

Calgary Regional Land Use Plan Working Session Notes

Regional Servicing

January 17, 2008

Attendance

Elected

Mayor Phil McCracken	Crossfield
Reeve Dene Cooper	Bighorn
Councillor Norma Lang	Crossfield
Councillor Bill Szabon	Nanton
Councillor Tara McFadden	Cochrane
Mayor Bill McAlpine	Okotoks
Councillor Beth Kish	Okotoks

Staff/Other

Peter Gilmore	Calgary
Jorie McKenzie	Rocky View
Craig Lawrence	Chestermere
Doug Bartlett	Bartech Developments
Dennis Poffenroth	Bartech Developments
Reiley McKerracher	Okotoks
Rick Quail	Okotoks
Shawn Low	Calgary
Stuart Jewison	Rocky View
Darren Martin	Calgary
Alex Broda	Calgary
Jane Toews	Black Diamond Citizen
Sharlene Brown	Black Diamond Citizen
Andrea Czarnecki	Alberta Environment
Rick Butler	CRP
Ron Laycraft	Foothills
Kary Troyer	Okotoks Citizen
Brenda Goode	Rocky View Citizen
Ken Bech	Cochrane Citizen
Cheryl Skelly	Crossfield
Martin Buckley	Bighorn
Colleen Renne	Canmore
Bob Neale	Airdrie
Bill Berzins	BRBC
Gordon McIlwain	Rocky View Citizen
David Pernitsky	CH2M Hill
Sharon Wood	Calgary
Tim Creelman	Calgary
Amanda Cromar	CRP
Colleen Shepherd	CRP
Bob Miller	Calgary/CRP
Charles Boechler	Remington Development Corp
Jodi Kohls	Westhoff Eng Resources Inc
Mark Jean	Carma Developers

Dave McIntyre

Alberta Gov

Attendance cont...

Bruce Racicot

MD RV Citizen

Don Brownie

Prolog

Tom Gilliss

MD Foothills

Chris Mountenay

Al Carmen

Calgary Fire

Doug Olson

O2 Planning and Design

1 Preamble

The Calgary Regional Partnership is creating a regional growth management plan where each municipality's uniqueness and autonomy will be kept, while ensuring that we have a way forward to make decisions about sustainable growth in the region for our future. The plan that we collectively create, with all 18 municipalities aboard, will help us determine a logical process for the **sustainable** development of infrastructure, land and community services across the region. Put another way, we will determine where the next 1.5 million new residents to our region will live sustainably; and what areas or lands need to be preserved forever – be that for agriculture, recreation or environmental protection. Taking this regional approach will allow us to not only avoid potential inter-municipal and environmental conflicts in the region, but it will help us proactively plan. The plan is being built for citizens in the region, by citizens in the region. Opportunities for input have been created for expert groups alongside citizens. To date we have developed three growth scenarios that show what the region could look like if we made certain assumptions. The first being – what if we continued to grow as we are now? The second looks at growth management from an entirely environmental perspective and the third looks at nodes and economic and transportation corridors. These scenarios have been fully and spatially mapped out by our planning team and have been presented to all the Mayors, Reeves and Councillors across the region.

This working session is part of the evaluation process and is designed to explore all the key issues around the regional plan and in particular, with respect to regional servicing issues. We will present an overview of the three growth scenarios mentioned above with particular emphasis on how these scenarios will impact water and wastewater servicing within the region. Experts from around the region will join attendees to discuss the key elements of the scenarios as well as the essential criteria needed to move forward to the Draft Plan.

2 Welcome provided by Mayor Bill McAlpine from Okotoks

Mayor Bill McAlpine is the Chair of the Regional Servicing sub-committee of the Calgary Regional Partnership that has worked with CH2M Hill to produce a analysis of regional water and wastewater options and alternatives for the region.

3 Session Presentations

All presentations are available to view in full at www.calgaryregion.ca under the Regional Land Use Plan/presentations or by clicking on

<http://www.calgaryregion.ca/crp/projects/projects/regionalgrowth/presentations.aspx>

Regional Land Use Plan – an overview of three scenarios for regional planning

By CRP Core Planning Team member - Doug Olson, O2 Planning and Design

Doug Olson – planning consultant to the CRP on the regional land use plan core planning team provided a summary of the three learning scenarios, created by the CRP’s core planning team that look long into the future and assume the same 1.75 million additional population. The first -Trend and Regional Predictions maps out what the region would look like if we continued with current policies, all approved ASPs, MDPs, and other contemplated projects currently in the planning stages. The second scenario looks at growth from the perspective of Nodes and Corridors – A network of connected nodes and corridors of intensified development that provides for efficient infrastructure and transportation delivery whilst building complete communities that adopt the forms of towns and villages. The final scenario focuses on creating a future that assumes that we will identify an ecologically and culturally sensitive land base and that development is excluded from these areas. It will create complete communities that adopt the forms of towns and villages with non retail employment associated with all towns to reduce travel requirements. Each of these scenarios will be evaluated against the same set of impact criteria and the resulting “Plan” will be a hybrid scenario that includes critically important conditions/assumptions from each learning scenario.

This presentation can be viewed on the home page of the CRP or by clicking http://www.calgaryregion.ca/crp/media/25209/crp_overview_2007_12_14.pdf

Group discussion following Scenario Presentation:

- The timeline for population growth presented in the scenarios may be underestimated – it is important for planners to move quickly on this and other key infrastructure issues.
- How flexible is the plan to consider gifts of land? When you have a plan in place, you can direct gifts and potential donors to fit within the framework.
- Does intensification only apply to residential or does it include commercial and industrial as well.
- Will you use this plan to ask the province for funding for water and waster water and other critical infrastructure?
- How can we ensure that agriculture and agricultural land is discussed as we evaluate the scenarios?
- We need to ensure that the parallel governance discussion also covers purchase of lands for watershed protection by looking at policy tools.
- It seems obvious from the trend scenario that more of the same is simply not sustainable.
- I did not see water quality parameters being addressed in the scenarios – this is very important have you been looking at this?
- This seems like a very good opportunity to connect more dynamically with the province - Alberta Environment and SRD for example. So much of the time we are working on overlapping issues and don’t know what others are doing. We need to talk more.
- The CRP - Regional Land Use Plan is one of the most important efforts underway at this time in the province with the most potential for success.
- Municipal governments have the highest ability to implement policy – they are the closest to the people – this plan has the potential to become something tangible.
- There needs to be more women represented in the Regional Land Use Plan sessions as speakers and experts – so far all the presenters have biased men – women bring important perspectives that need to be considered.
- This Regional Land Use plan presents a good opportunity to connect more closely the water basin groups – to connect the policy for land use of water quality measures and watershed management objectives.

Regional Land Use Plan and Regional Water and Servicing Options

By David Pernitsky, CH2M Hill

David Pernitsky is an engineer with CH2MHILL who has worked with the CRP's Regional Servicing sub-committee as well as the Regional Land Use Plan's core planning team to develop an analysis of regional water and waste water servicing options and their implications for all three learning scenarios. The presentation offered a general background understanding of key criteria for efficient regional servicing options, an analysis of servicing concepts for all three scenarios and a discussion of critical issues by watershed. David provided a technical Comparison of scenarios and what the key learning's were from this analysis.

Summary comments and questions -

- If the Calgary region is able to develop, agree upon and implement a strong regional land use plan (with associated settlement patterns) will the City of Calgary cooperate to provide necessary servicing from its license?
- How will the governance and implementation of water and waste water servicing systems be addressed?
- Is there a potential role to play for the Western Irrigation District – especially in the East of the region?
- What other water options and opportunity exists?
- Does the traditional approach of more pipe infrastructure lead to higher standards or do we need to look to more innovative conservation based approaches?
- We need to look at other responsible and sustainable options for addressing our water needs into the future.
- We should push our boundaries outside of conventional approaches while we are well positioned economically and politically to do so in this region – before we have to react to a water crisis.
- New York provides a good example for preservation and protection of a watershed, provides a water governance model and a means to ensure safe water for the population into the future – CRP could benefit from a look at this model.
- We need to be very concerned about climate change and the cumulative impacts of our activities on the sensitive water resource.
- We always emphasize water license and pipes to provide water for development and human consumption but what about the carrying capacity of our natural systems?
- When do we address the fact that our water system has critical limits?
- There are many examples of regions in the world, even in North America that are running out of water as we speak.
- It will be important to have subregional discussions as the core planning team moves into building the Hybrid scenario.
- The comparison of regional servicing efficiencies by scenario is very useful (may be found in the presentation).
- This plan needs to address the fact that not all areas in the region should be part of a larger regional servicing connection – they will have their own solutions and need to be included in this plan.
- The MD of Big Horn is very pleased that the CRP and the Regional Land Use plan Core Planning Team have included us and our issues as much as possible in this discussion.

- The MD of Bighorn holds much of the region's water assets that will be drawn from but has no access to the water due to licensing restrictions – a very interesting position. The MD has a large stake in weighing into the conversation and plans to continue to work with CRP as the Regional Land Use Plan develops.
- There are examples of developers that are doing high quality & innovative solutions to water servicing – we should be considering these too.

Group Working Session

Attendees were split into smaller groups covering their geographical areas for a facilitated discussion to address the following questions:-

1. Please identify and explain the strengths and challenges of each scenario.
2. Please identify the major concepts of these scenarios that should:
 - Move forward into the hybrid scenario
 - Be eliminated from the list of options
3. Please identify any additional considerations we need to look into, and do more homework on, as we move forward to build the hybrid.

Group One – West and North West of the Calgary Region

Question 1

Please identify and explain the strengths and challenges of each scenario – or identify questions about the scenarios?

- Regarding the trend scenario - what are the implications if we don't change our development patterns and our behavior?
- What happens to the servicing concepts if all growth goes to Calgary?
- What do we do if the City of Calgary doesn't share water?
- We need provincial changes to move ahead effectively: forced regional systems, credit for treated W.W. return, allowance for interbasin transfers, etc.
- The assumption that developers have a "right" to a profit needs to change.
- The public good and the safety of the public into the future needs to take precedence.
- The Nodes and Corridors scenario builds effectively on current community infrastructure and reflects more compact smart growth approaches
- The Nodes and Corridors scenario seems to have greater benefit for Bow corridor
- Look at adding Bighorn-Canmore water servicing expectations to the eco-cultural scenario to consider that the impacts are.
- Issue of watershed protection at source is a key issue.
- All 3 scenarios appear to provide equal level of protection
- On the eco-cultural scenario, W & WW lines need to move further west along Highway 8, to Highway 22 intersection.
- The Nodes and Corridors scenario should have lower costs for servicing: trends scenario seems to project more acreages- higher services costs
- Nodes scenario would provide greater reliability, better economics, more incentives for conservation, higher quality water to more people, more control with centralized system(s)

Question 2

a) Please identify the major concepts of these scenarios that should move forward into the hybrid scenario

- Move forward servicing to more communities
- Watershed protection is a priority
- Intensification is key – push for intensification
- Better use of land for utility corridors
- Maximization of conservation
- Preservation of quality of life needs to be emphasized
- Differentiation between rural & urban
- Limit the local and regional footprint
- Utility planning must not be done in isolation of other planning/amenities (eg. light rail transit)
- Lot of future residents will be urbanites, and will be expecting urban services
- Respect for forests : people have to understand value of forests
- Link green spaces – no islands

Question 2

b) Please identify the major concepts of these scenarios that should be eliminated from the hybrid:

- Eliminate “sprawl” and dispersed development styles
- Do not want to see wasteful consumption of water
- Don’t replicate WTP & WWTP’s where not necessary
- Eliminate antiquity-ensure best available demonstrated technology is used
- Is service area in all 3 scenarios too big? Are we creating growth/sprawl?

Group Two – East of the Calgary Region

Question 1

Please identify and explain the strengths and challenges of each scenario – or identify questions about the scenarios?

- The Trend scenario has very little strength with the exception of the ease that is provided by following the status quo.
- Trend strengths / challenges:
 - Needs water and servicing to make it happen
 - Unsustainable from an economic and ecological point of view
 - Offers certainty for developers & predictability
 - Less risk from a market view
 - More land is available for development
- New mixed use forms and higher densities represented in the Eco-cultural and Nodes and Corridors scenario actually presents an economic opportunity for developers.
- The Nodes and Corridors scenario seems to be most realistic & politically palatable.
- The Nodes scenario shows that you can plan infrastructure relatively efficiently and stage it into the future.
- Employment centers are key to future sustainability – they are included in both nodes and eco-cultural but the question is how do you ensure they happen as planned?

- The Nodes and corridors key strength is that it builds on existing corridors
- Both will preserve some ecological areas

Weaknesses/Challenges

- Intensification is more of a challenge than one may think – how do you achieve even 10% on a regional scale?
- Outlying communities are a weakness as more pipe is needed and too much emphasis needs to be placed on planning by pipes.
- More emphasis is needed on storm water reuse management/ H2O conservation.
- Consider Carseland in servicing options.
- The region's towns may not desire the development level intensifications and densities required by the Nodes and Corridors scenario.
- A different built form will be required – this will be a hard sell to the developers who often reference the “market” when being asked to change modes of operation.
- We will need to create a “market” for better and more interesting and dense forms that provide a full range of services including transit.
- This and any type of change requires social & political will.
- The length of pipelines to outlying communities may not be economical
- Need to ensure light industrial in corridors-commercial/office

Weaknesses/Challenges

- Trend scenario does NOT help the region achieve its vision for the future.
- Doesn't reflect growing global trends toward social and ecological responsibility
- May not be sustainable with current property tax model of pending development
- The Trend scenario is by and far less efficient and more costly
- The trend scenario lacks forward thinking – and – innovation
- Does not ask or require change
- The commuter factor is worsened

Ecological-Cultural Scenario – Strengths

- Compact & efficient for servicing
- Less capital infrastructure
- Maintenance and enhancement of quality of life
- Services closer
- Provides a legacy to future generations
- Makes change now-the sooner you start the easier
- Should be able to create a buy-in
- A clear vision – gets us to our goal for the regions future

Weaknesses/Challenges

- It appears that the eco-cultural scenario and Nodes and Corridors may require that some lands have development “rights” frozen or impeded in some way
- Needs strong political/social support
- How do you compensate landowners for the land and ecological services they provide?

- The local planning approvals/policy in place particularly in the sort to mid-term stands in the way of change
- Some relaxation/consideration may be required for projects along the way eg. approved etc.
- The regional plan seems to ignore the aspirations of smaller centers

Question 2

a) Please identify the major concepts of these scenarios that should move forward into the hybrid scenario:

- Use existing nodes as a place to start
- Continuous growth around nodes
- Ensure there are options/diversity between centers/nodes
- “Greenbelt” corridors/open space/parcels
- All a limited amount of CR but identify those areas where it is to occur but in conservation subdivision. No consensus on this. Some say no CR
- Provide efficient comprehensive serviced development
- Use existing infrastructure
- Consider East Rocky View Servicing Plan?
- Corridor development to allow regional transit infrastructure
- Look at options for outliers and small nodes

Question 2

b) Please identify the major concepts of these scenarios that should be eliminated from the hybrid:

- The trend-we can work through the hybrid as a combination of Ecological & Nodes and Corridors

Group Three – North of the Calgary Region

Question 1

Please identify and explain the strengths and challenges of each scenario – or identify questions about the scenarios?

Nodes and Corridors – Strengths and Weaknesses

- The best case seems to be a balance between eco & trend
- If we were to put a pipe out to Bragg Creek-what will this mean to population?
- The Nodes scenario allows us to move toward ecological middle road as a first step – it seems “doable”.
- The Nodes and Corridors scenario encourages regional transit, and builds on economies of scale.
- Nodes and Corridors would seem to make our region and local municipalities more economically viable.
- Nodes is better able to phase servicing – in nodes easier to rationalize and prioritize to the province.
- Staging needs to be clear.
- How do you direct growth and staging from a regional perspective?
- Do predetermined growth patterns take choice away?
- Crossfield is in favor of node/eco but external pressures may make trend better positioned.
- We must always be prepared for growth.

Trend Scenario – Strengths and Weaknesses

- A very large footprint - Eco-impact and lack of protecting water sources especially in the Elbow/Bow
- Trend leads to least resistance as area structure plans and development approvals are already in place.
- Demands the least intensification (easy but less responsible)
- Capital finances required for the volume of infrastructure is not doable.
- From a servicing perspective more in line with CH2MHILL Regional Servicing Study.
- Looking at a reasonable pace – Trend does not consider this – what are the priorities for development in the Trend? Are there any?
- It would require principles for staged development timing to really make it happen especially where water is needed.
- Developers will need to support any scenario to make it happen.
- Infrastructure costs always gets passed on somewhere-citizen/municipality/dev/government
- Trend is not the best option from the perspective of system and cost efficiency

Ecological-Cultural Scenario – Strengths and weaknesses

- Provides the best intensification opportunity.
- What is the impact on existing infrastructure?
- Expresses minimum footprint
- Maximum protection to water shed
- Efficient and sustainable use of settlement
- Difficult / challenging as it is farthest from current trend
- Drivers are not evident, a social – cultural shift would be required
- Most sustainable in the long term
- Takes us to what we might anticipate from a fuel crisis
- Help create a sense of identity for the region – building on being a beautiful region high economic opportunity responsible development to ensure quality of life
- Encourages open space into the future
- Has the most potential for impacting personal collective value systems
- All 3: cause us to think about more conservation
- Water is no longer free or endless in supply – eco scenario considers this
- There need to be will be local water solutions in the eco scenario
- Size and scale-identity of community are impacted by bringing pipe solutions:
 - Challenge in all = governance plan +support from government
 - Health issues also related
 - More than economic considerations
 - Eco-scenario=local solutions
 - Populations linked directly to cost of system
 - Where we settle + where pipe goes hand in hand related to costs
- Eco-cultural scenario might look at reducing waste water treatment sites
- Grey water can be enhanced/other solutions considered – our current model is not adequate
- Land solutions: Ecological – need policy changes to reward innovation and reducing impact.
- Could be a basin perspective
- Decisions=for the future population
-

Question 2

a) Please identify the major concepts of these scenarios that should move forward into the hybrid scenario:

- Water shed-water source protection
- Open space
- Transportation corridors well planned protected-offset developments if land banking is needed to protect corridors for future
- Densification and intensification
- Sense of place, heritage, protected nurtured: Region-Alberta-Canada
- Cost sharing as a common element
- Cooperation as a region on systems
- Stop order on country/residential-reevaluate country/residential
- Sustainable development
- Participation in process
- In communication be clear that we are not overwhelming (be real)
- Good news message – we are well positioned – its not that bad ... now is the time to do good planning
- Cultural shifts are necessary
- Be very clear about principles behind policy solutions
- Shifting values-language
- Population & jobs can be located together. Services in central city-impact transportation trends

Question 2

b) Please identify the major concepts of these scenarios that should be eliminated from the hybrid:

- Sprawl urban/rural – dispensable development
- There are other ways – don't always opt for the status quo
- Land trust areas-conflict with potential development in scenarios
- ****Need to consult with public and land owners ****
- Aggregate and energy extraction needs to be considered

Question 3

Please identify any additional considerations we need to look into, and do more homework on, as we move forward to build the hybrid.

- Limit expectation that the plan will be all things to all people
- What can it do? What should it do? Scope?
- Use current infrastructure to build out
- Try not to create “new” areas BUT not at the expense of critical ecological infrastructure
- More rigor needs to go into new areas – what is the analysis that is behind those new locations and forms?
- RECREATION needs to be considered
- Technological changes – future possibilities must be considered
- Do not stifle innovation
- Not just more of the same
- Policy to allow new approaches ie. streamlining approvals for new approaches
- Consider rewards and incentives in implementation

- Raise the bar
- Water harvesting-cycling need to be studied
- Youth to get involved in their own future

Group Four – South of the Calgary Region

Notes to follow