us," whereas I felt Inglewood certainly coming together. I mean, that's

just my perception in terms of where I connect and where a lot of my neighbours feel like they're connecting.

1:55

I'm not saying that we don't have a connection to Mission. Of course I use those amenities, et cetera. But I see in the types of revitalization that are going on that we're very strongly committed in those discussions that we've had about the green line and the alignment of the green line as it goes through Ramsay, or around Ramsay now, thankfully, and then further south and connects to Ogden and Lynnwood, kind of bringing in those communities, which are also historic communities. You know, we've been very concerned about thinking what that transit-oriented development would look like and to ensure that it kind of still is in line with our values of a revitalization that still makes space for that working-class heritage and also space for those artistic communities and for the kinds of diversity that we want to see, which is, you know, making sure we have economic diversity as well. I mean, that's my personal opinion as somebody who is engaged there.

Mr. McLeod: Yeah, but I also see there that, when you talk about revitalization, nothing against the Forest Lawn area, but in Inglewood and Ramsay it seems to be a little more ahead than theirs are. Theirs is going. I can see that. You can see that by driving up 17th Avenue, International Avenue, as you call it. You can see it, but it's occurring faster where you are.

Ms Janovicek: I mean, I think it's already happened. I think we'd be a good anchor and example for what could happen in Forest Lawn. Like, I would like to make sure that Forest Lawn still remains a place that, you know, people – it's a new-Canadian stronghold, right? It's a place where people come to Calgary and stuff. So I would like to make sure that revitalization kind of is more in line. I see a distinction between revitalization and gentrification, right? We've tried to keep that economic diversity, and I think that we could be an anchor for that and, you know, those communities would be more in line.

The Chair: I haven't called time yet, but we have a full slate for the rest of the afternoon, so I think I'm going to have to bring this conversation to an end.

Ms Janovicek: Yeah. Okay.

The Chair: But thanks very much for your suggestions and an interesting new thought, for sure.

Our next registered speaker is Graham Sucha.

Mr. Sucha: Well, good afternoon, Madam Chair and the commission members. Thank you for having me here. My name is Graham Sucha. I currently reside in and represent the constituency of Calgary-Shaw as an MLA. It's my pleasure to appear in front of the commission. You know, I always had a very strong interest in politics even before I took this job, so I've been watching the developments of the interim reports and the submissions very closely. I'm going to be very honest with the commission members as I'm a little bit saddened by what I'm seeing from the changes to the Calgary-Shaw constituency. It's been an honour representing that area for the last two years. There are a lot of great organizations and communities and people within that existing area. However, I do understand what the commission is faced with with regard to balancing population across the province and in southern Alberta and creating new ridings because of that.

I'm going to put those feelings aside and take a moment to talk about a couple of communities of interest that I serve within the

boundary changes and also bring forward some information that, as I've dug deeper into this, may relate to population changes as well. I'll kind of first open up with the population changes. To be honest, something that I overlooked and anticipated without looking at proper data or facts myself when I sent in my original recommendation was that they forecasted for the community of Providence – I'm speaking within the relation of the Calgary-Lougheed constituency. It's that southwest chunk that sticks out to the city there. I think for a while we've been forecasting that there is going to be population growth there within the next few years.

Within some reports that I have from the city of Calgary as well as some maps, which I will table to the commission – as well, I'll send a digital copy because unfortunately it is black and white, and there is some colour coding to it. I will submit a copy to the clerk so you have the original documents there, too, but it is publicly available. From what I've seen in that area, there is likely not going to be any population growth before the next mandate, before the commission is re-established in eight years' time.

The Chair: This is in the chunk of Calgary-Lougheed that sticks out to the east?

Mr. Sucha: That is correct. Yes.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Sucha: You know, you can see that through these reports that come from the city of Calgary and which I'll provide for you as well. It's also seen from recent developments that have come from infrastructure builds that the province of Alberta has committed to. The city of Calgary will never develop a community without thorough access in and out of that community. With the ring road five years out and with the commitments in the southeast part of Calgary of one 212th interchange as well as the 196th interchange into Silverado, we're going to likely see significant developments in that, and these reports can kind of show that likely occurring as well.

The other thing, too, is that having recently done a lot of tours of that area and having visited the ring road area, I can tell you right now that if you go down to that area of Lougheed, it's still a canola field. There has not been any preliminary work done to that area to predevelop it, showing that even if development was to start, considering that they would have to take waterways into consideration and establish utility lines, we are several years out before they can even get started on any new houses in that area.

Also, as sort of side commentary, I was driving in here today, and a CBC report just talked about how Auburn Bay and Seton are the fastest growing communities, some seeing a growth of 5,000 to 10,000 people per year, which I think also speaks to the fact that we seem to be growing more southeast now.

The other area that I'll bring forward, as I've discussed and I think the gentleman who came up before from Calgary-Northern Hills spoke about: Mrs. Day, you sort of reiterated about effective representation. One thing I have to applaud the commission for doing is establishing Macleod Trail as a natural boundary for the way it is. As saddened as I am to see the riding split up, we often joke around: on the other side of the tracks. The only reason I can effectively represent both sides of that is because for a long time I lived in the community of Millrise. My kids go to school in the community of Shawnessy, so I'm in that area quite a bit. However, my office is on the other side in the community of Midnapore.

To be completely honest, one of the recommendations that I've made – and I would really, you know, encourage the commission to look into this – is on how the communities of Somerset and

Bridlewood are split between the existing Calgary-Shaw and Calgary-Lougheed as well as ...

The Chair: Somerset and?

Mr. Sucha: ... Bridlewood. Your proposed reconfiguration would split up the communities of Shawnessy and Millrise, which work very closely together as well. The elementary school for the community of Millrise is the one that is in Shawnessy, and the community of Evergreen works very collaboratively with Bridlewood and Somerset.

One thing that has taken me aback in the last little while being in the community and also working within the office is that it's not uncommon as the member to receive just as many calls from Bridlewood, which is a community I don't represent, as Somerset, which is a community I do. There's a lot of confusion just from the way the community associations work to the newsletters that are issued through the public, and I think it's important that people have certainty of who their elected representatives are and that they're being effectively represented. Looking at shared schools as well as shared community associations and even looking at the shopping districts, as has been pre-eluded to, you know, it's a community hub in that little area. I think that it would be appropriate, especially looking within the population and the fact that we might not see as much growth as we originally were anticipating in those areas – I think the commission likely anticipated when they were drawing up these maps that we were to include those areas for common representation as well.

The Chair: If I can interrupt, because I don't want to lose your point here.

Mr. Sucha: Yeah. Absolutely.

The Chair: Do you have a map suggesting the constituency boundaries that you would like the commission to adopt instead of the ones we have adopted for your area?

Mr. Sucha: I do not have a map, but I can speak to what I think may be effective.

The Chair: You get to meet our magic green pen.

Mr. Sucha: Oh, nice.

The Chair: If you wouldn't mind coming up and redrawing the map on page 124 of my copy of the interim report to what you suggest it should look like.

Mr. Sucha: It's a little bit difficult because you cut off ...

The Chair: Well, just sketch it. It's just more of an aid for us when we get down to deliberations.

Ms Livingstone: Calgary-Lougheed is on page 118.

Mr. Sucha: Yeah. Can I actually use Calgary-Lougheed?

The Chair: Yeah.

Okay. Which part of this would be Calgary-Lougheed, and which part would be Calgary-Shaw?

Mr. Sucha: This would be Calgary-Lougheed, and then we'd move Calgary-Shaw down to this one.

The Chair: Okay. Could you write Calgary-Shaw down here? Okay. Thanks. All right.

2:05

Mr. Sucha: Just for the record, to allow those who are tuning in through the audio, to speak to what I'm proposing here, highway 22X is a natural boundary. It's going to be the new ring road that will be developed within the five-year span, and it is a very natural boundary. Macleod Trail to the east would be a natural boundary, city limits to the west, and then likely looking towards, in order to keep you within the quotient of population, James McKevitt Road and Fish Creek Boulevard as the north boundary.

You know, whenever I have my interactions with constituents outside of my constituency, it tends to be within that pocket of space, because we see the way community associations work together, the collaboration. Also, community associations in Calgary have changed over the years and now have to work together just because of the limited resources and volunteers.

The Chair: I'm back. Still on the map.

Mr. Sucha: Yeah. Sorry.

The Chair: Do you know how many people currently residing in our proposed Calgary-Lougheed would be moved into Calgary-Shaw if we accepted your submission?

Mr. Sucha: Actually, what I'm probably speaking to is that those residents in Calgary-Shaw are moved into Calgary-Lougheed.

The Chair: How many people should be moved out of Calgary-Shaw into Calgary-Lougheed?

Mr. Sucha: I would anticipate that you're looking at about 10,000, but I don't have the exact number for that.

The Chair: That would be 22 per cent, 24 per cent above the provincial average, so you would pop Calgary-Lougheed into illegal territory with that.

Mr. Sucha: You would offset that by removing Shawnee Slopes.

The Chair: And how many in Shawnee Slopes?

Mr. Sucha: I believe that community is sitting around 5,000.

The Chair: Where would it go?

Mr. Sucha: You could look at offsetting that within Calgary-Fish Creek as a potential. In Calgary-Fish Creek right now you're not going to be seeing a lot of growth within that area, but there is more potentially north within Calgary-Glenmore. It really is to the commission – it would be hard for me to redraw the entire map of Calgary. I recognize this is a challenge.

The Chair: No, no. I appreciate that. But just in this little corner of the ones that are touching you, which is fair game, that would then make you, rather than 3 per cent below the provincial average, you'd be 13 per cent to 15 per cent below the provincial average. More than that, my colleague suggests.

Are you a high-growth area in Calgary-Shaw? I just heard about the canola fields and so forth.

Mr. Sucha: That south area, the Calgary-Shaw area: basically what I'm proposing for those communities that I spoke of is transferring them to Lougheed. The area of Calgary-Shaw there is basically – from what I'm seeing on your maps here, basically you can use the name as you want, but it's trying to offset the challenge you deal with in Calgary-South East and the population growth you have there. However you draw the boundary, I think, you know, you

would look at growth forecasts and the challenges you're dealing with in Calgary-South East, Calgary-Hays, and Calgary-Shaw and offset them accordingly.

The Chair: Are you a higher growth area than Calgary-Lougheed?

Mr. Sucha: The boundaries that I have as they stand?

The Chair: Our proposed boundaries. Would that leave Calgary-Shaw as a higher growth area than Calgary-Lougheed or about the same?

Mr. Sucha: A higher growth area than Calgary-Lougheed.

The Chair: Would your suggested change leave Calgary-Shaw as a higher growth area than Calgary-Lougheed?

Mr. Sucha: Yes.

The Chair: Thank you.
Any questions? Mr. MacLeod.

Mr. MacLeod: No, not on this one.

The Chair: Ms Livingstone.

Ms Livingstone: Yeah, I do. I actually live in the area, so I have some pretty in-depth knowledge, too. You commended us earlier on using Macleod Trail as a natural boundary, but then your suggestion is that we violate that boundary and add just the Shawnee Slopes people into Calgary-Fish Creek. Canyon Meadows Drive doesn't connect them, so they're almost pretty much a noncontiguous riding. They're not connected to anything else in Calgary-Fish Creek, so why is that a good idea?

Mr. Sucha: I think demographicwise Shawnee Slopes is starting to become an aged community. You see a lot of retirees, people who don't have established children in the area, and that's what you're starting to see north in Calgary-Fish Creek, an aged community. Right now the Calgary-Fish Creek boundaries as you have drawn there, because it does include Midnapore and Sundance, do cross the creek, and you spill into the south with those communities as well as from the north end of Deer Run. I think they actually meld together very well in what's existing as Calgary-Fish Creek because it is also an aging community, so the demographics are a lot different in that part of the communities versus what I'm proposing for Calgary-Lougheed, which is middle income, newer Canadians, and younger families as well.

Ms Livingstone: Okay. Yeah. I don't know if I completely agree with that characterization. There's, if I recall, a pretty big development, a high-density development going on in Shawnee Slopes, isn't there?

Mr. Sucha: That's correct.

Ms Livingstone: Okay.

Mr. Sucha: The challenge they're having with that one – and having worked very closely with the developer, there's been a huge amount of capital invested into those properties. Some of the areas are going to be sitting vacant for approximately eight years just because they're trying to get a return on their investment, and with the downturn in the economy they're having a hard time selling those lots.

Ms Livingstone: My last question. Where you've basically proposed taking Lougheed across highway 22X there, you've got

Silverado once again turning into an island, and then you've got the communities on the other side of Macleod Trail, the highway there. Because we ran some of these scenarios when we were trying to draw these, I know that that ends up with a population number that's probably way too low for us to use, and we'll probably have to cross the river. Do you think that's a better connection than people, like, in Silverado have to Shawnessy?

Mr. Sucha: I think when you start looking at some of the demographics that are down in that area and all of it being newer growth and newer developments and some of the new schools that are being established in those communities, you're going to see a lot of people starting to cross the river and cross the roads to use the amenities in Silverado and then later extend to Chaparral as well.

The Chair: Is there a bridge handy there?

Mr. Sucha: A bridge handy over the Bow River?

The Chair: Right at the point of Calgary-South East and Calgary-Shaw.

Mr. Sucha: Yeah. That would be Stoney Trail.

The Chair: Anything else?

Ms Livingstone: No.

The Chair: Ms Munn?

Ms Munn: No, I don't have any questions for you.

The Chair: All right. Thanks so much for coming along, and thanks for your interest in the work of the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

Mr. Sucha: Sorry if there was any confusion in the process. I thank you for your time.

The Chair: All right. Our next speakers are Don Ray and Alan McNaughton.

Dr. Ray: Hi. We just have some copies of our presentation.

The Chair: Thanks.

Dr. Ray: Okay. This is a copy of the map with our proposed, suggested changes.

The Chair: Terrific.

Mr. McNaughton: Would you like me to start?

The Chair: Just a sec, please.

Mr. McNaughton: Sure.

The Chair: Okay. Go ahead.

Mr. McNaughton: I'm Alan McNaughton, a resident of Calgary-Varsity, and I'm here on behalf of the Calgary-Varsity NDP electoral district association. First, we'd like to thank the members and staff of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for your work in examining the boundaries of the provincial ridings for this province and for publishing the interim report. We do understand that this is an extraordinarily difficult task, and we'd like to express our appreciation for this. Your work obviously sets the groundwork for democracy in Alberta.

Second, we'd like to make several brief comments about your suggested boundaries for Calgary-Varsity and ask you to consider certain changes. This is a summary of the commission's proposed changes to the existing Calgary-Varsity boundaries. You've added the community of Silver Springs; you've removed the western half of the community of Dalhousie; you've added the communities of Point McKay and Parkdale, and those come out of Mountain View; and you've removed the community of Montgomery and put it in a riding on the other side of the Bow River. You've added the communities of St. Andrews Heights, again from Mountain View, you've removed the community of Banff Trail and put it in Mountain View, and then you've added just the western half of the community of West Hillhurst. That's a description on a community basis.

2:15

We do believe that, as far as possible, it's desirable not to split communities within ridings. In your proposal two communities, Dalhousie and West Hillhurst, have been split such that only part of the community is within the constituency. Both of these communities have substantial and active community associations. For Dalhousie we propose that all of Dalhousie be kept within Calgary-Varsity. We propose for West Hillhurst that it remain within Calgary-Mountain View.

At this point my colleague Don Ray will present the rest.

The Chair: Thank you.

Dr. Ray: Okay. Thank you. Next we would suggest that areas having similar regional interests be grouped together as they have common interests. Thus, we suggest that the community of Montgomery be restored to Calgary-Varsity and that Point McKay and Parkdale be included in Calgary-Varsity. All share a common set of transportation and commercial networks on one side of the Bow River. As well, historically Montgomery has been part of Calgary-Varsity. The restoration and addition of these communities will bring Calgary-Varsity to well above the desired provincial population average if the commission's proposed addition of Silver Springs should remain. Therefore, we would recommend that Silver Springs be allocated to another constituency.

We would also like to see the community of Banff Trail restored to Calgary-Varsity because there is a greater commonality and affinity with the other communities of Calgary-Varsity. We think that it would be better to maintain the essential nature of Calgary-Varsity by including all of Dalhousie and Montgomery even if that means the totals for the riding are somewhat higher than optimal.

This is a summary of our proposed changes to Calgary-Varsity with respect to the commission's proposal: removal of the community of Silver Springs, the addition of the western half of the community of Dalhousie . . .

The Chair: I'm just going to interrupt here. You're essentially saying: restore the status quo; don't change Calgary-Varsity.

Dr. Ray: Sorry?

The Chair: You're saying: restore the status quo; don't make any changes to Calgary-Varsity.

Mr. McNaughton: With the exception of the communities of Point McKay and Parkdale, which would be an increase in the riding.

The Chair: You want to keep those?

Mr. McNaughton: With respect to the commission's proposal, yes.

The Chair: All right. What population would that leave in Calgary-Varsity?

Mr. McNaughton: Very roughly, this probably results in about 2,000 less than – in the point form summary that Don was just about to launch into, I have 2016 numbers for those communities. It would result in – and I don't have exact numbers.

The Chair: Right now in the constituency as it exists as of 2016, you've got 44,860. If you add Point McKay and Parkdale, do you know what that population would go up to?

Mr. McNaughton: Just one moment. Point McKay in 2016 was 1,344 people, and Parkdale was 2,962, so that would be an addition of . . .

The Chair: So this would raise by about 10 per cent the population in Calgary-Varsity.

Mr. McNaughton: Correct. Yeah. But it would maintain what we sort of see as the existing nature of the riding.

The Chair: Okay. Those communities, the last two – forgive me; I'm not that familiar with Calgary – Point McKay and Parkdale, would come out of what is now Calgary-Klein or what is now Calgary-Mountain View?

Mr. McNaughton: Calgary-Mountain View, yes.

The Chair: Calgary-Mountain View is already 4 per cent below the provincial average. Not that that's the be-all or end-all, but if we took 10 per cent out of that, they'd be then 14 per cent below the provincial average, right?

Mr. McNaughton: No.

Dr. Ray: Point McKay and Parkdale would remain from your proposed . . .

The Chair: Okay. Sure. The \$64,000 question here is: why would this recommendation to make a vote in Mountain View worth 20 per cent more than a vote in Varsity allow more effective representation to the citizens who live in Calgary-Varsity and in Calgary-Mountain View?

Dr. Ray: Okay. How is that again?

The Chair: Well, if you make Calgary-Mountain View 14 per cent under and Calgary-Varsity 10 per cent over, that's a 25 per cent swing. If we were to accept your recommendation and that was implemented, a vote in Calgary-Mountain View would be worth 25 per cent more, would have 25 per cent more weight, than one in Calgary-Varsity because 25 per cent fewer voters would be needed to elect a majority candidate in that riding.

Dr. Ray: Okay. Well, I think what we're arguing is that we would want to see Dalhousie community reunited with the rest of Dalhousie. We would want to see Banff Trail, really, included in Calgary-Varsity. We would be losing Silver Springs and then adding. We would not be getting St. Andrews Heights and so on. We see a type of balancing in terms of the numbers.

Mr. McNaughton: I guess we didn't construct an alternative map of all of Calgary to say, you know . . .

The Chair: I know. I'm just looking at your next-door neighbour constituency that you want to take population out of. Your proposal has a direct and immediate impact on it.

Mr. McNaughton: Well, in one case we're taking area out of it, which is Banff Trail, but we're proposing for West Hillhurst that the half that is in your proposal go back. Those are kind of a trade-off.

The Chair: But also Parkdale and Point McKay, right?

Mr. McNaughton: Parkdale and Point McKay are in your proposals. These are with respect to your proposal.

The Chair: Okay. All right.
Anything else you'd like to say?

Mr. McNaughton: It might be beneficial in the future – probably not for this commission but the next one – if the methodology was made transparent. In constructing Calgary, did you work from the outside in, or did you work from the centre out?

The Chair: In fact, we discuss that expressly and reveal all in our report – let me just go to the page – which is the first time ever for an Electoral Boundaries Commission. Page 23, under Process. If you read the report on page 23, under Process, it'll tell you exactly what we did with Calgary.

Mr. McNaughton: Okay. I will certainly go and read that. It appeared that there wasn't a lot of or enough weight given to preserving existing boundaries. Maybe that isn't an actual requirement that you're trying to follow.

The Chair: It's not a requirement at all. Otherwise, we wouldn't have to do this ever.

Dr. Ray: I think what we're arguing here is that there can be a shifting of communities within the proposal for Calgary-Varsity which would enhance community cohesion, coherence – okay? – like uniting all of Dalhousie within Calgary-Varsity. Then there are other trade-offs which can be made, you know. We've said: okay; yes, you can add Parkdale and Point McKay. They form an arc along the Bow River, so they're part of that community, commercial, transportation flow. In our proposal our suggestions are based on ideas like that: communities, what seems to be a better fit, the historic participation of Montgomery . . .

2:25

The Chair: Okay. I'm going to cut you off – I'm sorry – because I don't want to use up the time of other people here this afternoon.

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

Ms Munn: Well, I do have some comments. We've heard from citizens from community associations and even from other MLAs that they're very pleased that Montgomery and Bowness are going to be reunited, or they're going to be united. Those who work in Montgomery think that their interests are going to be better represented if they're represented alongside the interests of Bowness. Do you have any comment about that?

Mr. McNaughton: Yeah. Calgary-Bow as you're proposing it is as much about, you know, the part that's above the hill, which is probably very different in nature than the parts down closer to the river, and I don't know how you deal with that.

Ms Munn: Okay. Just in terms of socioeconomic indicators or community associations or businesses or traffic Montgomery might be better off with Bowness. That's what we've heard from people, including the MLA.

Mr. McNaughton: Correct. I can see that to some extent, but both of those areas together are very different than the areas up the hill in Calgary-Bow.

It is interesting that Montgomery is the only example. If you look at the dividing line as the Bow River, it's the only area that crosses the Bow, like, where a constituency crosses the Bow.

Ms Munn: Uh-huh. Okay.

Now, can you tell me why the people of Banff Trail would be more effectively represented by an MLA in Calgary-Varsity as opposed to an MLA in Calgary-Mountain View, who's also representing Capitol Hill, Mount Pleasant? Why would there be more effective representation for those constituents if Banff Trail were in Calgary-Varsity?

Mr. McNaughton: If you take the West Hillhurst and the Banff Trail together, you know, one added and one taken away, it's more a matter of: why make the change when the population – that one almost comes across as change for change's sake. I know you wouldn't be doing that, you know, but it's some ripple effect that you didn't see while you were adding this piece and taking this piece away. Why not leave both pieces in the ridings that they were in previously?

Dr. Ray: There's also the point that we have a very complicated system of government in Canada, with three levels. People have been used to being represented by the MLA for Calgary-Varsity for Banff Trail. It will recognize that more easily. Things can change.

Ms Munn: I can certainly see what you mean by the reunification of West Hillhurst. It's anomalous because part of West Hillhurst is on the other side of Crowchild Trail, and I can see why that might be important to those residents.

Now, with respect to Dalhousie, both halves of Dalhousie – let's say that east of 53rd Street and that west of 53rd Street – is there a very strong community of interest between those two different parts of Dalhousie?

Mr. McNaughton: Well, I think they share the same commercial area, and they have one single community association that represents, you know, the whole of Dalhousie.

Dr. Ray: Yeah, yeah. I mean, I think the fact is that there's a common community association, and there's a focus on the shopping in the Dalhousie shopping centre area and the LRT.

Ms Munn: I just wanted to make one more comment about the methodology for Calgary. We started off with a problem in that we weren't going to have two new seats in Calgary; we were going to have only one. There were three different approaches taken to try to figure out Calgary, which were all problematic in one way or another. Your comments about the splitting of the communities are very, very important, and we'll seriously consider those. But you have to understand that we're balancing what you're saying against what other people are saying, all the while trying to make these numbers work.

Thank you very much for your input.

The Chair: Any questions?

Mr. McLeod: No questions; just one comment. In relationship to Calgary-Bow we had a presentation this morning, which was the shortest we've ever had, which was three minutes, which said: very well done; good. That was the end of the presentation, basically, this morning.

The Chair: That's your opposition.

Mr. McLeod: There's your opposition. Right.

The Chair: Mrs. Day, anything?

Mrs. Day: No. I just thank you for taking the time to be here and the love and care that you have for your community. You know, you've done a good job of your presentation. We'll take those into consideration.

Thanks.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We'll take a break after the presentation of the next registered speaker, who is Ricardo Miranda.

Miranda: Hello. Good afternoon. Ricardo Miranda. I am a resident in Temple and also the MLA for Calgary-Cross. I wanted to start by thanking you for giving us the opportunity to actually add more opportunities for us to come and give you our input after you've already held some public consultation on this very important matter. I also want to recognize the hard work that has gone into it in recognizing that it's not easy by any stretch of the imagination.

I wanted to start off with some of the changes that have been proposed with regard to the community of Vista Heights. This community, I understand, has at some point or another in history been basically bounced between different constituencies. One of the things I have heard from them is that they feel very much disconnected from the rest of the community because there is no community centre within Vista Heights. In fact, they actually have a shared community hall with Mayland Heights, which is in Calgary-East. So a lot of the residents actually do go to the constituency next door, Calgary-East, to actually be in community because there is no natural place there. So I understand why the commission would actually move them to a different constituency. Having said that, it's not ideal, in my view, because I have had the real pleasure and honour to serve them and continue to serve them going forward. However, I do understand where the interest there lies with the community across 16th from them.

The other thing I wanted to give you input on is the fact that the Properties, as they were known originally, which are Whitehorn, Temple, Rundle, and Pineridge, have been a community of interest for a very long time. In fact, they were initially known as the Properties and eventually were created into these very distinct communities, but they do share many, many features that actually build them into a community hub. One is the high school that is actually at the heart of those four communities, followed by the leisure centre that is right also next to the high school, Village Square. Those two things have created and continue to create very much a sense of community, and in the proposed changes for the boundaries these four communities have been split into two. I would encourage the commission to consider putting those four communities back into the same constituency because there is a lot of history, and not only that, there is a continued . . .

The Chair: What are the names? Sorry. I missed the names.

Miranda: The communities are Temple, Whitehorn, Rundle, and Pineridge. These are known as the Properties.

The Chair: Where do you propose? They want them back in your constituency? Is that what you're saying? You want them back in Calgary-Cross?

Miranda: Into Calgary-Cross. In trying to come up with some of the options, I understand that if you were to just put those four into a single constituency, it wouldn't have the actual numbers that you would need in order to do that. So what I would propose is looking to next door, Monterey Park, and adding part of Monterey Park into this constituency. In doing so, you would actually keep it within a ward 5, and with the population . . .

The Chair: Sorry. Just again, to add part of Monterey Park to what?

Miranda: Calgary-Cross, into the Calgary-Cross constituency.

The Chair: So you want that as well?

Miranda: Yes. Because the way that it is now or as it is proposed, taking out Vista Heights and only having the four properties together, you would not have the threshold you need in order to meet the population target that you're looking for. So by adding part of Monterey Park into this constituency of Calgary-Cross and keeping the four properties together, you would actually be within 10 per cent variance of the target.

2:35

The Chair: Well, how can that be because we're already 12 per cent over on our proposed constituency? If we added three new neighbourhoods, we'd have to be more than 12 per cent over.

Miranda: No. I'm talking about the constituency itself being made up of the four properties and part of Monterey Park, and when you put those four together, you would actually come up within 10 per cent.

The Chair: Okay. Are you essentially recommending that the status quo remain for Calgary-Cross?

Miranda: No. In the status quo I would still have Vista Heights and Sunridge and all of that area going all the way to the Deerfoot. What I'm saying is that concentrating the constituency into that quadrant that is . . .

The Chair: Okay. Did you bring a map showing what you're proposing?

Miranda: No, but I can definitely submit one.

The Chair: You can come forward and draw it on page 107 of my copy of the interim report, which is the Calgary-Cross proposed map. Would you do that?

Miranda: Absolutely. Do you want me to do that now?

The Chair: Absolutely. See, I can understand you better if I understand the basics.

Miranda: Absolutely.

The Chair: Okay. You're taking essentially the northern half, maybe a little bit more than half, of Calgary-Cross, and you say that that should be Calgary-Cross on a go-forward basis?

Miranda: Yes. Those four communities do come up with stability. There's not a lot of development going on there. Definitely, the communities have been well established for a long time. There is an influx of new Canadians that come in and out, but overall the

population has remained steady in those four particular communities. And in order to . . .

The Chair: Okay. I'm a slow learner here. So you're not just taking part of Calgary-Cross. You're saying that part of Calgary-Falconridge should also be moved into your constituency?

Miranda: Yes. From the proposed ones.

The Chair: Right. You gain population from Calgary-Falconridge, and you lose it, then, to Calgary-Forest in this proposal.

Miranda: Yes, that's right.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you. Go ahead.

Miranda: Again, the Properties, being a very unique and very distinct character within the northeast, which is a very diverse community, the Calgary-East constituency, which is the other part of the population that you had originally proposed to be brought into Calgary-Cross, I think, does have a more natural community of interest within Calgary-East. I believe there will be a presentation to that effect.

As far as I can tell you from being the MLA in the area, these four communities work really well together. They do have very well established communication and a well-established relationship between them, and I do believe that they would be better served by having them be in one constituency going forward. Then to keep within that particular vein of keeping all the populations, all the work that you're doing, I would say that by keeping all of these four together and adding that particular part of Monterey, you would actually achieve that same result.

The Chair: This is essentially your current constituency as it exists today plus part of Monterey.

Miranda: That is correct, yes. Minus parts of Sunridge and Vista Heights.

The Chair: All right.

Miranda: The Sunridge portion is an industrial park area, including also the Peter Lougheed hospital, so there is a natural boundary that occurs because of that industrial park from Vista Heights, and that's the reason why most of the time I would say that they feel very much isolated. The only reason why I think that adding them to another constituency that will keep them within Mayland Heights will be much more natural is because they do already have that relationship with that community centre and are very much integrated with them. It's not that I actually would like to see them go, but in the interest of keeping those communities of interest, I think that would make more sense.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

I'm going to ask Ms Munn if she has any questions or comments.

Ms Munn: I do have some comments. What we're faced with in the northeast and in north Calgary was incredible population pressure. There was also significant population pressure in the southeast. When we looked at the numbers, that population pressure was greater in the northeast, and the ridings, the constituencies, had to change in order to accommodate a new constituency in the northeast. If we were to go back to the status quo, we would be pushing population all the way down, and what you would have at the end of the day is all the population pressure in the southeast.

So that's why it was changed, because the population and the pressure in the northeast was so great. I understand the Properties, and I understand Marlborough – I used to live there – and it being cut up, but the question is in terms of the people who live there. Why would they have more effective representation if they were the four communities still together?

Miranda: They continue to have some fracturization because of the makeup of the communities themselves, and I think those have now begun to be overcome as a result of having a larger community of interest between them. Certainly, the socioeconomic challenges faced in the area have created a common ground for these four communities, who have been fractured within themselves. They have now gained a greater sense of identity and as a result have become much more effective in their advocacy for many social programs, for example, and different, well, programming – period – and social realities that they have faced have brought a greater sense of identity to the area particularly. I do believe that as a result of that, it's created a community that it would be counterintuitive, I think, to fragment when it's actually becoming much more coalesced into one area.

Ms Munn: And for those communities to have two MLAs instead of one MLA doesn't make their voice stronger?

Miranda: That's the interesting question that you have posed. I think when you have two MLAs who may not necessarily have a shared vision because you have competing interests within communities as well, that could be either a good thing or a bad thing. It all depends where the issues are at any particular point and on any particular spectrum. Certainly, from a political perspective that does change, whether one is effectively in government or in opposition, right? Having two or three voices doesn't really change the fact that communities themselves are going to advocate for their interests, and having a single voice who understands and lives in the area can actually advocate for those.

For myself, I've lived in the northeast. This is where I've grown up, and I have seen this play out over many, many years where we've in essence had certain communities be divided along ethnic lines, and now that's no longer the case. Now we have actual communities coming together, which is fantastic to see. As an MLA it allows me to actually advocate for issues rather than communities, and to me that creates much more a sense of why they should be kept in one area. Personally, I think that it depends on how many voices. Having six voices at a table may not necessarily be the best if they don't understand the issues. It's a matter of how effective you can be advocating for yourself and also having people who advocate for you.

Ms Munn: Well, I commend you for advocating for issues instead of communities.

Miranda: It brings people together a lot more. Certainly, there are many, many differences, but on issues of security, for example, issues of violence against women, I think we can transcend, and we have been able to transcend many issues, many divides that would normally have put people not wanting to be in the same room together to talk about these issues. It's actually an interesting thing, what I've seen happen in the northeast, and that is the reason why I think they would be better served by being together in one constituency.

The Chair: Mr. McLeod.

Mr. McLeod: Oh, yes. Just a few comments, Minister. With these changes, currently you're sitting at, approximately, with our proposal, about plus 12 per cent. Calgary-Falconridge, north of you, is plus 13 per cent. At Calgary-Airport there's hardly anything there currently, but there is some construction going on there. It's plus 4 per cent. In order to maybe look at your proposal and try to change things slightly, we're going to have to move that way. Up in Calgary-North East, where it's currently minus 14 per cent, and Calgary-Airport, where the population may not have grown as fast as it should have, do you think that's a way that we could start moving?

2:45

Miranda: Again, absolutely something that probably you might want to consider. What I'm looking at, of course, are these communities of interest, which I think much more allow for the advocacy that is necessary for these constituents to be able to have a unified voice.

Now, there is almost a divide that happens between McKnight in the northeast and Falconridge. I've seen it. For example, there is a police link centre that happens to be right on the other side of McKnight that a lot of my constituents could benefit from going to. There's an almost psychological divide that happens, and I cannot get many of them to go over there. So there is a natural divide that happens along the same lines as those communities of interest. I don't know if that would actually perhaps dilute that cohesiveness. I'm not sure. I guess I'm saying that I don't envy you the task. I can only tell you what I'm advocating for in my community and what I've heard in my community. Certainly, in many of these iterations the more natural set of constituents are the ones in Monterey, as I alluded to and as I proposed in the drawing of the map there, only because that divide between McKnight doesn't happen; 32nd is not as big of a division between these two natural boundaries that could exist to create this new constituency.

Mr. McLeod: When I look at it, though, I'm seeing that with the numbers north and even the numbers south and then even to the west into Calgary-Klein, which is plus 8, as Justice Bielby said earlier, once you change something here, how does this start moving along in all the points? I'm not saying that it can't be done. It's just that I do recall three separate runs at Calgary alone. It was a long process just for Calgary. That's all.

Miranda: The only thing I would say is that in the Properties there's not going to be a lot of growth. It's a fairly stable community, and it has been for a long time. One of the reasons why I love living there is because it has that established community, beautiful lawns, old trees. I've met people who actually have copies of the title in the community. Their family at one point owned half of what today is Whitehorn, and at the same time we have people who have just come to this country not too long ago. It's a very diverse community in that sense but a very established one, and there isn't a lot of development happening there. The stability that you're talking about and the future development that you're referring to in the north, particularly in the airport, as proposed: you don't see this here, right? The variance and the flexibility that you have elsewhere I think would be a much more easy thing for you to do.

Mr. McLeod: Thank you, Minister.

The Chair: Mrs. Day?

Mrs. Day: Thank you. I'm fascinated listening to people share about their communities in different ways, different accents, and

different parts of our province. Yeah. I just really appreciate hearing how you articulate for your community and advocate for them.

Miranda: Thank you. I can also do it in French. A lot of my constituents . . .

Mrs. Day: I'd love to hear it. I couldn't understand it, but I'd love to hear it.

The Chair: Okay. We're going to take a five-minute break now. Thanks very much.

[The hearing adjourned from 2:48 p.m. to 2:56 p.m.]

The Chair: Okay. Good afternoon.

Mr. Malkinson: Thank you very much. My name is Brian Malkinson. I am the MLA for the riding of Calgary-Currie. Since I know that you were asking other constituents where they live, I currently am four blocks away from living in my riding. It seems like with every boundary we draw, I go from living to not living in my riding about every 10 years, which I think speaks to the difficulty of your job to get these boundaries together.

Hearing many of the comments you've had on previous presenters, I am going to jump straight into the changes I would propose. I'm going to jump into why I would do that and how that affects other areas and the compounding solutions to that. Overall, I think you guys did a quite good job of actually working with Currie in the proposed boundaries. I understand why I've lost Wildwood. I like that community, but I understand, looking at the broader map, why that needed to happen, so I will start off by saying that I'm okay with that, with the communities of Bankview and Sunalta with 14th Street staying in the boundary with downtown in my riding. I also very much appreciate that that stayed as a boundary as that is actually what the city of Calgary defines as the difference between downtown and not. That area, as far as I can tell, has since pretty much the beginning of time been in this riding, so I appreciate you maintaining that.

For the changes, I am proposing that Lincoln Park and the community of Glamorgan be added to Calgary-Currie. I'm going to go through why I would like them.

The Chair: Where would they come out of, then?

Mr. Malkinson: They would be coming out of Calgary-Elbow.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Malkinson: And I will also be proposing a solution on how to deal with Calgary-Elbow by consequence of doing that.

I'm going to start off with Lincoln Park. It's primarily got Mount Royal University in it, Mount Royal University and an industrial park. It's, of course, historically associated with the Currie Barracks, the name of this riding. There is actually very little population in it. I note that on the census map there is actually 11 per cent of the target in that particular census zone that Lincoln Park is in; however, in that census zone that has Lincoln Park contained in it, I would propose to you that my estimate would be that 95 per cent of that population is already in either Calgary-Currie or Calgary-Elbow. So the proportion of population that's being moved by this change has more to do with drawing a very nice line on the map because that would allow Crowchild Trail to go straight down to Glenmore Trail and add very nicely to my other proposal of Glamorgan.

Of course, Lincoln Park does have a lot of historical significance. The houses that are at that very southern corner, which is a couple

of blocks of neighbourhood there, that is actually where I go during every Remembrance Day as a part of my duties as the MLA as per Remembrance Day ceremonies related to Currie Barracks and Remembrance Day. That's where they have, you know, things named, like, Dallaire Avenue and Peacekeepers Way. I am there every Remembrance Day at various military events in that area and have a very strong connection to the historical barracks. I think it would be good to have those as part of the riding. Often those houses: they would do their business in all the areas that are currently part of Currie.

Now, Glamorgan was built at the same time as the rest of the neighbourhoods in the riding. It very much helps with the natural boundaries as the western edge of the riding would be Sarcee Trail. Sarcee Trail turns into Glenmore Trail. This nicely follows around the bottom of the map.

I can come give you the magic green marker if you would like.

The Chair: Yeah. That would be – you're reading my mind.

Mr. Malkinson: I saw you looking longingly at that map.

The Chair: Yes. Thanks. Okay. If you put the lines of your proposed Currie on this map.

Mr. Malkinson: I'm going to get slightly creative. It just slightly goes off the edge of it here.

Ms Livingstone: Yeah. You'll need to flip to the Calgary-Elbow – is it the Calgary-Elbow map that you need?

Mr. Malkinson: Yes.

Ms Livingstone: It's alphabetical. If you just flip forward a page.

Mr. Malkinson: I'm going to draw that, actually, on the Calgary-Elbow map. For the record Calgary-Currie would extend all the way down Sarcee Trail to Glenmore Trail and then go up Crowchild Trail until it lines up with the current proposal.

The Chair: Could you draw a green boundary around – okay. Great. Thanks.

Mr. Malkinson: This is the addition here. I've just put some cross-hatching in there for the addition. Basically, one side of it is Lincoln Park, Glamorgan.

The Chair: Are you proposing that any part of this would be removed just while you're up here?

Mr. Malkinson: No.

The Chair: Okay. Thanks.

Mr. Malkinson: To continue to make my case for Glamorgan, the businesses that are in Glamorgan, the nonprofit organizations in my riding: I'll give you an example. Just recently – CSPD, the society for persons with developmental disabilities, which is a nonprofit that cares for those with disabilities and actually owns several houses in Calgary-Currie, actually does their AGM at the Glamorgan Community Association. I know that many other nonprofits in my area also utilize that area for their community events because it's already part – those communities were built at the same time as Glenbrook.

Basically, if you just go west from Glenmore, all of those areas were built at the same time as part of similar developments. They think of themselves as part of Currie. Historically they have been part of the same riding, part of West, you know, way back in the

day, and then part of Currie. In the recent past Glamorgan was actually part of Currie and its surrounding areas. I will note that I had my Stampede breakfast, and of course many people came from that same area as well.

I will commend the commission for giving me the remainder of Rutland Park, which is actually the thing that separates – in your proposed map there's a little detour down from Richmond Road that gives me the remainder of Rutland Park, which is the thing that separates Glamorgan from Currie Barracks, so I appreciate the commission's work on giving me the remainder of that community as opposed to putting a line through it. I appreciate that.

Now, I know that somebody's going to have a question about numbers and, you know, the cascading effects that this would have on Elbow. I know that there's another presenter, who represents the area of Glenmore, who will be making a presentation that an area of Lakeview, which has a very similar population number to Glenmore's – add that to Elbow due to similarities with Elbow. I will let that presenter make her case for that.

This also, although this would increase my population, would still very much be within the variance that you have in other areas of the city of Calgary as you've proposed to redraw the ridings.

The Chair: How many people would it add to Currie?

Mr. Malkinson: By my calculation it would add – I was doing it by, like, .7 of the goal. I would have to actually look at what that is.

3:05

The Chair: So it would be 7 per cent above or 7 per cent in addition to the 4 per cent our proposal has?

Mr. Malkinson: I had in my calculation that this would get me right at about the 10 mark above the goal. Sorry. I did not bring my math with me.

The Chair: No, no. That's fine.

Mr. Malkinson: I will note that Calgary-Currie is not expected to be a growth area, and hearing some of the other presenters in the south of Calgary, you know, trying to manoeuvre around communities – as you get into the south with population, this potentially could give you a little bit of breathing room in more southern communities. But I know that this is somewhere – like I said, Glenmore would be able to solve the population difference with Elbow and provide some room in Glenmore.

With that, I think I will leave it open to some questions.

The Chair: All right. Thanks. I don't have any. That's a very complete presentation. We should have videotaped you at the start and used it as a model for everybody.

Ms Munn.

Ms Munn: I don't have any questions.

The Chair: Ms Livingstone.

Ms Livingstone: Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. McLeod.

Mr. McLeod: Very well done. Thank you.

The Chair: Mrs. Day.

Okay. Thanks so much.

Mr. Malkinson: Yeah. No worries. Again, thank you very much for your work. You know, I have the luxury of being in the centre

of Calgary. I imagine that when you did this, you worked from the centre of Calgary out, so I think, like I said, this . . .

The Chair: We worked every way. We were trying to avoid putting Deerfoot in the middle of ridings, and there was no way that that would work. We went every which way.

Mr. Malkinson: Fair enough. I think also that this proposal makes for a little bit more – the southwest part of my riding, I think, provides for a much easier, describable boundary, which I think quite easily meets with one of your goals. These communities have traditionally and historically always been a part of the namesake, historical Currie Barracks in my area. Those neighbourhoods were built at the same time as the remainder of the neighbourhoods that surround Glamorgan there. I would note that, of course, with Mount Royal University I'm already there representing them on a regular basis as in the current boundaries they are across the street from me.

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

Mr. Malkinson: No worries. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Our next registered presenter is Michael Mooney.

Mr. Mooney: Unfortunately, I only have one map.

The Chair: At least you brought one. Thank you. Go ahead.

Mr. Mooney: First, thank you very much for having me here. I'm going to make a presentation on the riding Calgary-Forest. My name is Michael Mooney. I'd first like to start off with where I think you guys have done a great job in creating this new riding. I understand that you've moved Mayland Heights out, which is to the northwest, and I understand why you've done that.

I might as well just jump into what I think should be done differently. On the map I've given you, there are blue lines where we think the district should be redrawn. So up in the north that includes making Marlborough one community. You've split it in half for the commission. I understand that you're trying to create the perfect numbers, but we think that that community should be one community. On that point, too, we think that, down in the south, Dover should also be one community instead of split into two different communities.

To do this – we understand that you need to balance numbers – we've cut off Applewood to the east, and that could be included, potentially, in Cross as we'd be taking Marlborough Park, which is numberwise about 9,000. What would happen is that if we had half of that, that would be about 4,000, 4 and a half thousand gone from Calgary-Cross. That is about Applewood, which is about 7,000, 6,000 people, so that would not impact the Calgary-Cross numbers too much.

Down in Dover we understand that we'd be taking it from Calgary-Peigan, so to offset that, we would give kind of east of Stoney Trail to the new communities that are being developed on the edge of Calgary. Part of the reasoning for that, too, is that those communities do not really have much in common with the rest of our riding, and we think Peigan would be a better area for the representation as they're, if you at look at the map, quite big. But they do represent that type of community more than we do, so we think it'd be a better decision for them to be included there.

The Chair: How many people in Dover? Do you know?

Mr. Mooney: Yes. Dover is about 11,000, so if we were to add only Dover – and these new communities are about, I think, 3,000 to 4,000.

Ms Munn: Do you know what their names are?

Mr. Mooney: The new communities? No, unfortunately. But they are – I think Hart Estates is one of them.

Ms Munn: Hart?

Mr. Mooney: Hart Estates, yeah.

Ms Munn: Where are those new communities?

Mr. Mooney: They're on the very east edge of the Calgary city boundary.

Mrs. Day: Where it's talking – on this map here, where there's, like, nothing.

Unidentified Speaker: East of Forest.

The Chair: Right here on his map. This little jog out here. How many people in that?

Mr. Mooney: I don't have those exact – I think it's about 3,000 to 4,000 people in those communities.

Mrs. Day: It's growing.

Mr. Mooney: Yeah, growth.

The Chair: You're suggesting adding a much larger group of people to Calgary-Forest than you are taking out of it. Just my quick math: you want to give away a net 1,500 with the Applewood-Marlborough exchange, but then you'd pick up 6,000 to 7,000 with the other, so you'd be about 5,000 over. That would be about 12 per cent over, so Calgary-Forest – not that we're wedded to numbers, but obviously we don't want to go over the maximum. That would put you at 24 per cent over.

Mr. Mooney: Sorry. From the math I've done – and I could be wrong . . .

The Chair: Okay. You know, correct me. Yeah.

Mr. Mooney: My understanding would be – right now we have Dover. We'll say that half of Dover is in our constituency. That's about 5,000, 5 and a half thousand. If we were to add, then, another 5,000, you'd minus that from Hart Estates, which is 3,000, so it's only really, I think, a net gain of about 2,000 people. Then Marlborough itself, where we're going from the whole community being about 9,000: we'd be adding 4,500 there. Applewood would be about 7,000 people, so there's another 2,000, about 4,000 people.

The Chair: Four thousand people. So 10 per cent.

Mr. Mooney: Yeah.

The Chair: That's net in the entire constituency.

Mr. Mooney: Exactly. Yes. The reason we are doing this, too, is that, one, like I said, Dover and Marlborough shouldn't be split up as they're communities together. What you've done, which I agree with, is to put Forest Lawn and Forest Heights together. These communities all have a very social community. They're all very similar in the types of people that live in these ridings, their concerns, what they need, and what the future holds for them. I think it's important that they all stay together. Another key factor, too, is that while we are a bit above the number you're looking for, these communities are not really looking at major growth over the

next 10 years. There are a lot of single-family homes, stuff like that. There's not a ton of development happening in this area.

The Chair: Well, we proposed Forest at 12 per cent, so if you're right that it would be 10 per cent, it would in fact be closer to the variance by a titch.

Mr. Mooney: Yeah. We had hoped that this would also help. As you explained and other presenters explained, there's a lot of pressure both north and south of us, so I understand that we don't want to push that to other ridings because our riding is not as growth happy as those other two areas.

Yeah. I think that's it for my presentation.

The Chair: Okay. Thanks very much. Very concise. Any comments?

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

Ms Livingstone: No, thank you.

The Chair: Bruce?

Mr. McLeod: I think I'm good. Thank you.

The Chair: All right. Thanks very much.

Mr. Mooney: Thank you.

The Chair: All right. Anam Kazim.

Ms Kazim: Good afternoon. I am Anam Kazim. I am proud to say that I'm the MLA for Calgary-Glenmore, and the reason I'm using the word "proud" to say that is because Calgary-Glenmore is a very strong constituency because of its communities and community associations. I have not seen such strong community associations in other parts of the city, the concentration of the community associations particularly, as much as I have in Calgary-Glenmore. I am presenting my case to maintain the status quo.

3:15

Before I get into the details, I first of all would like to thank you all for letting us have the opportunity to present a different perspective in terms of working with the communities as well as being the MLA and how the constituency office relations play an important role when they are working with the community associations.

I would like to shed a little bit of light onto what's going on currently in Calgary-Glenmore and how the proposed boundaries are affecting the communities in Calgary-Glenmore. The one I want to begin with is the proposed boundaries. The community association that is being affected big time is the Chinook Park-Kelvin Grove-Eagle Ridge Community Association. The executives as well as the residents and my constituents have raised their concerns over social media. They have done the written submissions to the board as well. I have been working very closely with the residents, so I'm presenting not only my perspective but also the perspective of my constituents when I'm making this case.

That community association is being split into three, having three different communities in three different constituencies, again, having three different MLAs at the end of the day. It's really complicated to have a community association which is already dealing with three different communities and bringing things in alignment and talking about the issues. If any dispute happens among those communities, then you're having three different MLAs coming from different perspectives – one could be from the government side, one could be from the opposition side, and one

could be from the third party – and not knowing the certainty of the political environment and how each MLA is going to present, because every individual has a different working style. Also, for the residents to figure out who their MLA is when they're reading the newsletters or if there's a concern of who to contact, there will be continuous inconvenience for the residents as well as for the community association to have good representation in the Legislative Assembly.

In fact, I have prepared a letter in collaboration with the CKE community association, with the signature of the VP of the CKE community association, that I would like to table as well, that talks about the concerns that are being addressed, especially after CKE is being split into three different constituencies. I would highly encourage the board . . .

The Chair: I'll just ask our clerk to come forward and take that exhibit. Thank you. Do you just have the one copy of it?

Ms Kazim: Unfortunately, yes. I have one copy.

The Chair: Okay. Thanks. Go ahead.

Ms Kazim: Community building and strengthening communities is my passion, and I'm here to make sure that I represent the best interests of my constituents and communities when it comes to this matter. I strongly believe that keeping those communities – because it's one community association, having one MLA makes absolute sense because of the trending issues, because of the geographical reasons, and to make it give effective representation for the constituents by one MLA. They know who to contact and have that persistence and consistency in the operations, because it's not always the MLA who is dealing with the constituents. It's the staff that deals with them, too, so having three different constituency offices with three different staff members at the offices and having those different styles of work for processing cases and dealing with issues is not a good representation of any community.

At the same time, with the status quo I strongly support the idea. When the Calgary-Currie MLA came to present his case, he mentioned the Lakeview community. Now, since I'm talking about the status quo to figure out the population distribution part, the east side of Lakeview community, which has a quotient of .08, if that is given to Calgary-Elbow, then it will help balance the population distribution.

The Chair: What is the neighbourhood, again?

Ms Kazim: It is a combination of North Glenmore Park and Lakeview, bits of Lakeview and bits of North Glenmore Park. The North Glenmore Park association building is in this region. The interesting part is that currently most of North Glenmore Park is already in Calgary-Elbow, so this portion here, to be part of Calgary-Elbow, makes absolute sense.

The Chair: Does it reunite North Glenmore Park in Calgary-Elbow completely?

Ms Kazim: Yes. This will. This will because right now it's split in two portions. I have a quarter of North Glenmore Park right now in Calgary-Glenmore.

The Chair: What about Lakeview?

Ms Kazim: There's a small percentage of Lakeview, but most of Lakeview would stay in Calgary-Glenmore. Right now the facility of North Glenmore Park association is sitting in Calgary-Glenmore whereas most of the residents are in Calgary-Elbow.

Ms Munn: So you would split Lakeview, the community of Lakeview, between Calgary-Elbow and Calgary-Glenmore?

Ms Kazim: Yes. But it will be a very small percentage because Lakeview Community Association will still be in Calgary-Glenmore. Right now what is going on is that the North Glenmore Park Community Association building is in Calgary-Glenmore, but most of the population is in Calgary-Elbow. So it's better to move that community association building into Calgary-Elbow, and then Calgary-Glenmore would have the Lakeview Community Association building with most of the residents, a very small percentage loss in Lakeview residents, but geographically those Lakeview residents will still have access very easily to the Lakeview Community Association. The population and the ratio would balance out. Right now it's either a quarter of the North Glenmore Park population in my riding or a small percentage of Lakeview.

The point I'm trying to make is that the North Glenmore Park Community Association is in Calgary-Glenmore and 80 per cent of North Glenmore Park is already in Calgary-Elbow, so it's better to give that community association to Calgary-Elbow.

The Chair: Okay. Would you mind coming forward and marking in yellow on page 110 of my copy of the interim report, which is our proposed map for Calgary-Elbow, your proposed change in the boundary?

Ms Kazim: Okay. This portion here, I would say, should be part of Calgary-Elbow.

The Chair: Is that North Glenmore Park and Lakeview?

Ms Kazim: Yes. It has a small population of Lakeview residents, but it has the main facility of the North Glenmore Park Community Association. The building itself is in this area. The rest of Lakeview: that stays in Calgary-Glenmore. That's fine because the population can still have access to the Lakeview Community Association. So it's a more fair distribution that way.

The Chair: So are you proposing to move anything other than this yellow circle of land into . . .

Ms Kazim: Calgary-Elbow.

The Chair: Yes. That's all?

Ms Kazim: Yes.

The Chair: Okay. Are you proposing to move any other part of Calgary-Glenmore out of Calgary-Glenmore?

Ms Kazim: No. I'm actually requesting to have some parts moved into Glenmore. What I'm suggesting is that with the status quo right now I would like Kingsland, Haysboro, Kelvin Grove, Chinook Park to all stay in Calgary-Glenmore the way they are.

The Chair: Okay. If we go to page 115, which is our proposed map for Calgary-Glenmore, in yellow can you put on that map what you think should be moved back into Calgary-Glenmore?

Ms Livingstone: Sorry. You may need the Calgary-Acadia map.

Ms Kazim: Yes. We may need the Calgary-Acadia map because Acadia . . .

The Chair: Okay. Just flip through. They're in alphabetical order.

Ms Kazim: This is the addition I want, and then I would like the association to stop here.

Mr. McLeod: Would you be using Elbow Drive now as the line?

Ms Kazim: Macleod Trail between east and west.

Mr. McLeod: You're going as far as Macleod Trail?

Ms Kazim: Yes, that's right.

Ms Livingstone: While you're here, I'm just going to get you to draw that on the Calgary-Acadia map.

Ms Kazim: Yes. If it causes any issues with the Calgary-Acadia population, my proposition would be that Riverbend could probably be added to Calgary-Acadia if that would balance it out.

The Chair: Do you have Riverbend?

Ms Kazim: No, I don't. I'm just giving the proposition of that because . . .

The Chair: Riverbend is in Calgary-Currie.

Ms Kazim: No. Riverbend is here. Like, it's east of – it's in Calgary-Acadia.

The Chair: Okay. All right.

3:25

Ms Kazim: I'm proposing taking communities back from Calgary-Acadia to the original Calgary-Glenmore.

The Chair: Do you want to just draw that on?

Mr. McLeod: Did she include Southwood?

Ms Kazim: No. Southwood, no. Because Southwood is . . .

Mr. McLeod: . . . not that far. So that would be 75th Avenue . . .

Ms Kazim: Yeah. I'm sticking to the status quo, Basically, I'm not going south of Southland and to 14th Street, so just maintaining the status quo pretty much except for this Lakeview portion I talked about.

The Chair: Okay. And what constituency is Riverbend in?

Ms Kazim: Right now it is in Calgary-Fort, I believe.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

All right. If I can just ask a question, why are you proposing that these constituencies be moved back into Calgary-Glenmore? Same issue with the three community associations, or is there another reason?

Ms Kazim: I can just . . .

The Chair: Please do. Yeah.

Ms Kazim: Yeah. The reason that I'm suggesting that the communities come back is because Kingsland is very close to the CKE Community Association geographywise, and oftentimes Kingsland utilizes the CKE facility from time to time for different purposes.

The Chair: What's CKE?

Ms Kazim: Chinook Park/Kelvin Grove/Eagle Ridge Community Association.

The Chair: Okay.

Ms Kazim: Kingsland is a neighbouring community to that particular community association, so there is a lot of overlap among the residents for different festivals. It's kind of like: geographically it makes a lot of sense. Also, being on one side of Macleod Trail, all the addresses are southwest whereas on the other side of Macleod Trail all the addresses change to southeast.

In terms of the boundaries and in terms of the way Calgary-Glenmore is, based on my consultations with the constituents, people are very comfortable with the way that geographical representation is there in terms of their interactions with each other – community associations work very closely with each other in Calgary-Glenmore – and having one MLA to discuss all those issues with due to the nature of the issues.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Ms Kazim: You're very welcome.

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

Ms Munn: I don't have any questions at the moment.

The Chair: Ms Livingstone?

Ms Livingstone: I had just one. Your colleague from Calgary-Acadia this morning said almost the exact opposite of what you've suggested. She said that it was a very good idea to have Riverbend on the other side of the river with those communities over there and thought that, for the most part, the communities that we had added to Calgary-Acadia going up to 14th Street fit very well with the Calgary-Acadia riding. We've got, I guess, some very different views from you and your colleagues that we've heard today.

Ms Kazim: Yeah. I can definitely give my perspective on working with the communities because Haysboro was originally not in Calgary-Acadia. I've been working with the Haysboro community. Haysboro and Kingsland are neighbouring communities, again, and understanding the trends and how the demographics are, it absolutely makes sense to keep Haysboro in Calgary-Glenmore. I'm just proposing it as a solution. If I am making a case to keep Haysboro, which is now proposed in Calgary-Acadia, and understanding the constraint that there should be a balance of the population, it was my suggestion that in order to balance the population of Calgary-Acadia, maybe Riverbend could be added because the Calgary-Fort population is already a little above the quotient. In that regard, to create the balance, finding the balance of representing constituents effectively and maintaining the population balance, that's the solution I'm proposing.

Ms Livingstone: Okay.

The Chair: Mr. McLeod?

Mr. McLeod: No. I'm totally confused but good. Thank you.

The Chair: Mrs. Day?

All right. Thanks so much.

Ms Kazim: Thank you very much.

The Chair: All right. Our next registered speaker is Sylvia Hawkins.

Ms Hawkins: I'm Sylvia Hawkins, and I'm here today wearing two hats: firstly, as a 26-year resident of the community of Marlborough and, secondly, as the president of the Calgary-East NDP Constituency Association. My comments relate to the existing constituency of Calgary-East and the proposed new constituency of Calgary-Forest. I realize that a lot of work has gone into redrawing these electoral boundaries. It is very complex to balance one constituency in relation to another. I have spoken with other residents of Marlborough as well as Steve Hurley, the president of the Marlborough Community Association, regarding your proposal to split Marlborough into two ridings. At least for the last two elections the Trans-Canada/16th Avenue NE has been the northern boundary of the riding.

We urge you to reconsider your proposal to make Marlborough Drive the northern boundary of the riding. Marlborough has the lowest voter turnout in the existing riding of Calgary-East. We feel that if residents suddenly have to go to another community to vote, especially if they're unfamiliar with that community, they may simply decide not to go to vote at all. There's a very diverse population living in Marlborough, many whose first language is not English. Marlborough Community Association has been working hard to engage with these residents in order to make people feel that they have a sense of belonging to the community, so splitting the community at election time may hamper the progress they're making with community building.

In terms of the existing riding of Calgary-East the proposed boundary changes mean that we lose Mayland Heights, half of Marlborough, and Marlborough Park while gaining Applewood, Forest Lawn, some of West Dover, and Erin Woods in addition to all the rural area going out to Chestermere. One of the biggest impacts of these changes would be for the large number of volunteers who work in constituency associations. We're all working really hard to engage with residents in the area, providing them with options for the upcoming elections. I understand that there have to be changes made, but I would like to remind you of the challenges the constituency associations will have to undergo as they restructure.

Finally, I would like to request that, whatever communities are included, the name of the new riding remain Calgary-East and that it not be changed to Calgary-Forest. The federal riding of Calgary Forest Lawn overlaps this provincial riding, and it will be better to have a different name to avoid confusion about what the people are voting for, and there is often lots of confusion. Again, the federal riding of Calgary Forest Lawn has one of Canada's lowest voter turnouts. Many people who reside in what is often referred to as the greater Forest Lawn area do not feel part of Forest Lawn, but they are familiar with organizations and events using the demarcation of the Calgary east side or Calgary-East. I was also thinking of the Sunrise communities. Greater Forest Lawn, because of that, sort of excludes the other communities in the area.

They are my points. Thank you very much for your work and for giving members of the general public the opportunity to provide some feedback.

Thank you very much.

The Chair: Of course. Thank you.

Mrs. Day, any comments or questions?

Mrs. Day: No. Thanks.

Thank you so much for being here.

The Chair: Mr. McLeod?

Mr. McLeod: No.

The Chair: Ms Livingstone?

Ms Livingstone: Nothing for me.

The Chair: Ms Munn?

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

The Chair: Thank you so much.

Our next registered speaker, Alex Shevalier.

Mr. Shevalier: Good afternoon. My name is Alex Shevalier. I'm president of the Calgary & District Labour Council, and I want to see if I can beat the record for the shortest presentation.

Thank you to the staff for doing all of the work on this. Thank you to the commission for accepting public input. I'm very content with all of the recommendations that you've made. I can see nothing. Our primary concern in making our presentation was in ensuring sort of the redistribution of the ridings to the cities of Edmonton and Calgary. You've done that, and we are pleased as punch with it, so thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. McLeod: Just a moment.

Alex.

Mr. Shevalier: Yes.

Mr. McLeod: You did a fine job. That was about two minutes.

Mr. Shevalier: Excellent. If that was two minutes, you need a new watch.

The Chair: We're getting punchy at this point of the day. We get to do it all over again at 7 o'clock. Thanks very much for your brevity, and it's nice to have a cheer every so often, so thank you.

Mr. Shevalier: Thank you.

The Chair: All right. Our last registered presenter this afternoon, Michael Mooney.

Unidentified Speaker: He presented a few minutes ago.

The Chair: Did he? All right. Well, then, people are paying more attention than I am. I am indeed punchy.

Is anybody here who is a registered speaker who hasn't been called on yet?

All right. Thank you, then. We'll adjourn until 7 o'clock.

[The hearing adjourned at 3:35 p.m.]

