



# Off-site Levy Bylaw Review – Established Area Linear Levy Working Group

## Stakeholder Consultation Meeting Notes

**Date/Time:** November 18, 2021 / 10:00 am to 12:00 pm

**Location:** MS Teams – video conferencing

**Attendees:**

Internal	External
Dave Mair	Paul Battistella
Quinn Eastlick	Shameer Gaidhar
Daniel Vincent	Guy Huntingford
Pam McHugh*	Robert Homersham
Patrick McMahon	Chris Ollenberger
Marie Standing	James Robertson
Cody Van Hell	Jackie Stewart
Regrets	
Maggie Choi	
Kimberly Kahan	

### Agenda

- 1. Introduction & recap of last session** (Quinn Eastlick & Daniel Vincent)
- 2. Updated consultation timeline and approach** (Daniel Vincent)
- 3. Questions for today’s session** (Daniel Vincent)
- 4. Council –The ultimate decision maker** (Daniel Vincent)
- 5. Who pays and why?** (Daniel Vincent)
- 6. Administration of the Reactive fund** (Daniel Vincent)
- 7. \$1M –Will it be enough?** (Daniel Vincent)
- 8. Reporting** (Daniel Vincent)
- 9. Future reviews** (Daniel Vincent)

### Feedback collected:

**Question 1: Where do you still see gaps in determining how the program will work?**

- Is The City looking to be paid back for their contribution? Clarity to industry on this point will be necessary.
- How are projects prioritized for reimbursement consideration? How are completed developments treated (e.g. first in, first out)?



- Off-site Levy regulation consideration: Is The City satisfied that it can meet Section 5 obligations of the Municipal Government Act (MGA) and the minimum level of specificity laid out in that section?
- For water and wastewater levies imposed in the past, will this program constitute a “double dipping”?
- The proposal appears to work much like the oversize fund. Will a technical manual be developed to outline all the details of this proposal (technical, eligibility, reporting prioritization management fees, etc) prior to any recommendations to Council?

## **Question 2: What potential challenges do you anticipate with managing the reactive investment fund?**

- MGA 641.1 – Section sets out grounds of appeal and purpose of the Off-site Levy in relationship to future development that may not benefit from the levy program. Could this be an impediment to the Established Area Linear Levy? How do we tie the benefit to the lands?
- How does industry count on these funds with the uncertainty around availability of funds and the timing of their release? This program does not achieve the same result as the Centre City Levy where there is more certainty around fund access. Land buyer will likely assume (in the Established Area) the fund is unavailable and operate in a way that assumes the fund is not accessible toward upgrade costs which creates a finance issue.
- Concern that there will be a cost burden transferred to the landowner. More information around land transfer costs could be a more fruitful exercise; this would assist in the negotiation of land costs. How does this fee assist in Established Area development and in the achievement of the Municipal Development Plan goals?
- Concern in industry that the fund will be consumed quickly with the real-world costs required for upgrades.
- Fire Underwriters Survey Standard: What is The City doing to bring all areas into compliance?

## **General Feedback/Comments**

- Will this levy require a City Charter bylaw?
- Is the intent to create a matching fund program (e.g. \$500,000 + \$500,000)? The significance of the \$500,000 contribution will likely not be known until the levy fund is established. What is the relationship between the levy rate and the municipal contribution?
  - Will this be an ongoing element that The City is willing to review and consider? What is the cost of administering the levy program?
  - Is a \$500,000 contribution relevant when compared to the administrative costs and requirements?
- Fair share contribution and the current set up concerns stakeholder that they will not be able to regularly access funds and therefore this program will act as an additional tax. Looking toward the rates they will pay for developments such as duplexes and fourplexes. Smaller developments unlikely to see the benefit of participation and fund contribution. Equity should be demonstrated in the rates.
- Request for specific feedback to previously presented questions regarding the Established Area Local-size Levy be provided.



- Support for proactive map to mitigate potential reactive costs.
- Clarification: The City will match UP to \$500,000 as a maximum per year.
- Fire flow requirements: Are we using the right analysis in determining fire flow?
- Industry previously suggested an alternative approach to meet Municipal Development Plan targets. Is this program addressing the investment and population targets for the established area?

## Summary of Action Items

### City of Calgary

- Provide an example of “First In, First Out” at future session.

### Working group members:

- Provide feedback to Dan Vincent within two weeks of session for inclusion in subsequent working group meeting.