



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

Date/Time: Thursday, October 13, 2022 / 1:00pm – 2:30pm

Location: MS Teams – video conferencing

Attendees:

Internal	External
Brian Arthur	Bob Faktor
Quinn Eastlick	Brett Friesen
Feisal Lakha	Jim Gordon
Pam McHugh*	Brian Hahn
Angela Sedor	Jackie Stewart
Regrets	
	Joel Armitage
	Guy Huntingford
	Alex Leliever
	Wayne King

*Note taker

Agenda

- 1. Welcome & Agenda Overview** (Quinn)
- 2. Meeting Norms (Hybrid)** (Quinn)
- 3. Work Plan Update** (Brian)
- 4. Clarifications** (Brian)
- 5. Assumptions on Partial Project Costs** (Brian)
- 6. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)** (Brian)
- 7. Discussion** (Brian)

Feedback collected:

General Feedback/Comments

- Question of clarification: When projects are removed due to being completed how does that factor in? Obviously, the projects are physically completed, but have they also extracted the leviable or levied funds that were collected in past bylaws? Let’s say a project is \$100M dollars, in past projects like the leviable portion of a BRT leg, the bylaw assumed it would collect \$50M of that project. Has that assumed \$50M been taken from the levy pool? This is not intended to be a curveball question, but to understand how budgets get removed and the allocation of leviable dollars. Clarity seems to be within the OSL report.
- Can we get an accounting of what in the levy is already allocated to projects that are in progress/complete? What can we not touch? And what of that is left will be transitioned into



the new levy and formula? Project costs and estimates deadline is the end of 2022, yes? Can we get an interim levy balance? Essentially, what is untouchable because it has already been allocated to other projects.

- The projects that are listed here, are they projects that have continued and money has already been spent? What is the schedule and stage of the projects? When will we get that information?
- Please help us understand how these policies and plans have been used to support the list of projects and benefit allocation included in the leviable project list. For example, Route Ahead is new to me. A preamble that shows why something was chosen and the rationale and how the dots connect might be helpful as a backgrounder. The earlier the backgrounder is available, the better for industry.
- Item 2 states that project costs are currently in 2020 dollars. Have these projects been included in the budget and will be placed before Council in November and if so, are they in 2020 or 2022 dollars in the budget?
- Concerning Items 3 and 4 industry has several questions. While the notion of 30 years was discussed we view benefit percentage and horizon as potentially linked and require the benefit allocation in order to provide meaningful comment on whether 30 years makes sense. We note on slide 13 the benefit methodology was most recently scheduled to be on Oct. 27 however that is now indicated as under review.
 - When should we expect the benefit methodology to be discussed?
 - Given the significance of the benefit methodology to the levy, when is the earliest we can expect to receive the benefit methodology background materials?
 - Thank you for flagging that benefit is not 100%. Appreciate the clarification. Did you say the benefit is not 100%, but it will be consistent across all pieces of infrastructure and that each piece does not have its own benefitting percentage? If the intent of BRTs is to reduce vehicular traffic and congestion, those in the inner city benefit, possibly even more, than those in greenfield communities.
 - It sounds like you are reprioritizing the benefit and the timing is unknown so the remainder of the schedule is TBD because of that. Is a potential proposal for the benefit, inclusive of the denominator, and the city is open to amending the denominator and benefit based on that feedback?
 - The benefit calculation is of paramount importance to industry as an input to the formula. It is a large factor in swaying the end result and what the calculation spits out. The sooner we get to talking about it, the longer we must get it right.
- The partial funding slide in the presentation is confusing. The opening line is why projects are not partially costed, followed by partially costed projects. Help us understand the slide and why projects that clearly deliver a benefit and movements in the region are not partially costed. Understanding the math to determine the split for these projects will be helpful to industry. For the \$25M, will it have a benefit percentage for the portion levied? For the consultant, what was involved in the engineering judgement?
- If you normally negotiated a shared piece of infrastructure with a neighbouring municipality, are these the same assumptions and approach? It feels like the city is being too nice when growth is paying. What is the precedent as it might tell us the most?
- I think I am hearing two things: 1) The rationale is in the White Paper so can that be followed up on and 2) where industry will be interested from modelled to a connection/judgement approach is a table or illustration of why this works better. If we have something visual to discuss that will be effective and efficient for the process.



- Projects levied for partial Costs:
 - For the projects which are partial costs will the overall benefit allocation percentage be applied to the levy eligible cost?
 - Estimate costs to be levied are in round numbers. What is the rationale for each of the projects which determines the portion that is to be levied?
 - For example, Glenmore Trail/116 Street E assumption please explain how 40 M is estimated cost to be levied and rationale behind the 25% vs 75% benefit allocation. Please provide more details on all of the assumptions and the math to get to the estimated project costs listed.
- Grants - In the 2016/18 Levy \$139 M was included for Green Trip Provincial funding, why is only \$5M included for the new BRT project list? Past annual report provided credit for provincial funding, as a percentage we are seeing quite a big difference.
- In the 2016/18 project list which was a 60-year time frame, project lists for both established and greenfield totalled \$621 M. Why is the new cost for 30 years \$602.6M plus costs not inclusive of \$373M totalling \$975.6M? Why the huge increase in costs/projects? Why is the grant not more proportionally applied?
- Why the huge increase in costs in projects? We'd be curious about the fairness and alignment with the MGA requirement to include grants.
- Why the transfer of so many projects from established areas to greenfield?
- Please help us understand the evolution of projects listed in the 2016/18 Bylaw to the list provided above whether that is inflation or something else. Which projects are new?
- In looking at the map it is difficult to understand that there is not significant established area benefit in these projects. Please explain why these are not projects levied for partial costs.
- At the prior meeting held on September 15, Industry's understanding is Transportation indicated that it was not using or running a transportation model to support the OSL Bylaw work. Please confirm our understanding.
- In the go forward, schedule please help us understand when Transportation will present the empirical methodology used to identify the projects required, the sizing of the projects, the cost to be levied for the project and the benefit allocation.
- When we are talking about costs for BRT, what is contained within the cost of a BRT?
- Is there a chance, given these are generally roads projects, that these projects overlap a road widening project? Presumably, a BRT project cost includes the moving and repaving of the vehicle roads adjacent to it. Do we know that these budgets do not overlap? The Centre St and 144th Avenue BRT, can you speak to why a BRT will ever be required in that location? It seems odd given how that area is developing and is planned to be developed.
- 144 Ave BRT was indicated to be a study. I would've thought that levies are for infrastructure, not a study. How does a study get into the levy calculation and cost so much? For Centre Street, what is the perspective on this with the potential of the greenfield and intensification of infrastructure? Does BRT stand to get ripped up, for example, after being levy funded?