

**Smith Creek ASP
Community Advisory Group (CAG)
Meeting Notes
March 10, 2016
7:00-9:30 pm**

In Attendance

- Wanda Bogdane, Recreation
- Kyla Conner, Canmore Resident
- Ken Davies, Recreation
- Karsten Heuer, Environmental (10 minutes only)
- Pat Kamenka, Canmore Resident, Environmental
- Sean Krausert, Town Council – Councillor
- Paul Lessard, TSMV Resident, Canmore Business
- Andrew Nickerson, Canmore Business and Tourism

Regrets

- Chris Ollenberger, Owners Representative for TSMV

CAG Support

- Lori Van Rooijen, Facilitator
- Tracy Woitenko, Town of Canmore
- Alaric Fish, Town of Canmore
- Jessica Karpat, QPD
- Kent MacDougall, QPD
- Mitch Braun, QPD

Agenda

1. What are we hearing in the community?
2. Notes from January 7, 2016
3. Meetings dates and times
4. Review of Presentation
5. Wrap up and Next steps

Agenda Item 1: Introduction and Overview

An overview of the agenda was reviewed by the Facilitator.

A round table discussion on what are people hearing in the community was held.

Town of Canmore has been hearing concerns and questions with regards to undermining and wildlife science (particularly the hard edge vs. soft-edge discussions and corridor width).

Concerns stem from how information is being presented. The rest of CAG concurred. There has been much discussion in the community about the Resort Centre amendment and whether this is taking the focus off Smith Creek. The rest of CAG concurred.

Agenda Item 2: Review of Notes from January 7, 2016

Review of notes from January 7 CAG meeting and January 18 Wildlife sub-group meetings:

- There are concerns that the notes are missing some details particularly in representing minority opinions. The notes are generalized, leading to a reflection of the opinions of the majority while potentially missing differing opinions.
- The Facilitator made a point that meeting notes often must be generalized to attempt to reflect the conversation but that ultimately, the CAG must be comfortable with the notes.
- The Facilitator reiterated that the notes are to be a reflection of the CAG and therefore can and should be changed to reflect the discussions had before being made public. CAG members have been given the opportunity to look over the notes prior to and at each meeting and provide comments before they are approved. The Facilitator asked the CAG to take a closer look at the notes circulated before they are approved, and noted that every set of notes was distributed for review and approval by the CAG to date as well, and that is the time for comments or clarifications.
- CAG were asked to review and provide feedback on the notes from January 7, 2016 by Tuesday March 15, 2016.

Agenda Item 3: Karsten Heuer (10 minutes) at lead of meeting.

- Karsten does not feel the collaborative nature of the CAG process has been successful. He views the process thus far as more of a witnessing exercise. He thinks there has been a slow roll out of pre-determined project details. He has not seen all the movement he would like on issues he has raised with respect to the wildlife discussion.
- He is unsure if the CAG is the right forum for him to engage in and make a difference for wildlife in the Bow Valley. This is a personal choice for him.
- An information package was distributed with some background reading material and a map mark-up detailing his concerns and solutions which Karsten would like to the CAG to consider including the following five points:
 1. Keeping existing Across Valley underpass and opening more area (than proposed) to the existing connection (decrease the proposed area of development around the existing underpass).
 2. Achieve 450m – wide along valley corridor at Site 7 through the use of large development lots.
 3. Decrease proposed development area up to 100m in the Wind Valley corridor at the area described at the “armpit” as the current alignment encroaches into the corridor up to 250m (over half of corridors 450m width).
 4. Proposed an additional Across Valley corridor through the Smith Creek plan area.
 5. Resort Centre ASP: No development above (south) of golf course cabin line.
- QPD pointed out that only four points were ever tabled by Karsten in the wildlife sub group and work was still ongoing on 3 of the 4 points. They also pointed to areas where Karsten's

ideas had been incorporated. The 5th point will be addressed in the Resort Centre sub group. QPD suggested that the entire process was set up to balance all the issues, interests and considerations from all viewpoints, and strongly disagreed with Karsten's opinion that the CAG is a witnessing exercise, and that the plans have been drawn as the discussions with the CAG from the beginning. QPD expressed disappointment in Karsten's opinion that there were pre-determined outcomes, and their opinion was that his view was inaccurate.

- Karsten officially resigned from the CAG and left meeting.

Agenda Item 4: Dates and Times

A matrix of CAG meetings/activities undertaken to date was distributed and discussed. The document is attached. CAG members were asked to add their personal connections and communication with constituent groups over the past eight months and provide the detail to the Facilitator.

Agenda Item 5: Review of Progress to Date (Presentation and Discussion)

The presentation provided a 'snap shot' of the technical conversations undertaken to this point and the progress and decisions that have been made with regards to:

- Transportation (Three Sisters Parkway alignment).
- Trails and Open Space strategies.
- Wildlife Corridor and associated mitigation strategies and how this feeds into the Environmental Impact Study.
- Ongoing grading and land use discussions.

The vision will be the guiding principles for the project: The conversations to date need to be tested against the vision. Policies will need to reflect the vision. There may be a chance that the vision may also need to be updated.

Timeline for ASP submission remains June 2016: The timeline is aggressive particularly with the TSMV's decision to concurrently pursue an amendment to the Resort Centre ASP. Final roll-out of timelines (i.e. open houses, etc.) are not yet determined but will be shared with the CAG for their input and feedback.

Wildlife Corridor Boundary: There was an acknowledgment that the corridor is within Provincial jurisdiction and therefore not a Town of Canmore decision. The Town is responsible for land use adjacent to the designated corridor and that needs to incorporate consideration of impacts on a functional corridor. QPD noted that neither they nor TSMV are afraid of scientific evidence or best practice approaches. They are more concerned with political "rhetoric" and how this creates an air of uncertainty with the science.

There has been discussion around the Thunderstone Quarry area and some other details. The Province has been provided with the conceptual line, discussion notes and slope information but so far they haven't provided a timeline for a meeting to discuss or process for review, as their internal review is going. It is unknown whether there is Provincial support for moving the across valley corridor (i.e. Alberta Transportation may not be included in the discussions to date) or

adjusting the boundaries of the 2002 corridor near Thunderstone. The Town has not been part of the conversations and has requested to be included.

CAG Comment and Question: Not sure the process that determined the corridor line was a good collaborative process? Perhaps we should have left this with the Province to decide. Are we at 85% consensus on the line? Could we get to 95% confidence? Have we done enough? These are not necessarily for discussion today but perhaps offline or for another time.

Even the Province has acknowledged that there is no decision that will satisfy everyone. The Province appreciated the input the CAG provided, but they have been clear that they are the only approval authority for corridors as per the NRCB decision. QPD has provided the Province with all the information including the discussions from our sub group meetings. Golder has indicated that increased corridor width in the bend of the 2002 proposed corridor "armpit" area will have negligible measurable impact on the outcome of the EIS and that mitigation will need to be an integral part of the entire solution. Province shares the concern that the ongoing informal human use in the corridors is a significant issue. The Town also reiterated that they have not been part of the discussions.

Presentation - Wildlife Mitigations: An overview of mitigations was provided noting that no single solution exists. A successful mitigation strategy will need to include a number of simple and complex mitigations (wildlife attractants, sensory disturbances, and fines for humans found in the corridor) and must all work in concert with one another.

CAG Question: How does fencing work in terms of maintenance and operations?

QPD and Town of Canmore are contemplating a fencing strategy for the Smith Creek development. Questions such as how the fence would actually work (design, location, cost, maintenance) still need to be worked out with the project team using local expertise. These details will then feed information into the EIS and then the ASP policies. Parks Canada is experimenting with a variety of fencing strategies and has over 20 years of experience that they are willing to share with the Project Team.

CAG Question: Unsure where residential fencing has worked? Do examples exist? Fear that people won't abide by the fence strategy.

One CAG member: stated that human nature is that people want to be on the other side of the fence and will cut and jump and ignore fencing. Peaks of Grassi development proposal originally called for a fence, but was approved and developed with no fence due to opposition to the concept. The social aspect of fencing is lost here, human behaviour works against it. What can be done about the human behaviour around fencing?

Parks Canada indicated to the Town that for wildlife permeable fencing adjacent to the residential areas of Banff has required education, cameras, fines, and enforcement to achieve compliance.

CAG Comment: We are hoping to discuss affordable housing strategies, types of businesses being attracted to Smith Creek and ultimately the Town of Canmore. We are spending too much time on the details of fencing and wildlife corridors/mitigations. We just need to make a decision and move on.

CAG Comment: Wildlife is adaptable, human settlements are not. We should be focusing on attractant management to make the Town of Canmore less desirable to animals. QPD and the Town of Canmore need to develop bylaws around attractant management. What would be included in the ASP policies? What needs to be done throughout Canmore for human management?

Presentation - Transportation: The Transportation principles developed through a series of discussions between the Town of Canmore and QPD. The Final Parkway alignment was shown and it includes transit and a separate multi-purpose bike lane.

CAG Comment: Not sure about the separated bike lanes. Shared streets are safer streets. Overall the transportation section will have to reflect the Town of Canmore Transportation vision. Canmore engineering department has a handle on the multi-modal / biking strategy.

CAG Comment: Painted lane on shoulder would work, probably easier to maintain in terms of street clearing, etc. There was a discussion of matching unit densities along the parkway to balance the multi-modal strategy.

Presentation - Utilities: Overview of conceptual utility network provided. No issues identified.

Presentation - Grading and the landscape: The conversation is still ongoing. The Town has requested a slope analysis on the 8 degree and 12 degree thresholds being proposed by QPD. Cross-sections prepared for the transportation discussions illustrating the undulating terrain throughout the Smith Creek area with the CAG were shared. The slopes impact the amount of developable area and infrastructure operating costs. Steep areas also present a unique circumstance for a public amenity through the single-track mountain bike trail network being considered in the area. An opportunity exists to provide high quality recreational amenities and encourage humans to remain on designated trails rather than using the Wildlife Corridors. Pirate trails would be considered for rehabilitation.

CAG Member: Not sure how you close pirate trails. Many of them are well built roads with drainage. The proposed trail system may help with mountain bikers, but the pirate trails are used by dog walkers as well and the proposed single-track biking network may not deter the dog walkers in corridors.

CAG Comment: Green Buildings (LEED) and affordable housing provisions in the Smith Creek development would be supported by the community. Canmore Council should encourage provisions on PAH and other affordability items.

CAG Comment: Land would likely not be developed immediately in Smith Creek. If anything an assumption could be made that Resort Centre area would be developed prior to Smith Creek. It is great to know something is coming but need to know what the reality is.

CAG Comment: Wildlife Corridor footprint needs to be determined. Seems like what we are doing is planning around a line that is under provincial jurisdiction.

While the line is under provincial jurisdiction, we need to move items that can be moved forward. The line as is still allows us to complete certain studies and work such as the EIS. Once the line is established the intention is that no other additional 'asks' on the Smith Creek project area would be added from an environmental/wildlife perspective. The intent of the

collaborative process was to try to find an agreeable solution to the wildlife corridor designation for all parties.

Agenda Item 6: Resort Centre Update

CAG sub-group met and discussed the following:

Undermining was the topic of discussion at the last sub group meeting. Technology has changed over the last number of years, so there is room to learn from today's best practices and techniques. One example of this is the mapping techniques used to understand the undermined areas which, have led to the availability of more robust data and have offered a means of developing new solutions.

Members of the sub group felt that it would go a long way to have community members brought in to provide their own experience and expertise. QPD is amenable to having a discussion about the idea, however is concerned some members of the community have become entrenched in a position that they find difficulty in coming to such a discussion with an open mind. Group feels that it would be good to engage with local knowledge and demonstrate a willingness to work with the local community.

CAG Member: Hoping this is not another "Groundhog Day" scenario as they experienced with PriceWaterhouseCoopers (PwC) ASP submission. Council shouldn't be making decisions and determinations with regards to undermining as they are not technical experts on the issue. There are big concerns from a liability perspective and how to deal with this. In regards to fencing, the previous council was not happy with the proposed location of a fence in the PwC ASP which was located along the south line of the abandoned golf course where they would have rather seen it along the 'cabin line'. PwC application was eventually withdrawn prior to public hearing and was not felt a success.

CAG Member: What about having an independent moderator brought in for "arbitration-like" process to finish and finalize the wildlife corridor discussions?

It was noted that wildlife corridors aren't up for "arbitration", and are solely under Provincial jurisdiction as per the NRCB.

CAG Member: Idea of creating an interpretive Centre on (Under) mining history which could demonstrate the history and what we've learned until now. This could be used to increase public perception? An Education strategy? Is it worth considering moving forward? QPD noted that TSMV recently supported the Lamphouse restoration project.

Agenda Item 7: Discussing the Overall Role of the CAG

Facilitator used a round table format and asked each CAG member to provide a perspective on the role of the CAG in this process.

CAG Member: Does the Town of Canmore (Council) think that the CAG process is working? As the process is ongoing, Councils view of a "working process" or overall success is judged on the result. That said, Council continues to support the CAG process.

CAG Member: What is the Town of Canmore Council's view of the collaborative process? The process was developer initiated with Council blessing. Regular processes for approval still apply

for consideration when the new ASP is submitted. CAG does not mean much until material outputs are produced; time is given for internal review and whether public support can be achieved. If community support is achieved the CAG process is a success; negative perception would be status quo with little achieved.

CAG Member: We are kind of stuck in the process until the Province can make a decision on the boundary of the Corridor. How can we conduct Open Houses meaningfully? The Province is reviewing the line and no meeting scheduled yet. How does this impact the project timelines? Is June in jeopardy?

CAG Member: Are there other items to discuss while awaiting word on Wildlife Corridor decisions? Perhaps hosting lunch & learn style events on the vision for Resort Centre. Project team meetings with smaller working groups? CAG thinks this would be well received. Discussion groups would be better than silence while waiting. The sub group discussions did produce a lot of good ideas and really did help move some areas of the discussions along.

CAG Member: People want to know why the Resort Centre is all of a sudden viable to develop. The project focus and interest is seemingly shifting away from Smith Creek.

CAG Member: The loss of one of our members makes me wonder if the CAG process is working. Will the CAG continue to have an impact on the process? But, frustration was also expressed because we have all listened to the wildlife conversation for so long while other issues did not get discussed and wonders whether the wildlife issue could ever get resolved.

CAG Member: A member leaving leaves a sense of abandonment. Losing someone is not a good indicator of the process working. But, there are years and years of issues and there is a right to develop based on NRCB decision and some in the community don't want development period.

CAG Member: Too much time has been spent on wildlife corridors and we need to work on other issues.

CAG Member: The CAG has listened to a lot about wildlife, for a very long time and now Karsten has resigned. This is frustrating as the group has not been able to consider and move on more community related items. (i.e., vision/number of units/types/neighborhoods/affordable housing/recreation).

QPD (representing Owners): It feels like we have sat in a room and tried to work through the issues towards a resolution. However, it was clear that only if the four issues identified by the environmental side were agreed to there would there be agreement and peace. It is frustrating for sure. The conversations always felt close, so negotiations continued but yet four things remained and each time we got close the goal posts appeared to keep moving. What is really upsetting is that the expectation of "agree to disagree" and to continue to engage was clearly not a reality. There was surprise at fifth request added to the table as parting information this evening.

CAG Member: I am on the edge of thinking the CAG process was a waste of time. We need to move forward. The Project Team needs to reiterate if the CAG process is a worthwhile

experience. There is no interest in adding replacement member, just want to move on and move forward with the process/outputs. Is there a scenario where TSMV/Town would walk away from the process? No development is pursued? Go back to the Province and get out of the project/lands as a whole? At this point, we have gone as far as we can and while much has been accomplished, it doesn't feel as though the process is going anywhere at this point in time.

The Facilitator asked CAG members what “collaborative” means to them:

One CAG member felt he's learned a lot, and the process has been collaborative. Some may feel it's not been collaborative because for them collaboration is “agree to meet me at my idea.”

Another CAG member suggested that his view of “collaboration” is a step above what is happening in the CAG process. Collaboration when achieved is profound. Doesn't seem to be happening in this process thus far, Wildlife Corridor is an example.

One CAG member felt that it's very tough to collaborate until we're solid on vision/concept/overall idea. So far the process has lacked a clear concept and once achieved he believes we will all be pleasantly surprised.

Another CAG member suggested a sense of entrenchment is occurring and this isn't necessarily collaboration. There was a lot of contribution to the wildlife discussion and there was more than enough information to make an informed decision. CAGs role is advisory and we need to remember that.

One CAG member is really concerned about how the resignation of a CAG member will be perceived and more importantly, spun by groups that are good at pushing their perceptions.

Another CAG member suggested that the final project must reflect CAG contributions to community/environment/TSMV.

The Town views the process as positive. While difficult, the CAG and overall process being pursued has been better than previous processes. It has provided more input and feedback than any other process in the past and for that they are pleased and grateful.

A CAG member raised question on whether the Town of Canmore needs new growth. *The Town doesn't need the growth from a municipal corporation financial perspective. Sites 7, 8 & 9 (aka Smith Creek) are the last physical lands for Canmore, and reality is that TSMV has a right to develop their lands and that needs to be respected.*

Where do children 20 years from now go to live if there is no growth? There are areas in existing approved ASP areas which have not been developed yet, there are areas slated for commercial growth to support our tourism and tax goals. Town does need affordable housing and land availability is a key component to affordable housing.

All CAG members suggested that it was great to hear the Town of Canmore Administration point of view as it adds a lot to the discussion.

CAG members want to get out and engage on community aspects of plan. The Facilitator suggested that the CAG think about other engagement ideas for smaller discussion groups in the community. How can we roll this out in the community? The Project Team (QPD and the Town of Canmore) would be happy to hear from them.

Agenda Item 8: NEXT STEPS ON SMITH CREEK

The project team needs to be able to link the Vision to the work that's being done and decisions being made. Next CAG meeting technically to be held on the third week of April as outlined in Terms of Reference. The date will be confirmed by the Facilitator. The Project team is still working on items which precede unit numbers and density calculations, affordable housing calculations etc. Emergency access needs discussion.

The Town and QPD will take all the input and get back to the CAG on the following items:

- The date for the next CAG meeting?
- What are the next steps of the process? QPD/Town to think about the CAG process' value and how to engage moving forward as discussed above.
- What is the value to the developer/Town of the CAG?
- CAG members can provide other ideas for Resort Centre discussion?