



Off-site Levy Bylaw Review – Water Resources Working Group Stakeholder Consultation Meeting Notes

Date/Time: November 17, 2022 / 2:30 – 4:00 pm

Location: MS Teams – video conferencing and Calgary City Hall (800 Macleod Trail SE)

Attendees:

Internal	External
Maggie Choi	Paul Battistella
Quinn Eastlick	Greg Bodnarchuk
Tracey Keegan*	Shameer Gaidhar
Angela Sedor	Guy Huntingford
Chris Tse	Chris Ollenberger
	Jackie Stewart
	Mark Wynker
Regrets	
Krista Campbell	Jay German
	Brian Hahn

*Note taker

Agenda

- 1. Welcome, Introductions & Agenda Overview** (Chris Tse)
- 2. Meeting Norms (Hybrid)** (Quinn Eastlick)
- 3. Refresher on the proposed Established Area Levy** (Chris Tse)
- 4. Next Steps** (Chris Tse)
- 5. Discussion** (Chris Tse)

Feedback collected:

General Feedback/Comments

- Is the East Village able to access the established area (EA) funds?
- Please further explain the application process. Is the application for funding coming after the construction of the infrastructure a question of eligibility, or just a matter of timing in the process?
 - Maybe worded differently. “Apply for reimbursement” would be a better way of wording (slide 10) to avoid confusion.
- To confirm, earlier in the project, the idea was that if a single detached home was replaced by a single detached home, you wouldn’t pay into the levy.
- 2 million in seed fund - if there was a bunch of development that never went forward is it possible the city would seed that more than once?



- We have seen many versions of this levy now. Do you feel it is fully baked now? This is the implementation plan to go to council?
- Seems more like a solution looking for a problem. Everything we have heard has been anecdotal. We don't really have numbers or dollars around it. Yet these numbers are significant. This doesn't help that circumstance. The developer has to just hope.
- Not eliminating the barrier because we can't rely on it for cost recovery over three to four years for a two year pilot.
- Seems like you have found what you like and are going to go and do it. This consultation doesn't seem to be in good faith and is frustrating.
- There is a refusal to explore other options. This has been my feeling on the whole exercise. Industry is beginning to feel like the grumpy old man telling the same story.
- My issues are:
 - Issue seems anecdotal, limited evidence to back it up
 - not removing barriers
 - not explored fully
- It would be more helpful to have a clear cost indication when land is purchased versus made-up administrative programs.
- It would be more useful to have timely transparent information.
- You don't know how many projects have not gone ahead because of this proposal. Over the past five to 10 years how many projects didn't happen because of this issue?
- Slides with unit rates are based on pretense. In there you have semi, single, multi contribution. No chance of recovering those monies.
- Need a clear definition of a unit. Does it include legal suites? Want to make sure we are not defining that as a unit.
- When was this census taken? Things have changed quite a bit. There is an issue of fairness that rates are higher for a single. Although they absolutely contribute, they cannot access this fund. Could we look at a per unit basis again in the future?
- Plant levies - association members felt they never had a chance to speak on that. Now we're in a different time from 2019 with fundamental change.
- Rates and seed money: If there is a 50% subsidy from The City, does this mean dollars back from The City? Is every dollar matched?
- If there is an issue with the pilot, does this mean a loss overall or additional seed funding from The City? Will projects pay their funds regardless?
- Is it a self-sustained fund? Not looking for it to work perfectly right, as it is a pilot.
- Would the expectation be a revisiting of rates? The number of projects and the cost. Inflation for example. These rates are already off by about 15% before we'd even start.
- You mentioned at some point that you'd come back and tell us how these numbers were calculated. That would be helpful. An equivalent population works better than a unit count. There has already been a lot of work put into this.
- Touch back to recognition of tax uplift and revenues, utility rates otherwise collected. that's arguably will more than cover off-site improvements. Is that door closed? It seems to be a token levy as opposed to meaningful money for infrastructure upgrades.
- Even the cost of administrating this program. are we creating a solution to a very small problem? It doesn't seem significant enough to make a difference. The numbers are not significant enough.



- There is a perfect opportunity for the City of Calgary concerning growth and cost effectiveness and to take a leadership role to mitigate long term costs for climate change.
- This seems to be parading something that doesn't seem to address the problem and feels like a sound byte from The City more than anything else.
- Could we set up a scenario to see how much would have been collected if this levy had been in place for 2021 and 2022? Also, how would a fund have been operated if it existed at the time?
- These projects are triggered anecdotally.
- Can we backward model for base data?
- Is there any plan of revising rates prior to going to council?
- How are we going to demonstrate a clear benefit to who pays? We need more clarity on that connection.
- Industry will want data and want to know how it was devised. The rationale will need to be explained.
- What is the link to the levy and the principles approved by council?
- When did it originally go to council and decide to solve this through an off-site levy?
- That was pre climate emergency and a different council. Have we spoken to our new council and looked at the direction? A lot has changed since the last election. Is this still a priority to look at the established area and incentive?
- What is the background behind the rates - are these the rates we are going with to council before industry is provided with the background and an opportunity to see? I am expressing concern about that. are we rolling with these rates before and even simple math check?
- We never got the math behind these numbers. resharing or digging up these background rates calculations would be appreciated.