

Smith Creek ASP and Resort Centre ASP Amendments

Meeting with Dr. Adam Ford and Dr. Anthony Clevenger

August 23, 2016 2:00-4:00 PM
Canmore Civic Centre

Attendees

Dr. Adam Ford- UBC (via teleconference)
Dr. Anthony Clevenger- WTI-MSU
Kyle Knopff- Golder Associates
Tracy Woitenko- Town of Canmore
Jessica Karpat- QuantumPlace Developments Ltd.
Jenn Giesbrecht- QuantumPlace Developments Ltd.

Welcome and Introduction

- The Project Team thanked the attendees for agreeing to meet and stated that the meeting will be documented and draft notes will be sent to the attendees for them to review to ensure that the notes are reflective of the conversation.
- Following approval of the notes and with the permission of attendees, the Project Team, would like to continue to have a transparent process and would therefore like to share the notes with the public on the Smith Creek and Resort Centre project websites.
 - Attendees agreed that the notes can be made public after they are approved.
- The Project Team briefly outlined the proposed agenda for the meeting:
 - Smith Creek and Resort Centre Project Overviews
 - Wildlife Considerations
 - An overview of what Dr. Ford and Dr. Clevenger are working on
 - Go over the Bow Valley Consensus Letter written by Dr. Ford and Dr. Clevenger to address the proposals.
 - Identify suggestions and solutions.
- Overall, QPD and the Town view this meeting as part of the ongoing engagement initiatives for the projects. While it is acknowledged that the Smith Creek and Resort Centre proposals are not perfect, the objective of the engagement initiatives is to identify concerns and ultimately work to make the plan better, recognizing that no plan is perfect.

Project Overview: Smith Creek ASP and Resort Centre ASP Amendments

Process

- There are two proposals being put forward for Three Sisters lands. An Area Structure Plan (ASP) is being put forward for Smith Creek and amendments are being proposed for the existing Resort Centre ASP.
- The creation of the Smith Creek ASP is a collaborative process between the Town and Three Sisters Mountain Village Properties (TSMV; QuantumPlace Developments Ltd. (QPD) represents TSMV). The Town and QPD have jointly hired consultants and are co-writing the ASP.
 - Jessica (QPD) and Tracy (Town of Canmore) are co-project managers.
 - QPD and the Town have jointly hired Golder Associates to do the Environmental Study (which will meet the requirements of the Town's proposed Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Policy).
- While the Smith Creek ASP is a collaborative process, the Resort Centre ASP amendments are applicant driven and are being put forward by TSMV. After the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Smith Creek collaborative process was in place, TSMV made the decision to put forward the Resort Centre Amendment. At the time, there was limited capacity for Town administration to embark upon another collaborative process. However, the learnings from the Smith Creek collaborative process inform the Resort Centre ASP amendment process.
- A Community Advisory Group (CAG) was established for the Smith Creek project. The CAG is a group of Canmore residents that represent the diverse interests of the community including interests related to the environment, recreation and social considerations.
- During early engagement with the CAG, the group indicated that they wanted certainty on what would happen to the former golf course lands and wanted to know how the Smith Creek ASP would relate to Resort Centre. With this incentive, TSMV decided to amend the Resort Centre ASP.
 - A sub-group of a few members of the CAG was created for the Resort Centre ASP amendments. The sub-group reports back to the Smith Creek CAG as a way to create links between the two projects. The objective is to create a transparent process for both Smith Creek and Resort Centre.
- All of the notes from CAG meetings as well as the other community conversation engagement initiatives are posted on the project websites (www.smithcreekcanmore.ca).
- Golder's role is to identify and recommend mitigations for avoiding or minimizing potential environmental impacts caused by the projects. After mitigations are integrated into the ASP, Golder will complete an EIS that will identify residual impacts (i.e., those that remain after mitigation). Golder was initially hired as the consultant for Smith Creek however, when Resort Centre was brought forward QPD hired Golder as the environmental consultant for that Project as well. The EIS will address both Smith Creek and Resort Centre because there are so many

similarities between the two projects with regards to environmental impacts and many of the mitigations are best implemented comprehensively.

- Golder has not been hired to define the wildlife corridor. TSMV, in collaboration with the Town, the CAG and the broader community has been working to propose a wildlife corridor that would resolve the corridor disconnect issue in the Bow Valley. The proposed wildlife alignment is a TSMV application and the decision to approve the alignment rests solely with the Province.

Attendee Question: How was TSMV and the Town’s joint hiring of Golder not perceived as a conflict of interest when the Town and the developer are using the same consultant?

- Within the Smith Creek ASP TOR it is not specifically stated that there will or will not be a third party review of the EIS for Smith Creek. Council wants the Project Team to demonstrate that there has been effort to seek different opinions, identify different solutions and ultimately show that development of the EIS is transparent.
- When the Municipal Development Plan (MDP) is adopted, it is possible that the new EIS policy may change the requirements for third party reviews of an EIS or the preparation of an EIS.
- A current unknown is whether or not Council will ask for a third party review on the Resort Centre EIS. This would be complicated because Smith Creek and Resort Centre are inherently linked in the Environmental Study. However, this decision has not been made yet as there was no Terms of Reference approved by Council for the Resort Centre ASP amendments.
- The Smith Creek ASP TOR state that the development of the Smith Creek ASP is a collaboration between Town Administration and QPD. However, the Town reserves the right to make their own decisions about the process and the application.
- Once the Smith Creek ASP is submitted to the Town, the role of the Town changes. The Town becomes a reviewer and evaluator of the application. Ultimately, Administration does not make the decision to approve or reject the ASP—this is Council’s role.

Smith Creek Overview

- Smith Creek is envisioned as a residential community in Canmore that will also have a mixed use node as well as commercial and light industrial uses on the eastern portion of the Plan Area.
- The Smith Creek ASP is proposed to provide for a mix of housing styles and will consist of the following unit shares:
 - Detached and Semi-Detached—approximately 40%
 - Townhouses—approximately 25%
 - Stacked Townhouses—approximately 25%
 - Apartments—approximately 25%
- The ASP provides for a range of between 1200-1700 units (resulting in a population of 3000-4000 people). The ranges in the ASP provide future developers more flexibility while still adhering to the unit cap established in the 1998 settlement agreement.
- Due to the steep topography in the Smith Creek Plan Area, recreational uses are provided through designated trails of varying terrains and difficulty. The ASP provides for other recreational uses in Smith Creek including off-leash dog areas and a terrain park.

Resort Centre Overview

- The Resort Centre has an approved ASP and land use exists on two sites within the Plan Area.
 - Three Sisters Resort Accommodation District (TS-RA1) and a Direct Control District for the Resort Centre (TS-RC).
- The proposed amendments to the Resort Centre ASP primarily address the unfinished golf course.
- The overall vision for Resort Centre will remain consistent with the original ASP. Resort Centre is envisioned as a health and wellness destination for tourists and second home owners with a small amount of permanent residential housing being considered. Additional uses in Resort Centre would include a boutique hotel, a commercial village, resort accommodation units and public and private recreation facilities.
- Recreation in Resort Centre is less focused on trails than the Smith Creek Plan area but will still maintain a high level of pathway connectivity within and beyond the Plan Area.
- Currently Three Sisters owns a portion of land in Resort Centre that is in the Provincial wildlife corridor. The hope is to rectify this with the Province.
- There is also a 35m conservation easement between the wildlife corridor and the developed area. This is for the purpose of providing wildfire thinning and to have trails through the area. The current proposal would involve running a fence along the edge of the conservation easement closest to development (so the wildlife corridor and conservation easement would be on the same side of the fence) and provide for recreational uses in this area on the developed side.

Attendee Question: Can you give us a brief history of the conservation easement on the Stewart Creek golf course?

- The conservation easement was a requirement from the Stewart Creek ASP. It was intended to allow for the operation of the golf course while allowing some wildlife movement through the golf course in the off season, however the conservation easement is not part of the wildlife corridor.

Attendee Question: Is the golf course in Resort Centre already built?

- Yes, 15/18 holes were constructed between 2007 and 2008 but the construction was halted when the land went into receivership.

Attendee Question: Have you identified the number of trailheads in the Smith Creek ASP area?

- There are some existing trailheads in TSMV such as the one in Stewart Creek.
- While the Smith Creek ASP provides for trailheads, the exact number and location of the trailheads will be determined at a later stage in development.
- The trails in Smith Creek as well as in Resort Centre will be connected to more technical trails above the wildlife corridor and there will be specific access points for people to go through the fence to use them. The idea is that any trail that goes through the wildlife corridor would have a gateway through the fence with educational signage.

- The process of creating trails and identifying access points through the fence is currently very conceptual because the Province is still in the process of designating wildlife corridors as well as building the trails (such as the proposed extension to the Highline Trail).

Attendee Question: How many trails are currently in the wildlife corridor?

- *A map of pirate trails in the wildlife corridors was shown on Vertisee.*
- Currently the only new trails that are being built in the wildlife corridor are pirate trails. Golder, Province, Town and TSMV are collaborating to identify exactly how much human use is occurring in the wildlife corridor.
 - Humans and dogs are the most frequent animal captured on camera traps in the wildlife corridor.

Wildlife Considerations

- With regards to wildlife, not only is TSMV working with the Province, the Town, the CAG and the broader community to identify a designated wildlife corridor for Smith Creek, the Smith Creek and Resort Centre Project Teams are also working on a strategy to comprehensively address wildlife. Specifically, the EIS for Smith Creek and Resort Centre identifies human use management, attractant management, education and fencing as key components of an integrated strategy to co-exist with wildlife in Three Sisters and minimize negative human-wildlife interactions. These recommendations are reflected in both the Smith Creek ASP and the Resort Centre ASP Amendments.
 - A wildlife fence clearly delineates the corridor and serves to prevent wildlife from entering the developed area.
 - Designated trails and off leash dog parks are intended to provide people with an alternative to recreating in the wildlife corridor.
 - Attractant management is very important because even with a fence there will be intrusions if there is something to motivate wildlife to enter the developed area.
 - Education is another key component of the plan as it will provide information for locals and visitors on how to coexist with wildlife, minimize attractants, and respect the wildlife corridor.

Wildlife Corridor Alignment

- QPD showed the current approved and proposed Along and Across Valley Wildlife Corridors.
- 70% of TSMV land is proposed to be designated wildlife corridor. Should the Province approve the wildlife corridor, there would be a land exchange between TSMV and the Province. The Land identified as wildlife corridor would be transferred to the Province in exchange for lands within the proposed developable area of Smith Creek.
- The proposed wildlife corridor alignment resolves the current disconnect between wildlife corridors in the Bow Valley.
- The proposed wildlife corridor alignment adds approximately 350m to the northern boundary of the 1998 approved Along Valley Corridor boundary to the fence line in the area adjacent to Stewart Creek Golf Course.

- As part of the wildlife corridor application, TSMV is proposing to realign the Stewart Creek Across Valley Wildlife Corridor.
 - The Town has been focusing on addressing steep creek hazards in the Bow Valley since the 2013 flood. The preliminary steep creek hazard assessment of Stewart Creek has shown to have a medium and low hazard. In order to limit risk to public safety and reduce mitigation costs in the developable area, the Project Team has proposed to realign the Across Valley Corridor through the area. Although there would need to be a mitigation (diversion berm) up stream, there are several benefits to the proposed realignment. Not only does realigning the corridor ensure that this area cannot be developed and address public safety concerns related to steep creek hazards, the alluvial fan provides a decent area for wildlife to move.
 - The realignment of the wildlife corridor would require a new underpass under the Trans-Canada Highway. The existing Across Valley wildlife underpass could also remain in place.
 - There will also be a second underpass below the proposed Three Sisters Parkway, to be designed in more detail at a later stage.
- The wildlife corridor is subject to Provincial approval and the underpass is also subject to approval from Provincial and Federal transportation departments.

Attendee Question: How would the underpass be constructed? What would a crossing structure look like across the parkway?

- The exact logistics have not been determined. The ASP stage of development is broad and conceptual.
- The EIS establishes the generalities of what the underpasses and crossing structures should look like, detailed engineering design is not created at this stage in the process. The ASP ensures that the commitment is made to address the details in future stages of development.
- The crossing structure design is at the conceptual stage presently. At the time of technical design, it will be important that the planned underpass be designed properly using science-based guidelines.

Attendee Question: What would happen if Alberta Transportation did not approval the underpass?

- TSMV would adjust the land use concept so that the existing Across Valley Corridor alignment remains undeveloped as a wildlife corridor. The land use concept revert so that the development pods (the developable area) are not in the wildlife corridor.
- Steep Creek mitigations to address Stewart Creek would need to be identified. There would have to be a Steep Creek Hazard report to identify recommended mitigations, the Town would evaluate the report and the developers would then have to implement the mitigations provided in the report.
- The solution that Administration and QPD discussed was to realign the wildlife corridor however, should the proposed alignment not be accepted by the Province, the same wildlife mitigations recommended in the EIS would be applied to the existing corridor.

Attendee Question: Who pays for the underpass?

- The developer would pay for all costs of construction.

- The Trans-Canada Highway would be maintained by the Province while the Town would take over maintenance of the Three Sisters Parkway.
- The structure beneath the Three Sisters Parkway could be designed to accommodate wildlife as well as accommodate steep creeks hazards. Moving forward, all development on or near creeks with the Town will be required to have mitigations to accommodate steep creeks.
- While the Project Team is not anticipating any difficulty obtaining the approvals, the applications are complex because there are several Provincial departments that must issue approvals. Given that we do not currently have approvals in hand, the Project Team is working to carefully discuss the applications with the public.

What happens if you get the approvals but then do not have the funding to facilitate this?

- The underpass at Dead Man's Flats cost between \$1.8 and 2 million not including donations to construct. TSMV anticipates that the proposed underpass will be comparable to this cost plus inflation.
- Portions of the development that pertain to the approval will not be able to proceed unless conditions are met.
- The EIS, the ASP, and the Wildlife Corridor proposals are conditional- they predict outcomes but do not necessarily commit to anything.

Attendee Question: Has there been any thought on not having a continuous Parkway to avoid having the road bisect the corridor?

- We have emergency access requirements that would preclude us from "cul de sac'ing" the road halfway through the development. This is due to fire and safety requirements.
- This is an example of the types of issues that the Project Team has had to work through to achieve a balance between town requirements, wildlife requirements, community requirements and TSMV requirements.

Golder Question: In the opinion of Dr. Ford and Dr. Clevenger, will the road and double underpass scenario impact movement?

- Yes, the road will impact across valley wildlife movement, as will any increased use of the area by people. TSMV and the Town should cluster the road and any pathway connections through the corridor and make the road as narrow as possible. The Project team described a two way road with a bike lane through the corridor.
- Largest concern for movement is for the across valley corridors, which Dr. Ford and Dr. Clevenger suggested would be negatively impacted by a bisecting parkway; Dr. Ford and Dr. Clevenger expressed less concern for Along Valley movement.

Wildlife Conservation Fencing

- In addition to showing the alignment of the wildlife corridor, QPD also displayed the proposed fence line around Smith Creek and Resort Centre.
- Prior to settling on the proposed fencing concept, the Project Team and biologists explored the idea of using a strong building edge along the wildlife corridor as a means to create a sensory disturbance to deter wildlife from entering the developed area or the option of having a partial

fence around the plan areas. The Project Team also explored the idea of implementing a permeable fence (a post and rail fence).

- As part of the engagement initiatives for Smith Creek, the Project Team organized a meeting with local wildlife experts (including representatives from Parks Canada, Alberta Environment and Parks and Alberta Fish and Wildlife) to discuss their experiences with wildlife fencing. At the meeting experts concluded that a non-permeable enclosure would be a more effective option, in combination with strong attractant management and education strategies.
 - With regards to the idea of having a post and rail fence, Parks Canada indicated that there is a permeable fence in Middle Springs and they noted that the fence is only effective for deterring people from entering the wildlife corridor because of the heavy enforcement in place with the fence. While this level of enforcement is possible in a National Park, it is difficult to achieve in a private development.
- Using feedback from the aforementioned wildlife experts, a non-permeable fence is proposed around Smith Creek, Resort Centre and existing TSMV development as it has been recommended that a comprehensive approach to fencing in Three Sisters would be the most effective way to reduce negative human-wildlife interactions and to more clearly delineate the wildlife corridor.
- TSMV has been able to negotiate with adjacent land owners for the fence to run through Stewart Creek Golf Course to facilitate a full enclosure around TSMV. The alignment of the fence through Stewart Creek Golf Course is based on the operations of the golf course.
- The recreational trails provided within the developed areas as well as the trails along the fence line for maintenance are intended to deter people from recreating on private trails in the wildlife corridor.

Attendee Question: How would you deal with potential intrusions across the parkway and on the highway?

- The fence loop around TSMV would link up with the fence along the Trans-Canada Highway.
- To avoid intrusions in the fence, the Project Team is working to minimize the number of fence ends around the development.
- One of the key risks identified in the EIS was human use in the Across Valley Corridor (for both the current and proposed alignment). The EIS has focused on separating humans and wildlife along the Three Sisters Parkway as well as limiting human use in the wildlife corridors. The project biologists would like to minimize human use in the wildlife corridor and avoid a situation where significant human use limits the effectiveness of the corridor, similar to what currently occurs in the Tipple Valley Corridor. Dr. Ford and Dr. Clevenger agree that this is a key risk and are of the opinion that a bisecting parkway makes achieving this goal difficult.
- While there have been several iterations of fencing and other hard edge options, the current concept involves a single crossing point on the Three Sisters Parkway. Along the Three Sisters Parkway there would be fencing that would guide wildlife under the parkway and guide people to use a single crossing point. The fence would be an alternative to having housing immediately adjacent to the corridor which could result in what currently happens in Peaks of Grassi where each home having a path leading from the backyard into the wildlife corridor.

- It is recognized that there will need to be a solution (ie cattle guards, electro-mats or other crossing structures) included in the fencing design. These details have not yet been fully explored and will be considered at later planning stages.
- There will also need to be swing gates and/or jump-outs included in later stages of fencing design in order to handle wildlife incursions.
- Currently, wildlife managers spend significant time removing wildlife from developed areas. The fencing should improve this situation.

Community Engagement

- Throughout the Smith Creek ASP process and the Resort Centre ASP amendments process, the Project Teams have worked to collaborate with and seek input and feedback from the community.
- In terms of engagement related to wildlife, there was a CAG sub-group created to specifically focus on wildlife. In addition to meetings and discussions, the Project Team and the CAG sub-group also walked around Smith Creek to more clearly understand the landscape and identify a wildlife corridor solution that would balance the needs of wildlife with the necessity to create a viable development. This process informed the wildlife alignment being presented today.
- The Project Teams also hosted small group community conversations with several groups to specifically discuss wildlife. On July 14th, the Project Team hosted a meeting with representatives from environmental groups in the Bow Valley including Y2Y, Biosphere, and WildSmart.
 - At the meeting WildSmart noted that it would be challenging to get 100% compliance on attractant management in Town.
- The Project Team also met with groups that work with new Canadians to identify how to educate new residents how to coexist with wildlife.

Discussion

Golder Question: We think that the letter that you wrote is consistent with what has been identified in the EIS. You published a paper on the prey trap hypothesis in 2010. Do you have any additional data or was 2010 the most recent publication related to this?

- There is no more data on the prey trap hypothesis for this area.
- **Golder follow-up question: You didn't see a strong increase in predation because of fencing at crossing structures?**
 - No—we have seen this anecdotally but there was not a strong correlation. Dr. Ford and Dr. Clevenger observed predation occurring near fences, but no evidence for increased predation near the fences relative to the rest of the landscape.
 - The ideal situation would be to have several wildlife crossings along a highway so that if one crossing structure is blocked, there would be other options for animals to get across the highway. The data indicates that different families of species prefer different crossing structures.
 - The comment in the letter is more related to ensuring that there is more than one highway crossing. A 2010 paper by Dr. Ford and Dr. Clevenger describes a study system

with several crossing structures available for both predator and prey. This system is different than some of the development scenarios at TSMV, in which there are two or fewer crossing structures available. This low density of crossing structures has the potential to create a prey-trap scenario.

Golder Question: What do you think of the projects? In your opinion, what are the big risks? Do you have any suggestions?

- Attendees indicated that the meeting was useful to get up to speed on the proposals.
- Dr. Clevenger expressed the following concerns and comments:
 - Concerns related to the amount of human use in the wildlife corridors as well as the human use near crossing structures.
 - Concerns related to the Three Sister's Parkway bisecting the Across Valley corridor as well as the cumulative impacts associated with more development in the vicinity of underpasses. This is the primary concern of Dr. Ford and Dr. Clevenger who are keen to ensure that the underpasses are designed and implanted correctly. It will be challenging to fully mitigate human use in and around the limited corridors and crossings.
 - Dr. Ford noted that there are very few Across Valley corridors in the valley. He noted that it is going to be important to maintain functional connectivity across the highway.
 - Dr. Ford commented that there was a study in that area that suggested that mitigation could occur on that site if there is a wildlife underpass with fencing.
 - QPD noted that The NRCB has given approval for development in Three Sisters and consequently, no development is not an option. TSMV and the Town are working to identify what has not worked in the past and trying to learn from these past decisions. Overall, while development in Smith Creek and Resort Centre will contribute to cumulative impacts, it is also an opportunity for the Town to improve the function of the Tipple Across Valley corridor.
 - Concerns associated with having development on both sides of the Across Valley corridor and ensuring that there are appropriate mitigations to ensure the wildlife corridor functions with limited human use in the wildlife corridor.
 - Dr. Ford also noted that it will be important to ensure there is good data on human use and wildlife use before, during and after the mitigations go forward as a means to facilitate adaptive management. He also noted it would be important to ensure that the community is engaged in the process of implementing mitigations as this will make the mitigations more sustainable (re: the fence).
- Dr. Ford expressed the following concerns:
 - That developing on the abandoned golf course would eliminate flat habitat for elk. He wanted to see data related to the 25 degree slope in the wildlife corridor as he was unsure it would be suitable for wildlife movement.
 - The Project Team showed a map of the analysed data in the wildlife corridor and Dr. Ford remarked that much of the corridor and the golf course did not contain slopes exceeding 25 degrees.
 - He asked if there are any details related to habitat enhancement initiatives. He noted that he is concerned about details related to vegetation design, and how wildlife will

cross the parkway. Golder/QPD acknowledged the validity of this suggestion, and have taken it under advisement.

- Dr. Ford also expressed the opinion that the mitigations are an experiment and to make sure that we do our homework to make sure that we learn through the process of implementation.
 - The Project Teams noted that recommendations about phasing from the previous EIS have been integrated. Smith Creek will not be built as a single unit, rather it would be built in pieces. At each phase of development the fencing loop would be closed to ensure a full enclosure. This phased approach will provide an opportunity to monitor the implemented mitigations and adjust if necessary (i.e., adaptive management).

Golder Question: What is your opinion on fencing?

- Dr. Ford and Dr. Clevenger both noted that fencing is an effective method to funnel wildlife to crossing structures and also provides more opportunities, when combined with housing setbacks and vegetation management in the developed areas, for reducing sensory disturbance along the wildlife corridor.
 - The Project Team reiterated that there would be a trail on the developed side of the fence for maintenance purposes. The trail would be about four meters in width to accommodate a bobcat for maintenance purposes. As previously mentioned, the trail would also function as a designated trail to deter people from accessing the wildlife corridors from their backyards.
- **Golder Follow-Up Question: How far would the area need to be fenced to funnel wildlife through the crossing?**
 - It varies by crossing, from a few hundred meters to more than a kilometer.

Attendee Question: Is the fence line available to us in shapefile? We could use a model to explore different connectivity scenarios.

- At this point in time the fence line is not available because the Project Team is looking into some modifications based on engagement. During the PwC process (the former ASP application on these lands) and the MDP update process, there was a lot of confusion created due to version control issues and different iterations of similar data being circulated through the community. Consequently, the Project Team is trying to be careful with the data, using web-based mapping to share the information with the public without distributing hard copies of the maps.
- QPD is open to the idea of sharing the shapefiles with Dr. Ford and Dr. Clevenger after we have completed modifying the plans and have completed the information sessions.

QPD Question: Is the NRCB approval considered or factored into research related to wildlife corridors within TSMV lands?

- We recognize that development is inevitable. Scenarios are varied based on types of development could occur. Modelling scenarios can be developed to look at what the area would look like based on different alignments of the parkway or what the area would look like with clustered development etc. It is a tool to help make predictions and further explore “what if” scenarios.

- The models can consider items such as wildlife connectivity and land use sustainability and various priorities can be integrated into the model.

Attendee Question: How long do you anticipate built out of the Plan Areas to be? How is phasing determined?

- It is anticipated that the Stewart Creek Phase 3 build out will be within three to five years.
- The development in Smith Creek would start on the far western portion of the Plan Area (Phase 1) and Phase 2, the far eastern portion of the plan area, to create some commercial vitality in the area.
- In Resort Centre, development would be phased from east to west with priority on the resort core and the resort expansion area. Zoning exists on two sites in Resort Centre already.
- While concurrent development between ASPs can occur, it would need to be approved by the Town.
- Phasing is typically triggered by the market (i.e. market conditions influence where developers start development), however the Town makes the decisions related to land use. The Municipal Development Plan (MDP) notes that the Town may adjust the land use bylaw to accommodate new growth on land available for development within the next three to five years.
 - *Author's Note: this is found in Section 2.3.8 of the most recent version of the MDP (V7).*

Conclusion

- Attendees asked who they should talk to if they have any additional questions.
 - Jessica (QPD) and Tracy (Town of Canmore) would be good contacts for any questions related to the project and Kyle (Golder) would be the contact for wildlife and wildlife mitigations.
- The Project Team thanked Dr. Ford and Dr. Clevenger for agreeing to meet and discuss the project. Our approach has been to understand the concerns of stakeholders, experts and the community and we appreciate varying perspectives and want to work to incorporate them into the proposals where possible.
- The attendees also thanked the Project Team for the meeting and providing more context to the proposals. It was noted that the letter written was a way to advance the conversation among scientists who were requesting Dr. Ford and Dr. Clevenger provide information and data related to the project. Attendees indicated that the Project Team should feel free to follow-up if there are any additional questions.
- Notes will be distributed to attendees in draft as soon as possible. Attendees have the opportunity to amend or revise the notes before approving them. After notes are approved the Project Team would like to share them on the project websites (www.smithcreekcanmore.ca and www.smithcreekcanmore.ca/resort-centre).