CITY COUNCIL – REGULAR MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
400 MAIN STREET SE
NOVEMBER 5, 2012 at 6:30 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER – 6:30 P.M.

2. COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
   (Items in this section are confidential. Public attendance is not permitted.)
2.1. Legal Update (Sharon Pollyck)
      Introduction of Joanne Klauer, MLT

3. PUBLIC AGENDA - 7:00 P.M.

4. MINUTES
4.1. Regular Meeting of Council of October 15, 2012
4.2. Organizational Meeting of Council of October 22, 2012
4.3. Acknowledgement of Other Minutes
      Municipal Planning Commission of September 6 and 20, 2012
      Subdivision and Development Appeal Board of October 3, 2012

5. PUBLIC QUESTION PERIOD

6. APPOINTMENTS/PRESENTATIONS
6.1. Matt Carre and Deb Horton
      Council is being presented with concerns with respect to the Channelside neighbourhood.

6.2. Santa Claus Parade (Kim Harris)
      Council is being presented with an update on the Santa Claus Parade.

7. PUBLIC INPUT SESSION
7.1. Bylaw No. B-22/2012 Infrastructure and Off-site Levy Bylaw (Lorne Stevens)
      Bylaw No. B-22/2012 is a bylaw to establish off-site levies.

8. BYLAWS
8.1. Bylaw No. B-22/2012 Infrastructure and Off-site Levy Bylaw (Lorne Stevens)
      Council is being asked to give final readings to Bylaw No. B-22/2012, being a bylaw to establish off-site levies.
9. PUBLIC HEARING

9.1. Bylaw Nos. B-13/2012 & B-14/2012 (Mark Spence)
Bylaw No. B-13/2012 is a bylaw to amend Bylaw No. B-21/1991 (South Airdrie Area Structure Plan), and Bylaw No. B-14/2012 is a bylaw to amend Land Use Bylaw No. B-09/2005 to redesignate lands in Sierra Springs.

8. BYLAWS (CONTINUED)

8.2. Bylaw Nos. B-13/2012 & B-14/2012 (Mark Spence)
Council is being asked to give final readings to Bylaw No. B-13/2012, being a bylaw to amend South Airdrie Area Structure Plan Bylaw No. B-21/1991, and Bylaw No. B-14/2012, being a bylaw to amend Land Use Bylaw No. B-09/2005, to redesignate lands in Sierra Springs; and to adopt the amended Sierra Springs Outline Plan.

8.3. Bylaw No. B-20/2012 (Mark Spence)
Council is being asked to give First Reading to Bylaw No. B-20/2012, being a bylaw to amend Land Use Bylaw No. B-09/2005 to redesignate lands in Ravenswood.

8.4. Debenture Bylaw No. B-32/2012 (Chris Reason)
Council is being asked to amend the 2012 Capital Budget for the renovation of the Municipal Police Building and to give First Reading to Debenture Bylaw No. B-32/2012.

10. AGENDA REPORTS

Council is being asked to approve the 2013 Operating and Capital Budget. The 2014-2015 Operating and 2014-2022 Capital Plan are also presented for information.

10.2. Staff Appointments to the Airdrie Rodeo Ranch Association (Sharon Pollyck)
Council is being asked to rescind motion 2012-C-115, Staff Appointments to the Airdrie and District Rodeo Association.

10.3. Municipal Policing Advisory Board Terms of Reference (Sharon Pollyck)
Council is being asked to amend the Terms of Reference for the Municipal Policing Advisory Board.

11. BOARD/MEMBER REPORTS

12. REVIEW OF COUNCIL FOLLOW-UP (Paul Schulz)

12.1. Council Follow-up to October 15, 2012

13. ADJOURNMENT
Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Municipal Council of the City of Airdrie, in the Province of Alberta, held in Council Chambers with the following:

PRESENT

Mayor P. Brown
Deputy-Mayor M. Buchanan
Alderman G. Alexander
Alderman F. Burley
Alderman R. Chapman
Alderman K. Hegg
Alderman A. Hunter

City Manager – P. Schulz
City Clerk – S. Pollyck
Assistant City Clerk/Recording Secretary – K. Kitiuk

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Brown called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Alderman Burley moved “that Council enters Committee of the Whole” at 6:32 p.m.

Carried

Alderman Hunter moved “that Council leaves Committee of the Whole” at 6:53 p.m.

Carried

Recess/Reconvene

Mayor Brown declared a recess at 6:54 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 7:01 p.m.

MINUTES

Alderman Alexander moved “that Council adopts the minutes of the regular meeting of Council of October 1, 2012, as presented.”

Carried

Deputy-Mayor Buchanan moved “that Council acknowledges the minutes of the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board Hearing of May 30, 2012.”

Carried

PUBLIC QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Richard Herdman, 1840 Meadowbrook Drive, advised that he works out at Genesis Place regularly and wanted let Council know that he always receives excellent service. He expressed concerns regarding some benefits not being provided to part-time employees.

Mr. Paul Schulz, City Manager, noted that details regarding staff benefits can be provided to Council during a personnel update.
Mr. Rick Smith, 120 - 2nd Ave NW, on behalf of Thuy Nguyen, owner of Anna’s Café Europa at Main Street and 2nd Avenue NW, indicated that he is speaking as a favour to Ms. Nguyen and has no interest in the business. He advised that she has concerns with handicap parking behind the locations and would like the parking on 2nd Avenue NW changed from one hour to short-term parking to accommodate three to four cars. Mr. Smith noted there is support from both residents and businesses in the area and provided a number of letters and a list of signatures evidencing this.

Deputy-Mayor Buchanan moved “that Council directs the Traffic Advisory Committee to report back to Council after its November meeting with respect to the potential of establishing short-term parking on 2nd Avenue NW adjacent to Anna’s Café Europa.”

Carried

APPOINTMENTS/PRESENTATIONS

Kosovo Unit, Canadian Army Veteran’s Motorcycle Unit

K. Brinson, Parks Operations Team Leader, introduced Alain Habel, President of the Kosovo Unit, The Canadian Army Veterans Motorcycle Unit, to present Council with a plan for the development of a portion of the centre median on Veteran’s Boulevard as a permanent memorial for fallen soldiers.

Mr. Habel provided background on the 2011 Airdrie Remembrance Day event when flags were hung on light standards, temporary crosses were erected on Veterans Boulevard, and a parade was held.

He noted the Unit has held a vote to become a not for profit, the results of which are yet to be determined. The Unit will bear the costs of the project through donations and grants through Veterans’ Affairs. He reviewed the attachments illustrating the proposed project and discussed the five-year plan for development, including flagpole and monument installation.

In response to a question from Council, Mr. Habel confirmed that Canadian flags will fly from the flagpoles and will be maintained by the Kosovo Unit.

Mayor Brown thanked the Kosovo Unit for their great work.

Alderman Burley moved “that Council approves the installation by the Kosovo Unit of the memorial amenities consisting of five flagpoles and two bronze monuments on a portion of the centre median of Veterans Boulevard.”

Carried

Nose Creek Valley Museum

M. McAllister, Community Developer, introduced Laurie Harvey, Curator, and Karen Copely, Assistant Curator, of the Nose Creek Valley Museum, who appeared to ask Council to enter into a lease for the Museum at its present location of 1701 Main Street for a further five years with four renewable five-year terms.

Ms. Harvey reviewed the presentation in the Agenda. She provided details on the displays and services offered by the museum. She discussed entrance
fees in comparison to other communities and reviewed the museum’s various sponsors and partners.

Ms. Fiona McCarthy, Property Administrator, discussed the proposed lease, which is aligned with Airdrie’s Great Places report and AirdrieONE Plan. She discussed Council’s vision and how it aligns with the museum’s operations.

Alderman Chapman moved “that Council directs staff to enter into a lease with the Nose Creek Valley Museum for the location of 1701 Main Street for a further five years with four renewable five-year terms.”

Carried

**Airdrie 2014 Alberta Summer Games Society**

M. Lock, Director of Community Services, introduced Al Jones, Chair; Michelle Carre, Vice Chair; and Val Simpson, Director of Administration; of the Airdrie 2014 Alberta Summer Games Society who appeared to ask Council to endorse an agreement with the Alberta Recreation, Sport, Parks and Wildlife Foundation outlining the City’s responsibilities with respect to hosting the 2014 Games. M. Lock reviewed the report. It was noted that a resolution is also required to endorse the appointments to the Alberta Summer Games Society Board.

Mr. Jones provided Council with the names of the Board of Directors and Executive Committee. Council thanked the individuals for stepping up to sit on the Society.

Alderman Hegg moved “that Council endorses the appointment of the following individuals to the Airdrie 2014 Alberta Summer Games Society:

Al Jones, Chair
Michelle Carre, Vice Chair
Kim Harris, City Liaison
Rebecca McKay, Director of Accommodation
Val Simpson, Director of Administration
Karin Simpson, Director of Culture
Michelle Lock, Director of Facilities
Marie Lauer, Director of Food Services
Keith Wilkinson, Director of Friends of the Games
Dan Oneil, Director of Promotion
Kristen Reid, Director of Protocol
Pat Elliott, Director of Registration and Results
Chris Gourlie, Director of Safety and Communications
Rob Spillet, Chair of Security
Adam Gourlie, Chair of Communications
Heather Zyerveld, Director of Sports
Gil Vincent, Director of Transportation
Tim Elliott, Director of Volunteers
Chris Mulders, Chair of Communications & General
Lise Blanchette, Chair of Recruitment & Registration
Megan Baxter, Chair of Volunteer Appreciation.”

Carried

Mr. Jones discussed the agreement that the City must enter into with Alberta Recreation, Sport, Parks and Wildlife Foundation.
Ms. Simpson asked that the City to provide funding in the following manner:

- Prior to December 31, 2012: $100,000
- Prior to March 31, 2013: $100,000
- Prior to March 31, 2014: $100,000

Mr. Jones discussed the timing of the provincial disbursements in March of 2013 and 2014.

Mr. Schulz noted that the City is currently in the process of budgeting for 2013 and 2014. The City did not know if the Games would be awarded to Airdrie until midway through 2012; therefore, the source of the 2012 funding will need to be determined.

In response to a question, M. Lock noted that the Community Services Advisory Board has heard the presentations regarding support for the Games but did not consider the agreement before Council tonight as it is an agreement between Council and the Foundation.

Alderman Hegg moved “that Council amends the 2012 operating budget to disperse one hundred thousand ($100,000) dollars in funding to the Airdrie 2014 Alberta Summer Games Society and refers the budget amendment to the Finance Advisory Committee to determine the source of funding.”

Carried

Alderman Hegg moved that Council directs staff to include one hundred thousand ($100,000) dollars to be paid to the Airdrie 2014 Alberta Summer Games Society in each of the 2013 and 2014 operating budgets.”

Carried

Alderman Hegg moved “that Council endorses the agreement between the City of Airdrie and the Alberta Sport, Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation, and formally acknowledges the Airdrie 2014 Alberta Summer Games Society.”

Carried

**Airdrie Housing Limited**

M. Lock, Director of Community Services, introduced Shelley Sweet, Managing Director, and Helen Shields, Vice Chair, of Airdrie Housing Limited to present Council with the 2013 Budget.

Ms. Sweet reviewed the mission and objectives of Airdrie Housing Limited. She provided background on the organization and discussed the provincial funding received. She provided highlights of the housing provided including client growth and monthly supplements. She discussed the affordable rental program including the number of units, location, rent and vacancy rate, noting that there is a waiting list for these units. She further discussed market rate rental units.

Ms. Sweet discussed asset management and the reserve fund for maintenance expenditures. She noted Airdrie Housing Limited has moved to an in-house property management model and discussed the savings being
experienced. She further discussed the partnership with Community Links and the Airdrie Rotary Club.

Ms. Sweet described the difference affordable housing makes in the community and provided some details on good news stories. She requested that Council provide financial support at the same level as provided in 2012.

Ms. Sweet discussed the development of a mixed use building. Acquiring land and partners is a major undertaking for 2013. It was noted Airdrie Housing Limited does have some sites they are interested in.

Alderman Hunter moved “that Council forwards the 2013 Airdrie Housing Limited request for grant dollars to the Finance Advisory Committee for consideration within the 2013 City of Airdrie operating budget.”

Carried

BYLAWS

Alderman Burley moved “that Council gives First Reading to Bylaw No. B-13/2012, being a Bylaw to amend Bylaw No. B-21/1991, the South Airdrie Area Structure Plan, by amending Figure 7 ‘Development Plan’ and updating all associated text and tables, as shown in Schedule A attached to the bylaw.”

Carried

Alderman Burley moved “that Council gives First Reading to Bylaw No. B-14/2012, being a bylaw to amend Section 2-8 (3) (b) (Land Use Map) of Land Use Bylaw No. B-09/2005 to rezone a total of 1.046 hectares (2.58 acres) from Industrial Business Park Two District (IB-2) to Convenience Commercial District (C-C) for Lots 15, 16, and 17; Block 3; Plan 0512433 (Sierra Springs), as illustrated in Schedule A attached to the bylaw.”

Carried

Alderman Hunter moved “that Council gives First Reading to Bylaw No. B-22/2012, being a bylaw to establish off-site levies and to repeal Bylaw No. B-16/2010.”

Carried

FINANCIAL POSITION

Deputy-Mayor Buchanan moved “that Council accepts the Cash and Investments Summary for September 30, 2012, as presented.”

Carried

BUSINESS ARISING

Alderman Burley moved “that Council endorses the maintenance of the status quo with respect to the enforcement of Traffic Bylaw No. 803 as it pertains to parking in marked bus zones and does not allow bus zones to be used by taxi cabs.”

Carried
CORRESPONDENCE

2012-C-109
Lisa Dang
Request for Tax Penalties Relief
Deny

Alderman Alexander moved “that Council denies the request of Lien Dang for tax relief for Bay 1 – 99 East Lake Crescent, Airdrie.”

Carried

In Favour:
Mayor Brown
Deputy-Mayor Buchanan
Alderman Alexander
Alderman Burley
Alderman Chapman
Alderman Hegg

Opposed:
Alderman Hunter

MEMBER/BOARD REPORTS

There were no Member/Board Reports.

ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Brown adjourned the meeting at 9:46 p.m.

Mayor

City Clerk

kk
Minutes of the Organizational Meeting of the Municipal Council of the City of Airdrie, in the Province of Alberta, held in Council Chambers with the following:

PRESENT

Deputy-Mayor M. Buchanan  
Alderman G. Alexander  
Alderman F. Burley  
Alderman R. Chapman  
Alderman K. Hegg  
Alderman A. Hunter  
Acting City Manager – M. Locking  
City Clerk - S. Pollyck  
Assistant City Clerk – K. Kitiuk  
Recording Secretary – M. Soukoreff

ABSENT

Mayor P. Brown

CALL TO ORDER

Deputy-Mayor Buchanan called the meeting to order at 5:46 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

2012-C-110  
Enter Committee of the Whole  
Alderman Burley moved “that Council enters Committee of the Whole” at 5:47 p.m.  
Carried

2012-C-111  
Leave Committee of the Whole  
Alderman Burley moved “that Council leaves Committee of the Whole” at 6:23 p.m.  
Carried

Recess/Reconvene

RECESS/RECONVENE

Deputy-Mayor Buchanan declared a recess at 6:24 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 6:31 p.m.

AGENDA REPORTS

Establish Regular Council Meeting Schedule

2012-C-112  
Establish Regular Council Meeting Schedule  
Alderman Alexander moved "that Council sets a regular meeting schedule for the public meetings of Council of the first and third Monday of each month at 7:00 p.m. in Council Chambers; and in the event that a Council Monday falls on a statutory holiday, the meeting will be held the next business day (Tuesday)."  
Carried
Council Calendar

Alderman Burley moved “that Council adopts the 2012 Council Calendar as presented with the first meeting of January 2013 cancelled.”

Carried

Adopt Signing Authorities Policy

Alderman Chapman moved “that Council adopts Signing Authorities Policy No. P-10/2001 as amended.”

Carried

Staff Appointment to Rodeo Ranch Association

Alderman Hegg moved “that Council appoints Kim Harris as staff representative with Lorri Laface as an alternate to the Airdrie Rodeo Ranch Association for 2013.”

Carried

Amend Volunteer Terms

Alderman Hunter moved “that Council:

1. removes the set term for volunteers on the Assessment Review Board, Community Services Advisory Board, Environmental Advisory Board, Finance Advisory Committee, Municipal Planning Commission, and Subdivision and Development Appeal Board, and continues to appoint volunteers annually with no maximum term of service on any one board; and

2. amends the applicable board, committee and commission profile sheets to reflect the removal of the set term for membership.”

Carried

BYLAWS

Alderman Alexander moved “that Council gives First Reading to Bylaw No. B-24/2012, being a bylaw to amend Section 5 of Subdivision and Authority Bylaw No. B-34/2004 to read as follows:

a. the Commission shall be comprised of nine (9) members, of which not more than two (2) shall be members of Council, who shall be appointed by resolution of Council at each organizational meeting for a term of one (1) year.”

Carried
2012-C-118
Bylaw No. B-24/2012 Second Reading

Alderman Burley moved “that Council gives Second Reading to Bylaw No. B-24/2012.”

Carried

2012-C-119
Bylaw No. B-24/2012 Permission for Third Reading

Alderman Hegg moved “that Council grants permission to give Third Reading to Bylaw No. B-24/2012.”

Carried Unanimously

2012-C-120
Bylaw No. B-24/2012 Third Reading

Alderman Hunter moved “that Council gives Third Reading to Bylaw No. B-24/2012.”

Carried

2012-C-121
Bylaw No. B-25/2012 Repeal Police Committee Bylaw No. 839 Effective January 1, 2013 First Reading

Alderman Alexander moved “that Council gives First Reading to Bylaw No. B-25/2012, being a bylaw of the City of Airdrie to repeal Police Committee Bylaw No. 839, effective January 1, 2013.”

Carried

2012-C-122
Bylaw No. B-25/2012 Second Reading

Alderman Burley moved “that Council gives Second Reading to Bylaw No. B-25/2012.”

Carried

2012-C-123
Bylaw No. B-25/2012 Permission for Third Reading

Alderman Hegg moved “that Council grants permission to give Third Reading to Bylaw No. B-25/2012.”

Carried Unanimously

2012-C-124
Bylaw No. B-25/2012 Third Reading

Alderman Hunter moved “that Council gives Third Reading to Bylaw No. B-25/2012.”

Carried

2012-C-125
Establish Municipal Policing Advisory Board

Alderman Alexander moved “that Council disbands the Police Committee and establishes a Municipal Policing Advisory Board, effective January 1, 2013; and adopts the Municipal Policing Advisory Board profile sheet.”

Carried

2012-C-126
Bylaw No. B-23/2012 Amend SDAB Bylaw No. 28/95 First Reading

Alderman Alexander moved “that Council gives First Reading to Bylaw No. B-23/2012, being a bylaw to amend Subdivision and Development Appeal Board Bylaw No. 28/95 as follows:

1. That Section 3(c) be deleted.

2. That Section 7 be amended to read as follows:

   ‘(c) maintain a recording of all the meetings of the Board solely as an administrative aid for use by the Secretary and the Board in preparing decisions of the Board.”
Recordings are held, following the meeting, for five years and then destroyed, unless the hearing has not been completed.’

3. That Section 8 be added to read as follows:

‘Notice of Appeal

(a) A person who files a notice of appeal with the Board shall, at the time of such notice of appeal is filed, pay to the City a fee established administratively in the Fees and Charges schedule.

(b) A notice of appeal will not be considered as having been filed unless the notice of appeal and fee referred to in subsection (a) above have been received by the Secretary within the time period for filing a notice of appeal prescribed by the Municipal Government Act.

(c) The fee referred to in subsection (a) above shall not be waived or refunded under any circumstances.’

4. That Section 9 be added to read as follows:

‘Transcripts

A person who requests a transcript of a hearing of the Board must pay to the City:

(i) the actual cost of the preparation of the transcript; and

(ii) a twenty-five dollar ($25.00) administration fee.’

5. All subsequent numbering be amended accordingly.”

Carried

2012-C-127
Bylaw No. B-23/2012
Second Reading

Alderman Burley moved “that Council gives Second Reading to Bylaw No. B-23/2012.”

Carried

2012-C-128
Bylaw No. B-23/2012
Permission for Third Reading

Alderman Hegg moved “that Council grants permission to give Third Reading to Bylaw No. B-23/2012.”

Carried Unanimously

2012-C-129
Bylaw No. B-23/2012
Third Reading

Alderman Hunter moved “that Council gives Third Reading to Bylaw No. B-23/2012.”

Carried
APPOINTMENT OF ALDERMANIC REPRESENTATIVES

Alderman Chapman moved "that Council makes the following aldermanic appointments which shall be in effect until the next organizational meeting:

**Mayor Brown** – Airdrie Mainstreet Square, Calgary Regional Partnership, Emergency Management Executive Committee, Finance Advisory Committee, Rocky View/Airdrie Intermunicipal Committee, and as an alternate to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.

**Alderman Alexander** – Airdrie Municipal Library Board, Airdrie Mainstreet Square, Community Services Advisory Board, Emergency Management Executive Committee, Municipal Police Committee (Chair) (until January 1, 2013), Municipal Policing Advisory Board (Chair) (effective January 1, 2013), Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (Chair), and as an alternate to the Rocky View/Airdrie Intermunicipal Committee.

**Deputy-Mayor Buchanan** – Airdrie Housing Limited, Airdrie Mainstreet Square, Emergency Management Executive Committee, Environmental Advisory Board (Chair), Finance Advisory Committee (Chair), and as an alternate to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.

**Alderman Burley** – Airdrie Housing Limited, Airdrie Mainstreet Square, Community Services Advisory Committee (Vice-Chair), Emergency Management Executive Committee, Municipal Planning Commission (Chair), and the Rocky View Foundation.

**Alderman Chapman** – Airdrie Mainstreet Square, Calgary Regional Partnership, Emergency Management Executive Committee, Finance Advisory Committee (Vice-Chair), Rocky View/Airdrie Intermunicipal Committee, Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (Vice-Chair), and as an alternate to the Rocky View Foundation.

**Alderman Hegg** – Airdrie Municipal Library Board, Airdrie Mainstreet Square, Community Services Advisory Board (Chair), Emergency Management Executive Committee, Environmental Advisory Board (Chair), and as an alternate to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.

**Alderman Hunter** – Airdrie Mainstreet Square, Calgary Regional Partnership, Emergency Management Executive Committee, Municipal Planning Commission (Vice-Chair), and Municipal Police Committee (Vice-Chair) (until January 1, 2013), Municipal Policing Advisory Board (Vice-Chair) (effective January 1, 2013)."

Carried
CITIZEN APPOINTMENTS

Citizen appointments run from January 1 through December 31, 2013.

2012-C-131
Citizen Appointments
Municipal Library Board
Alderman Alexander moved “that Council confirms the continuing appointments of Judy Dufort, Dustin Fedun, Jean McClean, Shelley Sweet, and Tara Daigle, and appoints Andrew Speirs and Derek Stamp to the Airdrie Municipal Library Board.”
Carried

2012-C-132
Citizen Appointments
Assessment Review Board
Alderman Chapman moved “that Council confirms the continuing appointments of Janis Risi, Dan Oneil, Jonathan Ward, and Christa Sanders to the Assessment Review Board.”
Carried

2012-C-133
Citizen Appointments
Community Services Advisory Board
Alderman Hegg moved that “Council re-appoints Andre Aubut, Todd Brand, Denise MacEachen, Rae McMullen, Kristen Reid, and Rob Van Biezen, and appoints Monica Sheible to the Community Services Advisory Board.”
Carried

2012-C-134
Citizen Appointments
Environmental Advisory Board
Alderman Hegg moved “that Council re-appoints Aaron Holmes, Al Jones, Purple Kumai, Thomas Minard, and Ray Walinga to the Environmental Advisory Board.”
Carried

2012-C-135
Citizen Appointments
Finance Advisory Committee
Alderman Chapman moved “that Council re-appoints Grant Monsour, Ally Kunyi-Taylor, and Sean Monaghan, and appoints Kellie Anderson to the Finance Advisory Committee.”
Carried

2012-C-136
Citizen Appointments
Municipal Planning Commission
Alderman Burley moved “that Council re-appoints Donelda Johnson, Darren Lockhart, Allan MacEachen, Dan Oneil, Peter Schonekess, Karin Simpson, and Karl Terry to the Municipal Planning Commission.”
Carried

2012-C-137
Expand Membership
Municipal Policing Advisory Committee
Alderman Alexander moved “that Council expands the citizen complement of the Municipal Policing Advisory Board to six citizen members until a vacancy presents itself, at which time the complement will return to five citizen members.”
Carried
2012-C-138
Citizen Appointments
Municipal Policing Advisory Committee

Alderman Alexander moved “that Council re-appoints Taylor Farthing, Chris Gourlie, Jean-Paul DuBreuil, Sherry MacInnis, and Trevor Schulz to the Municipal Police Committee until January 1, 2013; and appoints Taylor Farthing, Chris Gourlie, Jean-Paul DuBreuil, Sherry MacInnis, Trevor Schulz, and Jeff Richards to the Municipal Policing Advisory Committee effective January 1, 2013.”

Carried

2012-C-139
Citizen Appointments
Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

Alderman Alexander moved “that Council re-appoints Gary Armstrong, Robert Brunet, Bruce Buchart, Hank Geddert, and Kelly Hall to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.”

Carried

ADJOURNMENT

Deputy-Mayor Buchanan adjourned the meeting at 6:57 p.m.

Carried

_____________________________________________________
Deputy-Mayor

_____________________________________________________
City Clerk
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Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Airdrie Municipal Planning Commission, held in Council Chambers with the following:

PRESENT
Alderman Fred Burley (Chair)
Alderman Allan Hunter
Donelda Johnson
Allan MacEachen
Dan O'Neil
Peter Schonekess
Karl Terry

Manager, Planning & Sustainable Development - Tracy Corbett
Team Leader, Planning & Development Services - Jamie Dugdale
Senior Planner - Naren Garg

Recording Secretary – Kathryn Rushford

ABSENT WITH REGRETS
Darren Lockhart
Karin Simpson

CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with a quorum present.

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING AUGUST 16, 2012

Alderman Hunter moved “that the Airdrie Municipal Planning Commission adopt the minutes of the regular meeting of August 16, 2012 as presented.”

CARRIED

2012-P-026
Approval of Minutes
August 16, 2012 Regular Meeting

REMOVAL OF MUNICIPAL RESERVE DESIGNATION
SIERRA SPRINGS DEVELOPMENT
APPLICANT: TDL GROUP CORP.
OWNER: CITY OF AIRDRIE
LOCATION: 2649 MAIN STREET SE
STAFF CONTACT: NAREN GARG

N. Garg advised that TDL Group Corp. (operating entity for the Airdrie South Tim Horton's) has submitted a request for disposition of 1428.3 sq ft of Municipal Reserve to allow for the leasing of land in order to modify the drive-thru to increase the capacity for off-street vehicular stacking at the Airdrie South Tim Horton's.

A question arose as to what would happen if Tim Horton's vacated the site. N. Garg advised that removal of the MR designation is premised on TDL Group entering into a lease agreement with the City. If Tim Horton's vacates the site, any new operator would need to negotiate a new lease agreement with the City.

It was questioned whether a land use bylaw amendment will be necessary before the City can proceed with leasing the land. N. Garg advised that rezoning will not be
necessary as the primary use already exists on the adjacent site and this land will be used solely for a roadway and for landscaping. In response to a question, J. Dugdale advised that the land cannot be subdivided and consolidated with the adjacent parcel because TDL Group leases the parcel on which the Tim Hortons restaurant is located.

In response to a question, N. Garg confirmed that lease negotiations are being carried on by Corporate Properties and this property will become a revenue-generating component of the City’s portfolio.

2012-P-027
Removal of MR Designation
Sierra Springs Development

Alderman Hunter moved “that the Airdrie Municipal Planning Commission recommends Council removal of the Municipal Reserve designation for 1428.3 sq ft of Plan No. 0010815 as generally identified in the Municipal Reserve Disposition Area Map, with the following conditions:

Approved Plans

1. That the proponent enters into a market value lease agreement with the City of Airdrie for use of the aforementioned land.

Signs

2. That the proponent submits a Development Permit application in accordance with the City of Airdrie Land Use Bylaw No. B-09/2005 which addresses:

   a. The relocation of pathways impacted by the development to the satisfaction of the City of Airdrie;

   b. Landscaping improvements and removal and relocation of trees in and immediately adjacent to the subject land to ensure effective buffering between the pathway and the new drive-thru lanes to the satisfaction of the City of Airdrie;

   c. Modifications to Public Utility easements to the satisfaction of the City of Airdrie."

CARRIED

DP NO. 140-12
HIGHWAY BULLETIN SIGN (RENEWAL)
APPLICANT: AIRDRIE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OWNER: CITY OF AIRDRIE
LOCATION: 369 BIG SPRINGS DRIVE SE
STAFF CONTACT: KARI MAJOR

J. Dugdale advised that this item was removed from the agenda as new information has been received which will substantially change the agenda report.

DP NO. 69-12
FREESTANDING SIGN
APPLICANT: MELCOR DEVELOPMENTS LTD.
OWNER: 924643 ALBERTA LTD.
LOCATION: 2 KINGSVIEW BV SE
STAFF CONTACT: KARI MAJOR

Melcor Developments Ltd. has applied to erect a freestanding sign at the Kingsview Market Square Shopping Centre on the northwest side of the property, just east of Highway 2 on the south side of Yankee Valley Blvd.
J. Dugdale reviewed the application. Representatives of Melcor Developments Ltd. were in attendance in support of the application.

Concern was raised over the significant height of the sign and the variances being requested to accommodate the height (100% variance) and the size of the message boards (250% variance).

Representatives of Melcor noted that the sign will be located about 1,200 feet back from the highway. The height and copy size are required to give drivers travelling at 110 km/h sufficient time to change lanes and exit. A comment was made that the sign is past the opening to the exit ramp. In that location, a driver in the left hand lane would still not have time to change lanes and exit.

J. Dugdale noted that Melcor had provided photos showing what the travelling public would see as they drive north on the highway. A comment was made that the photo makes the sign look unobtrusive from far away but it would look much more obtrusive from close proximity, particularly given that the sign is proposed to be six stories high and the land is higher than the highway.

Concern was raised that this sign would set the precedent for other signs in the area, particularly for businesses on the west side where visibility for the travelling public is a more significant issue. J. Dugdale noted that this type of sign does not fit well into the freestanding sign category and that staff will be re-considering this type of sign in the Land Use Bylaw review.

It was questioned whether there are any similar signs in Calgary. J. Dugdale advised that the applicant had provided some comparables from the Edmonton area. The Commission agreed that they would like to see those comparables.

Concern was raised that seven signs have already been approved for the site (a variance of three). Given the size of this sign, it would be equivalent to 11 or 12 signs on the site. J. Dugdale noted that Planning staff have taken into consideration the cumulative impact of all of the signs.

Alderman Hunter moved "that DP 69-12 be tabled until the applicant can provide more information on visuals and structural impact, and comparables."

CARRIED

INFORMALS

Tim Horton's - Assuming Council approves the removal of the MR designation, can the flow of traffic in the drive-thru lanes be reversed to flow from west to east so the parking stalls on the east side of the restaurant won't be blocked by drive-thru traffic? The applicant advised that this wouldn't work as pick-up cannot be through the passenger window. N. Garg advised that this site has been challenging. Staff have worked extensively with the applicant and this appears to be the only feasible design solution. Alderman Hunter commended staff and the applicant for coming up with a solution given the limitations associated with the site.

It was questioned whether this application will come back to MPC again. N. Garg advised that the development permit will be handled administratively. Staff are looking at different approaches which other municipalities are using as "one size does not fit all" for drive-thrus.
Next Meeting

NEXT MEETING

The next regular meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 20, 2012.

Adjournment

ADJOURNMENT

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 7:37 p.m.

[Signature]
Chairman

[Signature]
Recording Secretary
Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Airdrie Municipal Planning Commission, held in Council Chambers with the following:

PRESENT
Dan O'Neil (Acting Chair)
Donelda Johnson
Darren Lockhart
Allan MacEachen
Peter Schonekess
Karl Terry

Team Leader, Planning & Development Services - Jamie Dugdale
Senior Planner - Mark Spence

Recording Secretary – Kathryn Rushford

ABSENT WITH REGRETS
Alderman Fred Burley
Alderman Allan Hunter
Karin Simpson

CALL TO ORDER
J. Dugdale called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. with a quorum present. Mr. Dugdale called for nominations for Acting Chair for the meeting. A. MacEachen nominated D. O'Neil and D. O'Neil accepted. J. Dugdale turned the chair over to D. O'Neil at 7:04 p.m.

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING SEPTEMBER 6, 2012
D. Johnson moved “that the Airdrie Municipal Planning Commission adopt the minutes of the regular meeting of September 6, 2012 as presented.”

CARRIED

2012-P-029
Approval of Minutes
September 6, 2012 Regular Meeting

BYLAW NO. B-13/2012 & B-14/2012
LAND USE AMENDMENT 1-B2 TO C-C
APPLICANT: FOCUS CORPORATION
OWNER: 1230169 ALBERTA LTD.
LOCATION: SIERRA SPRINGS AREA
2926, 2934 & 2942 MAIN STREET SOUTH
STAFF CONTACT: MARK SPENCE

Focus Corporation has requested, on behalf of 1230169 Alberta Ltd., to amend the South Airdrie Area Structure Plan (using Bylaw No. B-13/2012) and the Land Use Bylaw (using Bylaw No. B-14/2012) by re-designating a total of 2.58 acres from Industrial Park Two District (IB-2) to Convenience Commercial District (C-C). In addition to the two proposed bylaw amendments, staff will also present Council with a resolution to adopt the amended Sierra Springs Outline Plan.

M. Spence presented the application. Representatives of Focus Corporation were
present in support of the application.

In response to a question, M. Spence advised that the C-C designation is commonly referred to as Highway Commercial and focuses on good location and exposure to high volumes of traffic. The parcels to the south remain as IB-2 designations.

The following concerns were raised by the Commission:

- Comments in the agenda report are not consistent with respect to the interface between commercial and industrial uses. It was noted that there will always be an interface somewhere between different land uses. Prior to annexation, the City debated what purpose each area should serve and it was agreed that industrial uses should be spread throughout the city to alleviate congestion in one area.

- While the size of each parcel is not large enough for most IB-2 type uses, the size is what the developer requested. A comment was made that if this size of lot is never appropriate for industrial use, developers should not be allowed to create such a lot in an industrial zoning.

- A comment was made that the staff report indicates that approval of this application would avoid spot-zoning of a single parcel; however, the application gives the impression of being "better spot zoning". M. Spence advised that only two parcels in this area remain vacant. If those landowners want to rezone their land, staff will evaluate each land use application on a case-by-case basis.

- There is a shortage of developable industrial land in the City and yet this application proposes to re-designate three industrial parcels as commercial. M. Spence agreed that preserving industrial land is important, but equally as important is where such industrial land is located. Sierra Springs is a regional commercial centre. To have an IB-2 use amongst predominantly commercial uses would not be a good compatibility mix. M. Spence advised that a lot of industrial based land was added with the annexation, especially in the northeast and southeast quadrants of the city. In this area, at least one full section of land south of future 40th Ave is designated full industrial. Future 40th Ave is a more logical dividing line between commercial to the north and industrial to the south and will act as a physical separation between the two uses.

- Proximity to Morningside and other residential areas is a difficult rationale given that the area surrounding the RV storage site will be residential, yet the land to the south and east of the storage site is zoned industrial. A comment was made that if an industrial designation is not suited to this area, the whole Area Structure Plan should be converted to a different land use. It was questioned whether it is possible to change the Area Structure Plan and have non-conforming land use. J. Dugdale advised that they should line up. It was suggested that everything between the railway and the highway as far south as future 40th Ave (and perhaps further) should be something other than industrial.

K. Terry moved “that the Airdrie Municipal Planning Commission gives their recommendation to Council to approve Bylaw No's. B-13/2012 and B-14/2012 as presented and to make a resolution to adopt the proposed amendments in the Sierra Springs Outline Plan.”

CARRIED
INFORMALS

D. Oneil raised concern, on behalf of a neighbour, about the travelling carnival that has been set up on the grass beside the cenotaph. It is a totally inappropriate interface, especially so close to people’s bedroom windows. J. Dugdale advised that a development permit was issued with strict conditions on hours of operation, parking, etc. and that numerous City departments were involved in the process. A staff member did attend the site last night to check on large tractor trailers which were not supposed to remain there overnight. J. Dugdale noted the concerns and advised that the process will likely be changed so that fairs such as this will require a special event permit in the future.

Next Meeting

NEXT MEETING

The next regular meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 4, 2012.

Adjournment

ADJOURNMENT

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

[Signatures]
Chairman

[Signatures]
Recording Secretary
Minutes of the City of Airdrie Subdivision and Development Appeal Board Hearing held in the City of Airdrie, in the Province of Alberta, with the following present:

Chairman
G. Alexander

Members
R. Chapman
G. Armstrong
B. Buchart
H. Geddert
K. Hall

Regrets
R. Brunet

Approving Authority
J. Dugdale

Secretary
K. Kitluk

Recording Secretary
M. Soukoreff

CALL TO ORDER

The Chairman called the hearing to order at 6:02 p.m. and explained the procedures that would be followed. Introductions were made by the Board and no objections from the appellant or approving authority were made to the panel hearing the appeals.

APPEAL NO. 1

This is an appeal against the decision of the Development Authority to approve Residential Occupation Permit Application No. 89-12 (RO) allowing a tattoo studio to operate from 279 Sagewood PL SW, Airdrie, Alberta.

The appellant is appealing this decision because the business is inappropriate for a residential area and there is a lack of parking.

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION:
No. 89-12 (RO)

APPLICANT(S):
Elizabeth Hall
279 Sagewood PL SW
Airdrie, Alberta T4B 3M7

REGISTERED OWNER(S):
Michael Hall
279 Sagewood PL SW
Airdrie, Alberta T4B 3M7

APPELLANT(S):
Jim Smolinski
275 Sagewood PL SW
Airdrie, Alberta T4B 3M7

Residential Occupation Application No. 89-12 (RO) was received on August 15, 2012 and approved by the Approving Authority on August 23, 2012.

An application to appeal was filed on September 13, 2012.

The applicant, appellant and other concerned parties were notified of the hearing by mail.

Representing the approving authority, J. Dugdale provided background on the appeal and a presentation was given.
J. Dugdale noted that the Subdivision Development Appeal Board (SDAB) has three options with respect to this appeal:

**Option 1:** To refuse the appeal and confirm the Development Authority's decision to approve the residential occupation permit for Hall of Ink Tattoo Incorporated.

This option would allow the residential occupation to operate with the conditions as approved.

**Option 2:** To grant the appeal and overturn the Development Authority's decision.

This option would suggest that the SDAB feels the development is not a suitable use within the residential area, and would require that the residential occupation cease operations at its current location.

**Option 3:** To vary or substitute the decision of the Development Authority.

This option would support the decision made by the Development Authority but would involve adding or modifying the conditions of approval, or allowing for a temporary permit that would allow for a monitoring period to evaluate the impacts of the residential occupation.

The Chairman asked if there were any questions from the Board for the approving authority. There were none indicated.

The appellant was asked to provide his submission to the Board.

Jim Smolinski, 275 Sagewood PL SW, Airdrie, Alberta, appeared before the Board. He advised they live on a quiet cul de sac with many kids on the street, riding their scooters with ramps set up. They purchased this house for that reason, to allow kids to play on the street as they often do in cul de sacs such as this. Mr. Smolinski advised that his issue was more about cars coming and going to an area they are not familiar with and without an understanding of how many children are outside playing in the area.

Mr. Smolinski added that although the applicant says there will be a maximum of two clients a day, he has seen more than two; one car was parked in the driveway and one on the street. His concern is less about parking availability, it's the number of vehicles coming and going. Also, he believes the business has changed as it is posted on Facebook that it is now offering piercings as well as tattoos. This may be great for the business but means more people will be on the cul de sac. This amount of traffic is not appropriate to this street with kids always on the street. This is a residential/family area, not commercial. This business would not be good for the neighbourhood.

The Chairman asked if there were any questions from the Board for the appellant. There were none indicated.

The Chairman asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak in favour of the appeal.

Julie Smolinski, 275 Sagewood PL SW, Airdrie, AB advised that they bought in this cul de sac as it provided a safe neighbourhood for their children. This is not an area that is appropriate for a customer based business. Her concern is not what type of service is being provided but that it is a customer based business.

Clint Graville, 271 Sagewood PL SW, Airdrie, Alberta, wanted to advise that he is against this business in their neighbourhood. His concerns are not with a tattoo studio as a business but that it should not be in a residential area. Mr. Graville stated that
they bought a home in Airdrie to give their family the best quality of life and he feels it is the Board’s responsibility to give residents that desired quality of life. Any business bringing vehicle traffic into a tight area is unacceptable.

Michelle Caudle, 225 Sagewood PL SW, Airdrie, Alberta, stated that her issue was with people coming to the area for this service are unknown strangers, not people they know. That is her issue.

Deb Metiko, 237 Sagewood PL SW, Airdrie, Alberta stated that she had no children but enjoys watching the children play, is amazed by number of children in the cul de sac and that they are all friendly kids playing on the street. They watch for traffic but are kids. When she has friends visit, she makes sure to remind them to watch the street for kids. Customers will not be familiar with the amount of kids on the street, making this not as safe a neighbourhood.

A member asked Ms. Metiko about the number of families on cul de sac. She believed there were about 24 families and was told there were 40 children when she first moved there.

Dave Harris, 229 Sagewood PL SW, Airdrie, Alberta, has been living in the area for about 6 years. It has always been a family oriented neighbourhood. He confirmed that there were over 35 kids from the corner in, with a slight reduction in the last year or so. Mr. Harris advised that he has several tattoos and plans on getting many more. His issue is not with the business itself but that it’s a very family oriented neighbourhood and not a place for any business.

The Chairman asked three times if there was anyone else present who wished to speak in favour of the appeal. There was no response.

The Chairman asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak against the appeal.

Elizabeth Hall, 279 Sagewood PL SW, Airdrie, Alberta is the applicant and she provided a copy of her presentation. She wanted to also clarify that she does not do piercings, when listing businesses in Facebook, a tattoo studio is categorized as tattoos/piercings. There are two ways into the cul de sac. She plans to consult during the day when there is not a lot of family activity. She advised that she also has young children, aged 6,2 and 3 who use the cul de sac and play outside as well. She meets with potential clients in a consult to make sure she is comfortable working with them. She also makes them aware of the speed limit in the area and the fact that there are a lot of children playing outside.

Ms. Hall added that they have a lot of friends and family in Airdrie and are involved with a number of playgroups during the day. She is a stay at home mom and a lot of the traffic back and forth can be attributed to those mom’s groups she is involved in. For friends and family, if there is no space to park, she will ask them to park up the street but for her business, she has them park in the designated space. Ms. Hall does not market in any newspapers, just Facebook and swap and buy mom sites. Her target is family people requiring tattoos. She is not busy enough for more than 2 people a day or 14 a week. Currently her clientele is not even near that point, being such a new business.

Ms. Hall then stated that when making the decision to open the business in her home, she did not want to cause a controversy. She also chose the neighbourhood due to the number of kids her children could grow up with over the years. Ms. Hall went on to say that she was willing to work with her neighbours in order to address their concerns.

The Chairman asked if there were any questions for the applicant.
A member asked Ms. Hall what her optimum number of clients would be. She advised that her goal was to have enough in the future to allow her to open up a commercial space. However, her children are still young and her husband is home with medical issues which does not allow her to work outside of the home at this time.

In response to the question about what would be the tipping point to going to a storefront, Ms. Hall responded that she would need a consistent number of clients and it is not feasible at this time due to family commitments and the cost of childcare. She can handle a couple of people every day and evening. It takes an average of one to three hours for a tattoo. She prefers to book around 8 pm as her kids are in bed and she then has no disruptions.

Ms. Hall was then asked if she would work seven days a week and she said yes.

Ms. Hall was also asked what would be the optimum time for her business or when she is the busiest and she advised it would be evenings, 7:30 to 8 pm. Most of her clients also have families and it is then that she can give them her full and undivided attention.

The Chairman asked if there was anyone else who wanted to speak against the appeal.

Michael Hall, 279 Sagewood PL SW, Airdrie, Alberta, said that the issue of parking has been covered. They do provide a parking stall for his wife’s clients and they also bought in Sagewood because it is a family community. They were sold on the house due to the area and the amount of kids. The business only utilizes 13 metres squared of the home. When developing a business, he feels baby steps need to be taken and one can’t jump right into leasing commercial space. His wife is limited in her hours due to his medical condition. His wife schedules her clients around the needs of the family and can’t commit to an employer or commercial space due to his condition.

The Chairman asked three times if there was anyone else present who wished to speak against the appeal. There was no response.

The Chairman then advised that she would provide an opportunity for rebuttal.

Jim Smolinski, 275 Sagewood PL SW, Airdrie, Alberta wanted to reiterate that he believes the applicant is not abiding by parking limits as she has more than one client a day. He saw one client back out and another came out of the house and moved their vehicle onto the parking pad. He advised that he works weekends and nights so is often outside playing with his kids during day. The cul de sac is not empty during the day.

Mr. Smolinski also believes that there is no guarantee she will stay with only 14 clients a week. Her intention is to have a thriving business and she wants to make money. Also, how many businesses can a cul de sac hold? She has a lot of support on Facebook and should secure a storefront. Our families should not bear the burden of her limitations.

The Chairman asked if the Board had any questions for Mr. Smolinski.

Mr. Smolinski was asked how he knows that these vehicles contain clients and not friends or family. The answer was that he has never seen someone leave a parking pad and then have another person move their car from the street into that parking spot. He admitted he wasn’t paying that much attention to whether they had cellophane on covering a tattoo but he saw the jockeying around of vehicles.

Mr. Smolinski was then asked if he understood that 50% of businesses are run from home and when did Mr. Smolinski feel a home business becomes inappropriate. The
response was when it brings a lot of people to and from the area. When asked how many is too many, Mr. Smolinski responded that the applicant was not going to turn business away and there was no guarantee she would not get busier. He admitted he is not comfortable with any number of clients as there is no control over the number it will grow to in a year from now.

Clint Graville, 271 Sagewood PL SW, Airdrie, Alberta advised that he had something else to add. If he had wanted to live in an area with commercial businesses, he would have bought there. There is no place for a customer based foot traffic business in the area. This is a business she chose despite the cost of commercial space. She raised her family’s needs but no one is speaking to the neighbour’s families’ needs.

Mr. Graville was asked to confirm that he had concerns about any business in this community. Mr. Graville advised that a number of people who own businesses have to travel to the site, not have traffic coming to and from. It wouldn't matter if it was a dayhome, he wife tried to do that but every neighbour yelled at her because the cul de sac was jammed. They decided that wasn’t going to work and their neighbourhood wasn’t the place for it.

The Chairman then asked the Development Authority to provide their rebuttal. J. Dugdale stated that a home occupancy is a discretionary use in residential districts in the City and this application did meet the requirements.

Mr. Dugdale was asked how parking is monitored in the district. Mr. Dugdale advised that they did ask engineering about traffic impacts in area and were told 10 two way trips in a day is average. When considering the impact on traffic, a day home for example has a lot more significant impact. Mr. Dugdale was then asked if a cul de sac was monitored differently. He stated that this is quite a long cul de sac, there several ways in and out but do not consider it any differently.

The Chairman asked if there were any further questions from the Board. Hearing none, the Chairman declared the hearing closed for Lot 35, Block 22, Plan 0513786 (279 Sagewood PL SW, Airdrie, AB).

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

G. Armstrong moved “that the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board enter Committee of the Whole” at 6:47 p.m.  
Carried

R. Chapman moved “that the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board leave Committee of the Whole” at 7:50 p.m.  
Carried

B. Buchart moved "that the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board vary the decision of the Development Approving Authority and approve a one year residential occupancy permit allowing for a monitoring period to evaluate the impacts of the residential occupancy subject to the following conditions set out by the Development Authority:

1. On-site parking stalls shall be provided and utilized for all business vehicles associated with a home occupation."
2. There shall be no outdoor business activity or outdoor storage of material or equipment associated with the home occupation.

3. There shall not be any form of advertising placed either on the site or affixed onto a building located on the site related to the home occupation visible from the outside of buildings located on the site.

4. A home occupation shall occupy the lesser of:
   (i) A total of 30 square metres of floor area in the principal and accessory buildings or;
   (ii) An area not to exceed one half of each and every accessory building in which the home occupation is located.

5. Compliance is to be maintained with Land Use Bylaw No. 09/2005 Section 4-1(13).

The reasons for the Board’s decision are as follows:

1. The home occupancy permit complies with the Land Use Bylaw and will not generate vehicular traffic or parking in excess of that which is characteristic of the District within which it is located.

2. The home occupancy will be operated as a secondary use and will not change the principal character or external appearance of the dwelling involved."

Carried

2012-D-012
Adopt Minutes
Previous Meetings

2012-D-012
Adopt Minutes
Previous Meetings

H. Geddert moved "that the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board adopt the minutes of May 30, 2012 as presented."

Carried

Adjournment

ADJOURNMENT

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 7:52 pm.

[Signature]
Chairman

[Signature]
Secretary

ms
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit A</td>
<td>Application for Development Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit B</td>
<td>Approving Authority Notice of Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit C</td>
<td>Notice of Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit D</td>
<td>Staff Report / Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit E</td>
<td>Applicant’s Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit F</td>
<td>Map Highlighting Subject Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit G</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have concerns about the Channelside neighborhood in General:
  - parking of vehicles on vacant lots and overall cleanliness of the lots
  - Municiple Enforcement and Plannings roll/involvement in getting the area cleaned up
  - what is Genesis doing to finish off the area
AGENDA REPORT

Meeting Date (M/D/Y): 11/5/2012

Subject: Santa Claus Parade

Boards Routed Through: N/A

Date: N/A

Description: To provide an update to Council on the Santa Claus Parade.

Background:

This past summer, after the Rodeo Association felt they could no longer organize Canada Day Parades, a group of local volunteers came together to plan the July 1, 2012 Parade.

This dedicated group has committed to, on a go forward basis, organizing Canada Day Parades and most recently, a Santa Claus Parade, to be held on Saturday, December 1, 2012, from 4:30 – 6:00 p.m. In addition to the parades, the Committee would also like to organize both the July 1st and December 31st fireworks.

To date, the Committee has not formally acquired not for profit society status and therefore must rely on the City of Airdrie for insurance purposes. The traffic advisory committee has granted approval for the Santa Claus Parade permit. As a major partner of this event, the City of Airdrie through a variety of departments would provide and facilitate items such as: road closures, permits, safety, access/egress plans, policing, communications, insurance, etc. The City as landowner has a vested interest to ensure the event is safe and well coordinated.

How do other municipalities host parades? Below are a few examples:
- City of Red Deer – partnership between City and Parade Groups
- City of St. Albert – partnership between City and Parade Groups
- City of Calgary – City of Calgary organizes and hosts

A strong partnership between the City of Airdrie and organizers should result in a successful and hopefully sustainable event. Supporting this type of initiative aligns well with Council’s 2013 strategic priority of “Arts & Culture in Motion”: continue to support community-grown and led arts and cultural events to enhance our citizen’s quality of life.
The following are City departments that have been involved to date in preparation of the parade.

**Insurance** - As the City of Airdrie owns the land that this event will take place on, it therefore has a vested interest to provide a safe event and protect City-owned assets. Because the group does not have society status, the City of Airdrie has agreed to provide insurance for the Santa Claus Parade in 2012.

**Parks and Public Works** – Have indicated that this would be a great way to involve downtown businesses and help the Festival of Lights. The partnership with the Canada Day Parade Committee assists the City with being able to pass on the task of organizing the fireworks for the City of Airdrie not only on Canada Day, but on New Year’s Eve as well. - Road closure/barricades, strategically placing road closure signage notices, taking barricades/signage down after the parade (same support role as with the Canada Day Parade).

**Fire Department** – Will work with AHS to establish a plan for access/egress to Airdrie Urgent Care for the Parade (Ken Hubbard is the liaison for Urgent Care and will assist with the plan which will be consistent to the Canada Day Parade plan). It is the hope that the Parade Committee and the City build positive relationships with Airdrie Urgent Care for the hosting of these large events.

**Municipal Enforcement** – Will provide lane closure support and visual presence at the parade.

**Alternatives/Implications:**

This report is being presented for information but Council may provide staff/departments with feedback or direction if desired. Should staff be directed to not support the parade with City of Airdrie resources, the parade may be cancelled and public reaction may be negative as the parade event is both community initiated and driven.

**Public Relations/Marketing Plan:**

Corporate Communications will work with the Parade Committee to advertise parade road closures and emergency access/egress.

**Recommendation:**

That City Council approves staff resources to assist the Parade Committee in hosting the Santa Claus Parade.

Kim Harris, Community Developer
AGENDA REPORT

Meeting Date (M/D/Y): November 5, 2012

Subject: Bylaw B-22/2012
2012 Infrastructure and Off-site Levy Bylaw

Boards Routed Through: Corporate Planning Team
City Council

Date: October 11, 2012
October 15, 2012

Description:

Council is being asked to give final readings to Bylaw No. B-22/2012, being a bylaw to establish off-site levies. A Public Input Session has also been scheduled as part of Council’s consideration of the referenced bylaw. Council is also being asked to endorse a Voluntary Public Facility Contribution.

Background:

Purpose and Authority to Collect Off-site Levies

Off-site levies are charges that are applied to new developments in order to fund and construct systematic capital improvements necessary to provide adequate off-site servicing. For instance, a sanitary forcemain to Calgary and a water reservoir are examples of off-site projects that are necessary to provide appropriate off-site services to development areas. All on-site development costs are normally paid for by the developer.

The levies are regulated by Section 648 of the Municipal Government Act which requires a bylaw to set out the object of each levy and how the amount was determined.

It has been the City’s position as per the Airdrie City Plan (Municipal Development Plan) that development must support itself in terms of any required capital improvements (growth must pay for itself). The proposed levy structure and accompanying bylaw has been established in conformance with that philosophy and in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Government Act.

An off-site levy FAQ is attached to this report for reference.
Infrastructure and Off-site Levy Review Process

The City engaged BSEI Municipal Consulting Engineers (BSEI) to complete the infrastructure and off-site levy report update. BSEI has been the City’s municipal engineering consultant for over twenty years and is acquainted with both the City’s current infrastructure capabilities as well as the growth and planning requirements as envisioned through area structure plans.

Generally, the City has targeted the update of infrastructure plans and the accompanying off-site levy bylaw approximately every second year. The City last completed an infrastructure and off-site levy review in 2010 (with an escalation built in for 2011). The City engaged BSEI to commence work on the infrastructure and off-site levy report update in February 2012.

BSEI’s analysis considered the servicing requirements necessary to support 60,000 and 80,000 population horizons. In order to develop some specific infrastructure requirements for the next ten years, the location of the projected growth within Airdrie’s boundaries was estimated for each of the population horizons. The corresponding projects to service these lands are identified in the report and include water, sewer and arterial roadways.

As part of the overall infrastructure review process, public facilities (e.g. fire halls, regional parks, recreation facilities) were also reviewed – both facilities constructed over the past five years as well as facilities identified within the 10-year capital plan. A proposed Public Facility Contribution was developed to recognize the impact of growth on public facilities. It should be noted that this has been identified as a voluntary contribution, as it falls outside of the specific authority of the Municipal Government Act.

Results of Off-site Levy Review

In general, off-site levies have been significantly impacted by growth, growth patterns, changes requested by the development industry (e.g. purchase of land for arterial roadways) and construction cost increases since the time of the last review.

Based on a standard residential subdivision at 8 units per acre, current levies and recreation contributions average approximately $62,000 per acre. Staff are proposing that effective 2013, levies and the public facility contribution would average approximately $78,800 per acre – an increase of approximately 27% over 2010 levies. As a comparison, recently adopted City of Calgary levies and development charges are in the range of $129,000 per acre. It should be noted that there are numerous differences in terms of what various communities include in their off-site levy bylaws. For instance, the Calgary levies include costs for off-site storm sewer trunk lines which have not been required to date in Airdrie (mainly due to relatively close proximity to Nose Creek). It should also be noted that it is staff’s understanding that Calgary has, in certain instances, implemented special levies and bylaws for specific road costs that are not reflected in the overall Calgary levy.
There are some additions to the transportation and utility levies that were specifically requested by the development industry in the interests of fairness and equity. During the 2012 review, developers proposed that the City should purchase all necessary arterial roadway and reservoir/lifts station public utility lots, with funding being provided from the development industry through increased transportation and utility levies. The cost for the inclusion of arterial road right-of-way purchases equates to an increase of $1,683 per acre. The cost for the inclusion of reservoir/lift station land purchases equates to $316 per acre.

Development Industry Consultation and Concerns

Staff have worked collaboratively and productively with a cross-section of the development industry in developing the proposed levies and development charges. The City hosted three forums with the development industry to discuss the 2012 Infrastructure and Off-Site Levy Review. These were held on April 11, May 25 and September 20, 2012. Each forum was attended by approximately 15-20 development industry representatives. The purpose of these forums was to discuss the results of the technical work and to attempt to address areas of concern.

The City and BSEI has attempted to take into account feedback and concerns received from the development industry during these consultations while ensuring that key outcomes were met. The key issues raised by the development community included:

- fair allocation of costs,
- concerns about Airdrie's competitive advantage being eroded,
- the potential impact of proposed Calgary water/wastewater acreage assessments,
- the issue of a proposed Public Facilities Contribution,
- requests for improved transparency in the off-site levy process, and
- implementation timing

In terms of the key issues discussed as part of the 2012 Infrastructure and Off-site Levy Review, staff offer the following comments:

1. **Allocation of Costs** – There was a fair amount of discussion about who should pay for the cost of growth-related infrastructure. Some developers feel that existing residents may benefit from new infrastructure (e.g. a new water supply line to Calgary or a new arterial roadway) and should pay accompanying costs. Staff contend that new or newer residents to Airdrie have driven the need for new infrastructure projects and have paid their proportionate share through the purchase of homes or businesses which included levy costs passed on from the development industry. Additionally, new development is not being asked to cover the costs of infrastructure previously fully funded by prior residents – even though new residents will utilize that previously constructed infrastructure (e.g. Main Street, East Lake Boulevard, Main Water Reservoir).
Ultimately, staff believes that “growth pays for itself” and “allocation of costs” are not mutually exclusive concepts. One example of this is the new 600 mm water supply line to Calgary. To illustrate staff’s position on why this water supply line is development funded, the following rationale is provided:

a) In the case of the new water supply main from Calgary, there was no requirement for this piece of infrastructure if the City stayed within a population capacity of approximately 25,000 residents, as a redundant water supply system was in place for that capacity (both a 900 mm and a 350 mm water supply line).

b) Based on growth and growth-driven development activities and population increases, an upgrade to the City’s water supply system was necessary when reviewing what infrastructure was required to support growth. This was done when the City population was at or very near the 25,000 population threshold (2006 Infrastructure and Off-site Levy Review).

c) The water supply line project and accompanying levy was introduced in the off-site levy bylaw. Growth and development continued to occur. The City population increased proportionately to that activity. Subsequent infrastructure/off-site levy reviews updated the project scope and costs.

d) As the water supply line proceeded to construction, the topic of benefitting parties was raised during development industry discussions.

e) Existing residents benefit from the new water supply line; but it’s a very critical point in terms of who benefits and why, particularly as it ties into this overall discussion. At a certain point in time, approximately 25,000 residents had a system that provided an adequate, redundant supply of water. That system had been paid for by those residents. It would be inappropriate to charge those residents for a water supply system to accommodate additional growth when they had already funded a system adequate for the size of the community to that point. This is the essence of the “growth pays for itself” philosophy.

f) With respect to the issue of “allocation of benefitting parties”, residents and/or businesses who have moved to the City since the population was approximately 25,000 have essentially been paying for the new 600 mm water supply line through off-site levies that have formed part of land or housing costs that they have paid. When the water line project is funded, conceptually it is on the basis that existing residents who benefit from that (e.g. residents/businesses who have moved here since the capacity of the original system was exceeded) have contributed funding for their portion of the line via payment of previous off-site levies. Future growth/development continues to pay a levy based on future benefitting residents. So at the point that the project is built, this allocation of benefitting parties is inherent in the process.
2. Competitive Advantage – The development industry is obviously concerned about ensuring that off-site levy costs are competitive within a regional context in order to avoid an economic disadvantage. Staff have been mindful of off-site levy pricing relative to other communities in the region and have worked collaboratively with the development industry with that intent in mind. Staff would offer that there are numerous community amenities (e.g. Genesis Place, Chinook Winds Park) that are attractive from a residential marketing standpoint and which are predominantly City-funded.

3. Proposed Calgary Water and Wastewater Acreage Assessments – The City of Calgary has requested that Airdrie charge the same water and wastewater acreage assessments as Calgary and flow those accompanying funds back to Calgary to fund infrastructure capacity upgrades. This is related to Airdrie receiving water and wastewater servicing from Calgary and utilizing certain infrastructure within Calgary to do so. At this time, Airdrie has taken the position that further time is necessary to review and discuss these proposed charges with Calgary, and as such, they are not being implemented at this time.

In the interests of awareness and transparency, the City has advised the development community of Calgary’s request.

4. Public Facilities Contribution – The development industry and the City are mindful of a recent Court of Appeal decision involving Okotoks where recreation contributions were struck down as a condition of development. Notwithstanding that, generally there appears to be a general understanding by the development industry that growth impacts the need for public facilities.

BSEI and staff have calculated a figure for the Public Facility Contribution that takes into account a proportionate share of public facility costs attributable to growth. This places a higher threshold (100%) on emergency services facilities as a result of growth impacting response times and adequate fire zone coverage, and a lesser threshold (13.5%) on recreation and quality of life facilities.

The proposed Public Facility Contribution ($14,574/acre for residential lands) is intended to supersede the previous Recreation Contribution ($1,200 per residential unit). In shifting to a per-acre contribution, there is an intention to continue to encourage efficient development and reduce City infrastructure, which is in line with AirdrieOne objectives.

5. Improved Transparency

In response to requests for additional information from the development community, individual Project Profile sheets have been included as part of the BSEI report. The Project Profile sheets contain the accompanying specific financial information (e.g. levies collected, outstanding amount to be collected, financing charges, etc.). These were previously addressed on an aggregate basis. This change has been well received by the development industry.
In addition, staff implemented a change to the overall off-site levy process such that a developer/public input session is held prior to Council considering second and final readings of the off-site levy bylaw.

6. **Retroactive Off-Site Levy Charges vs. January 2013 Implementation**

The off-site levy review and development industry consultation process took longer than initially envisioned. The bulk of development agreements executed this year were signed on the basis of 2011 levy rates, with only a few signed with retroactivity provisions for the 2012 levy rates, once determined. Given the time of year and from an equity standpoint, the development industry believes that 2011 rates should be in effect for the full 2012 year, with the new levies coming into effect in January 2013, on a go-forward basis. Staff concur with this approach and are proposing that the new rates come into effect on January 1, 2013.

**Alternatives/Implications:**


   With this alternative, the proposed levies would be adopted and effective January 2013. In addition, Council would be establishing the amount of the Voluntary Public Facility Contribution.


   With this alternative, the proposed levies would be adopted and effective January 2013. The Voluntary Public Facility Contribution would not be endorsed. Unless otherwise addressed, the existing Recreation Contribution of $1,200 per residential dwelling would remain in effect.

3. Table Bylaw No. B 22/2012 and request more information.

**Public Relations/Marketing Plan:**

If ultimately approved, the proposed levy and development charges will be posted on the City’s website and incorporated into City of Airdrie Subdivision Servicing Agreements.
Recommendation:

That City Council:

a) Confirms that 2012 off-site levies remain at the same amount as the 2011 off-site levies;

b) Gives final readings to Bylaw No. B-22/2012, the 2012 Infrastructure and Off-site Bylaw;

c) Rescinds Bylaw No. B-16/2010; and

d) Establishes the rate for the Voluntary Public Facility Contribution at $14,574 per acre for residential lands.

Lorne Stevens
Director of Community Infrastructure
Off-Site Levies – Frequently Asked Questions

What is an “off-site” levy?

An off-site levy is a charge imposed on developers by a municipality to recover the capital costs associated with infrastructure improvements required to support new development. Off-site levies may only be collected once in respect of lands subject to development or subdivision. Off-site levies may be collected at the time of subdivision or development.

What does “off-site” refer to?

*Off-site* costs refer to large-scale infrastructure that must be extended or developed by the municipality to service a development. The infrastructure originates beyond or “off-site” from the subdivision or development. Examples included arterial roads, intersection expansions, water and sewer pipes, pump stations and the like.

On-site costs are those contained within the subdivision or development. These would include costs such as land, roads, shallow and deep utilities, and stormwater ponds/facilities.

What authority does the City have in imposing an off-site levy?

The Province of Alberta has provided municipalities the authority, under the *Municipal Government Act* (MGA), sections 648 and 649, to set and collect off-site levy rates through the adoption of a bylaw. Funds must be accounted for separately from other funds and levies. Funds collected earn interest.

What do off-site levies pay for?

According to the MGA, off-site levies may be collected from developers to pay for the capital costs associated with:

- New or expanded water facilities
- New or expanded sanitary sewer facilities
- New or expanded storm sewer drainage facilities
- New or expanded roads.

Funds must be used only for the specified purposes for which the funds were collected.

How are levy costs determined?

The city uses a four-step process to determine the off-site levies:

1. *Determine how much growth is likely to occur within the next 20 years:* Growth projections are based on anticipated population projections as well as assumptions regarding the amount of land area required and the anticipated density of a development area. Growth areas are mapped and form part of the consultation process between the city and the development community. The city tracks growth rates and development activity on an annual basis and uses this information to keep the calculations current and accurate.

2. *Determine what infrastructure projects are required to support new development:* The city develops a number of servicing master plans and infrastructure studies to determine what types of infrastructure and servicing extensions are required to support the projected growth. An example is the Transportation master Plan which includes a detailed capital plan for roads.
3. **Confirm the development area:** the city collaborates with the development community to confirm what areas will be developed within the established planning horizon and determines the geographic extent of the benefitting area. The benefitting area refers to the development area that will benefit from the infrastructure improvement. Some improvements benefit large areas whereas; some are limited to a specific development.

4. **Allocation the project costs over benefitting area:** The city calculates the capital cost of new infrastructure required to service new developments based on projections and approved area structure plans. The cost of infrastructure projects is apportioned to the benefitting area and then divided by the number of acres included within the benefiting area. Costs are allocated on the basis of net developable area: this includes all land to be developed less the environmental reserve and arterial road right-of-ways.

**Cost Allocations in Plain English?**
- **Cost** of infrastructure associated with a defined area
- **Minus** the city share of specific infrastructure projects (existing development and neighbourhoods)
- **Minus** any grant contributions to the capital project
- **Divided by** the area anticipated to develop within the growth period (usually 20 years)
- **Equals** the levy rate per area of land

Net area X levy rate = assessed off-site levy

**What is the city’s responsibility to the development community?**
According to the provincial legislation and the off-site levy regulations, the city has a responsibility to consult and negotiate with those affected by the off-site levies. While the legislation and regulations do not specify a particular form of consultation, they require the following principles to be met:
- Levies are to be determined in good faith
- There is to be full disclosure of levy costs & payments
- There is a shared responsibility between municipalities and developers for defining infrastructure requirements
- All parties that benefit participate in the cost on an equitable basis related to the degree of benefit
- The methodology is to be consistently applied across the municipality.

A public hearing is not required for an off-site levy bylaw, but the bylaw must be advertised.
PUBLIC FACILITY CONTRIBUTION
1. Public Facilities Contribution (Voluntary - For Discussion)

The City of Airdrie is reviewing a methodology to assist with the capital costs for public facilities that are required by the public as the City develops. The intent of the public facility contributions is to enable the City to better provide needed community-serving facilities and essential services as growth occurs. These services are necessary to ensure community safety, liveability and quality of life for residents. Without adequate service capacity the City would need to consider managing growth and approvals in a manner that allows servicing and facility provision to catch up with development. The public facilities contribution is intended to assist with the timely provision of public facilities concurrent with development demand. Issues reviewed for discussion with the development community include:

- Historical costs for community facilities;
- Future costs for community facilities;
- Impact on community facilities and quality of life;
- Grant and other funding available for community facilities;
- Estimated net cost of community facility per new resident/household.

The facilities would fall into the following categories and is illustrated in Tables 5.0 and 6.0:

- Recreation Facilities:
  - The recreation facilities fee of the charges is intended to cover the capital construction, servicing and land costs of recreation facilities.
  - The recreation facility rate is based on the estimated cost of a new facility or renovations divided by the land base that it serves.
  - The estimated cost of a new recreation facility or renovation is determined based on the cost of similar facilities or renovations recently constructed within Airdrie.

- Community Facilities:
  - The community facilities fee of the charges is intended to cover the capital construction, servicing and land costs of community facilities.
  - The community facility rate is based on the estimated cost of a new facility or renovations divided by the land base that it serves.
  - The estimated cost of a new community facility or renovation is determined based on the cost of similar facilities or renovations recently constructed within Airdrie.
• Essential Services Facilities:
  o The essential services facilities component of the fees is intended to cover the capital construction, servicing and land costs of emergency response facilities.
  o The estimated cost of a facility is determined based on the cost of similar facilities recently constructed within Airdrie.

An analysis of actual construction costs for public facilities incurred from 2007 to 2011 are summarized in Table 5.0. Following is Table 6.0 that summarizes the proposed facilities developments complete with budget and the contributing revenue distribution. The new development population was converted to an approximate acre amount as shown below:

- New Development = 15,000 persons
- Assume average of 3,290 persons per 160 acres = 20.60 persons / acre
- Results in New Development area = 728 acres

Based on the City of Airdrie projected costs from 2012 to 2022 (please refer to Table 6.0) and the suggested contributing revenue distribution, the Public Facilities Contribution is being considered as per the following calculation:

- Project costs for New Development from 2012 to 2022 = $51,221,900
- Existing Development Contribution (86.5%) = $40,611,980
- New Development contribution (13.5%) = $10,604,920

Therefore, the total New Development shared by the new development area (728 acres) results in the following per acre fee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total New Development</td>
<td>$10,609,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Benefitting Area</td>
<td>728 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Per Acre Fee</td>
<td>$14,574 / acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1.0 - Actual Construction Costs for Public Facilities Incurred from 2007 - 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>TYPE OF FACILITY</th>
<th>RECREATION</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>ESSENTIAL SERVICES</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTING REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rec</td>
<td>Genesis Place (ELRWC) Phase II Design</td>
<td>$1,325,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec</td>
<td>Genesis Place (ELRWC) Phase II Construction</td>
<td>$17,126,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Debitures, Grants, Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec</td>
<td>East Lake Athletic Park</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec</td>
<td>Chinook Winds Phase I</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec</td>
<td>Genesis Place Phase I</td>
<td>$18,535,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Debitures, Grants, Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec</td>
<td>Chinook Winds Phase II</td>
<td>$2,205,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec</td>
<td>Genesis Place Phase II</td>
<td>$9,560,640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grants, Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec</td>
<td>Chinook Winds Phase III</td>
<td>$1,361,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec</td>
<td>Genesis Place Phase III Design</td>
<td>$1,380,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>RCMP Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>$531,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Chinook Winds &amp; Kings Heights Fire Stations</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Emergency Services West Side Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>RCMP Facility Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Debitures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>ES Facility Kings Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,369,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Debitures, Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>RCMP Facility Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,624,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Debitures, Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Emergency Services West Side Facility Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Debitures, Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Totals:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$54,593,240</td>
<td>$22,174,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$76,767,240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Airdrie Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PERSONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>29,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>43,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>60,000 (Projected)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2.0 - Project Construction Costs for Public Facilities from 2012 to 2022 & Contributing Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Type of Facility</th>
<th>Existing Development</th>
<th>New Development</th>
<th>Benefitting Percentage</th>
<th>Contributing Share</th>
<th>Benefitting Percentage</th>
<th>Contributing Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkland Development</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$3,191,300</td>
<td>$2,761,861</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>$429,439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefitting Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing Share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinook Winds Phase Site Development</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$2,045,000</td>
<td>$1,769,813</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>$275,187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefitting Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing Share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland Acquisition</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$3,210,000</td>
<td>$2,778,044</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>$431,956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefitting Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing Share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinook Winds Site Development</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$805,000</td>
<td>$696,675</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>$108,325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefiting Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing Share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis Place Phase III Twin Arena</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$18,801,100</td>
<td>$16,271,118</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>$2,529,982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefiting Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing Share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition / Phase 1 Park &amp; Ride Facility</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$1,975,500</td>
<td>$1,709,666</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>$265,834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefiting Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing Share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bert Church Theatre Renovation</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$2,783,800</td>
<td>$2,409,196</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>$374,604</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefiting Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing Share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Ride Phase 2 / New Transit Facility Land &amp; Design</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>$1,817,412</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>$282,588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefiting Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing Share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airdrie Public Library Expansion</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$12,015,000</td>
<td>$10,398,194</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>$1,616,806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefiting Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing Share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Fire Station Design and Construction</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$4,295,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$4,295,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefiting Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing Share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong>:</td>
<td>$28,052,400</td>
<td>$18,874,300</td>
<td>$4,295,200</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>$10,609,920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong>:</td>
<td>$51,221,900</td>
<td>$51,221,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**
- *Existing Residential Population* = 45,000 persons (4682 acres / 5410 acres = 86.5 percent)
- *New Residential Development* = 15,000 persons (728 acres / 5410 acres = 13.5 percent)
- *Future Residential Total Population* = 60,000 persons (4682 + 728 = 5410 acres)

### Public Facilities Contribution Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Share Total</td>
<td>$10,609,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area</td>
<td>728 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Per Acre Fee</td>
<td>$14,574 per acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The City of Calgary Potable and Wastewater Acreage Assessment Rates for Regional Servicing (For Discussion Purposes)

The City of Calgary is proposing to implement a Potable and Wastewater acreage assessment to communities that they currently provide regional servicing to. These acreage assessment are to fund certain infrastructure requirements that are triggered by new development in municipalities serviced by Calgary.

The proposed rates for regional servicing are based on recovery for existing infrastructure and future investments for potable water treatment and distribution and wastewater collection and treatment. The proposed assessments are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>($ / acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potable Water</td>
<td>$24,865</td>
<td>($10,063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>$45,075</td>
<td>($18,241)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Proposed Acreage Assessment</strong></td>
<td><strong>$69,940</strong></td>
<td><strong>($28,304)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City of Airdrie is advising the development community of The City of Calgary proposed acreage assessment fee. These fees have not been included as part of Airdrie’s proposed 2012 Offsite Infrastructure Levy and will be addressed separately as warranted.

3. Offsite Levies – Levies and Acreage Assessments

The 2012 Levies and Acreage Assessments are summarized in Table 7.0.

Also attached is Table 8.0 which provides a comparison of levies in other communities, and Table 9.0 which provides a comparison from Airdrie’s 2011 and 2012 levies.
### Table 3.0 - Offsite Development Levies, Acreage Assessments and Public Facilities Contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime Recovery Area</th>
<th>SCHEDULE L</th>
<th>SCHEDULE M</th>
<th>ACREAGE ASSESSMENTS</th>
<th>Total Charge Per Acre</th>
<th>For Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Levy per Acre</td>
<td>Landscaping, Pathway and Land Acquisition per Acre</td>
<td>Total Levy Per Acre</td>
<td>Prime Recovery Zone</td>
<td>Sub Recovery Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>$38,870</td>
<td>$2,839</td>
<td>$41,709</td>
<td>$13,068</td>
<td>$7,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>$38,870</td>
<td>$2,839</td>
<td>$41,709</td>
<td>$13,068</td>
<td>$7,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>$38,870</td>
<td>$2,839</td>
<td>$41,709</td>
<td>$13,068</td>
<td>$7,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>$38,870</td>
<td>$2,839</td>
<td>$41,709</td>
<td>$13,068</td>
<td>$7,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>$38,870</td>
<td>$2,839</td>
<td>$41,709</td>
<td>$13,068</td>
<td>$7,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>$38,870</td>
<td>$2,839</td>
<td>$41,709</td>
<td>$13,068</td>
<td>$7,462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Transportation levy includes $2,839 per acre for pathways, landscape enhancements and road ROW acquisition.
- Water and wastewater levy includes $316 per acre for Public Utility Lot land acquisition.
- City of Calgary water and wastewater levies not included in total charges per acre.
BYLAW NO. B-22/2012
OF THE CITY OF AIRDRIE
IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA

Being a bylaw of the city of Airdrie in the province of Alberta for the purpose of establishing off-site levies.

WHEREAS in accordance with Section 648 of the Municipal Government Act, R.S.A. 2000, Chapter M-26, a Council may by bylaw:

a) Provide for the imposition and payment of a levy, to be known as an "off-site" levy, in respect of land that is to be developed or subdivided, and
b) Authorize agreements to be entered into in respect of the levy.

AND WHEREAS the City of Airdrie Council deems it desirable to establish off-site levies for the purposes described in Section 648 of the Municipal Government Act, R.S.A. 2000, Chapter M-26;

AND WHEREAS the City of Airdrie Council engaged the engineering firm of BSEI Municipal Consulting Engineers to prepare a Report in 2012 with respect to the fair and equitable calculation and allocation of off-site levies in accordance with the purposes of the Municipal Government Act, R.S.A. 2000, Chapter M-26;

AND WHEREAS the City of Airdrie Council has reviewed the Report prepared by BSEI Municipal Consulting Engineers and wishes to enact a bylaw to impose and provide for the payment of off-site levies, to authorize agreements to be entered into in respect of payment of the off-site levies, to set out the object of each levy, and to indicate how the amount of each levy was determined;

NOW THEREFORE pursuant to the authority conferred upon it by the laws of the Province of Alberta, the City of Airdrie Council, duly assembled, enacts as follows:

1. SHORT TITLE

1.1 This Bylaw may be cited as the "City of Airdrie Off-site Levy Bylaw No. B-22/2012".

2. PURPOSE AND INTENT

2.1 The purpose and intent of this Bylaw is to:

a) impose and provide for the payment of levies to be known as off-site levies in respect of land that is to be subdivided or developed,
b) authorize agreements to be entered into in respect of payment of the off-site levies,
c) set out the objects of each off-site levy, and
d) indicate how the amount of each off-site levy was determined.
3. **DEFINITIONS**

In this Bylaw, the following words and phrases shall have the following meanings:

3.1 "Act" means the *Municipal Government Act*, R.S.A. 2000, Chapter M-26 and amendments thereto;

3.2 "Bylaw" means this bylaw together with all schedules;

3.3 "City" means the City of Airdrie or the geographical area within its jurisdictional boundaries, as the context may require;

3.4 "City Manager" means the Chief Administrative Officer of the City or his/her authorized designate;

3.5 "Council" means the City of Airdrie Council;

3.6 "Development" has the same meaning as provided in the Act;

3.7 "Land Use Bylaw" means the City's Land Use Bylaw, as amended or replaced from time to time in accordance with the Act;

3.8 "Net Developable Acre" means the total area of land that is the subject of a Development permit or Subdivision approval excluding land provided as environmental reserve as well as any land provided to the City or Province of Alberta for arterial roads and public utilities for regional water and sewer infrastructure, as indicated in the BSEI Municipal Consulting Engineers Report dated September 2012;

3.9 "Off-site Levy" means a levy imposed and created by this Bylaw;

3.10 "Off-site Levy Fund" means a fund into which an Off-site Levy together with any interest earned from the investment of the Off-site Levy is deposited and kept separate from General Account or any other municipal account and administered in accordance with the Act; and

3.11 "Subdivision" has the same meaning as provided for in the Act.

4. **ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT**

4.1 Council hereby delegates to the City Manager the duty and authority to enforce and administer this Bylaw.

5. **ENACTMENT**

5.1 An Off-site Levy as provided for in the Act is hereby imposed in respect of all land within the City that is to be Developed or Subdivided at the rates and on the terms as specified in this Bylaw with the exception of any land where Off-site Levies have been previously imposed and collected in full.

5.2 Notwithstanding any other provision in this Bylaw, the City may impose further or different Off-site Levies, duly enacted by bylaw, on any portion of lands which are the
subject of a Development permit or Subdivision approval and in respect of which the City has not collected Off-site Levies imposed under this Bylaw or any previous off-site levy bylaw authorized by the Act or a predecessor Act.

5.3 The City is hereby authorized to enter into agreements with owners of the lands referred to in Paragraph 5.1 for payment of the Off-site Levy imposed on that land.

6. **OBJECT OF THE OFF-SITE LEVIES**

6.1 The object of the Off-site Levy or Levies imposed and collected pursuant to this Bylaw are to pay for all or any part of the capital cost of any or all of the following:

a) new or expanded facilities for the storage, transmission, treatment or supplying of water,

b) new or expanded facilities for the treatment, movement or disposal of sanitary sewage,

c) new or expanded storm sewer drainage facilities,

d) new or expanded roads required for or impacted by a Subdivision or Development, and

e) land required for or in connection with any facilities described within this Paragraph.

7. **OFF-SITE LEVY PAYMENT**

7.1 Where the owner of land that is subject to the imposition of an Off-site Levy or Levies under this Bylaw fails, neglects or refuses to either pay the Off-site Levy imposed or provide sufficient security for the payment of the Off-site Levy, the City may:

a) commence proceedings in Court for recovery of the Off-site Levy as an amount due and payable to the City, or

b) refuse to endorse a plan of Subdivision or release a Development permit until the land owner has paid the Off-site Levy or has provided sufficient security for the payment of the Off-site Levy in a form satisfactory to the City Manager.

8. **OFF-SITE LEVY FUND**

8.1 The City Manager shall establish and maintain a separate fund for each facility in respect of which an Off-site Levy is being imposed pursuant to this Bylaw. Such Off-site Levy fund shall be kept separate from the City's General Account or any other City account and shall be administered in accordance with the Act.
9. **DIVISION OF THE CITY INTO AREAS**

9.1 For the purpose of imposing Off-site Levies, the City is divided into 6 geographic areas as shown on Schedule "A":

a) Area I (Northeast);

b) Area II (North Central);

c) Area III (Northwest) including sub-recovery zones III-1, III-2 and III-3;

d) Area IV (South Central);

e) Area V (South and Southeast) including sub-recovery zones V-1, V-2, V-3 and V-4; and

f) Area VI (Southwest) including sub-recovery zones VI-1, VI-2, VI-3 and V1-4.

10. **DETERMINATION OF THE OFF-SITE LEVIES**

10.1 The Off-site Levies included in this Bylaw were determined in accordance with the calculations from the 2012 Off-site Levy Bylaw Report prepared by BSEI Municipal Consulting Engineers dated October 2012. The BSEI Municipal Consulting Engineers Report is hereby incorporated into this Bylaw by reference as Schedule “A”.

10.2 The determination of the amount of each Off-site Levy amount in respect of each of the separate facilities for which an Off-site Levy has been imposed is as shown within the BSEI Municipal Consulting Engineers 2012 Off-site Levy Bylaw Report which has been included as Schedule "A" of this Bylaw. The total amount of the Off-site Levies imposed in respect of each of the 6 geographic areas referenced in Section 9 are also shown in the BSEI Municipal Engineers 2012 Off-site Levy Bylaw Report which has been included as in Schedule "A" of this Bylaw.

10.3 The Off-site Levies reflected in this Bylaw will apply to all new Subdivision and Development agreements approved effective January 1, 2013.

11. **INFORMATION ON REQUEST**

11.1 Upon receiving a request from a ratepayer or landowner, the City shall disclose full information regarding Off-site Levy calculations, allocations, impositions, collections, costs and payments.

12. **ANNUAL REPORT TO COUNCIL**

12.1 Not less than once per calendar year, the City Manager shall provide a report to Council detailing all Off-site Levies imposed under this Bylaw, collections and expenditures during the previous calendar year, unpaid Off-site Levy amounts as at the end of the previous calendar year, funds on hand to meet anticipated expenditures during the current calendar year and updated estimates of the costs expected to be incurred in order to complete construction of the facilities in respect of which an Off-site Levy has been imposed under this Bylaw.
13. **GENERAL**

13.1 In the event that any provision of this Bylaw be declared invalid or void by any Court having competent jurisdiction, then such invalid or void provision shall be severed from the Bylaw and the remaining provisions of the Bylaw shall be maintained and deemed valid.

13.2 Bylaw No. B-16/2010 is repealed on the date of the third and final reading of this Bylaw.

13.3 This Bylaw comes into full force and effect on the 1st day of January, 2013.

READ a first time this ______ day of _______________, 2012.

READ a second time this ______ day of _______________, 201_.

READ a third time this ______ day of ________________, 201_.

EXECUTED this ______ day of _______________, 201_.

________________________
Mayor

________________________
City Clerk
SCHEDULE "A"

2012 Off-site Levy Bylaw
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1. Introduction

In January 2012, the City of Airdrie, aware that infrastructure upgrading requirements and offsite levies should be reviewed on a regular basis, commissioned BSEI to update the 2010 Infrastructure and Offsite Levy Report to ensure that the following noted items are properly addressed:

- Construction costs based on current market conditions;
- Changes in previously contemplated development patterns;
- Change in the anticipated rate of growth;
- To ensure that the adopted offsite levy approach is equitable between present and future developments;
- To ensure that growth pays for itself;
- Investigate the impact on the levy if Airdrie considers a net versus gross developable area;
- Investigate the impact on the potable and wastewater levy if Airdrie considers purchasing public utility corridors and public utility lots;
- Investigate the impact on the transportation levy if Airdrie considers purchasing road rights of ways (36m ROW and larger);
- Investigate the mechanism for a Public Facilities Contribution to construct or expand existing facilities categorized into Recreation, Community and Essential Services.

The proposed timeline for review, update and implementation of the 2012 infrastructure and offsite levies is as follows:

- The City requested comments from the Development Community starting in November, 2011 relative to the proposed 2012 infrastructure and offsite levy review;
- The proposed draft levies are to be discussed with the Development Community in April 2012 to incorporate Developer feedback and written comments received from UDI (February 23, 2012) and WestMark Holdings Ltd. (February 27, 2012) as applicable;
- A second meeting was held May 25, 2012 with the Development Community to review the revised draft of proposed infrastructure and offsite levies;
- The updated levies are anticipated to be presented to Council for approval in October 2012.
- A third meeting will be held in September 2012 with the Development Community to review the revised draft of proposed infrastructure and offsite levies.
2. Offsite Levies – Criteria

Financing of Municipal Infrastructure (FMI) follows the following principles:

- **Principle I** - Developer contributions and development levies are appropriate only for growth-related capital – these developer charges should be used for infrastructure required for support or is triggered by new development city-wide. Operational costs should be offset through other revenue sources;

- **Principle II** - Developer contributions are an adequate means of funding on-site infrastructure.

- **Principle III** - Development levies can be used to fund certain infrastructure beyond the boundary of the development area – new development may trigger offsite or downstream infrastructure outside the development area. Developer contributions should be permitted to be used to fund this infrastructure.

- **Principle IV** - The establishment of specific rates for development levies should be based on the actual benefits received by the benefitting residents – developer levies should be collected from lands that benefit from the infrastructure required.

- **Principle V** - Development levies should be structured to reflect as closely as possible the capital costs of constructing the infrastructure – the amount of the developer levies should reflect the accurate costs of infrastructure required.

- **Principle VI** - The establishment of specific rates for development levies should be reduced to reflect other sources of funding to avoid double charging – in the situation where funding sources other than developer levies are received, the developer levies will be adjusted to achieve a balance between total costs and funds collected.

- **Principle VII** - Development levies should not be used to fund infrastructure or services that are appropriately funded through ability-to-pay taxes.

- **Principle VIII** - As new taxation authority that better represent the benefits principle is made available to The City, and as existing authority is further implemented, development levies that have been used to fund the infrastructure or services in question should be reduced and eliminated.

- **Principle IX** - Transportation (36.0 m & wider arterial roadways) and potable water (300mm Ø and larger oversize) are allocated equally over the entire City as these improvements are deemed to benefit development on a City-wide basis.

- **Principle X** – Wastewater levies are allocated to the catchment area as identified in Plate 5-1 and Table 4.0 as improvements are deemed to benefit development in those areas.
Following are the factors considered in the development of offsite levies.

2.1. **That Growth Pays For Itself**
That all the costs required for growth be included in the offsite levy bylaw. Projects or portions of projects that are required for maintenance reasons or for increased environmental standards should be paid for either through the potable water and wastewater utility rates or through the tax levy. This will ensure that the offsite levy bylaw is equitable between existing and future residents.

2.2. **Recovery Areas**
These areas were established to achieve equitable distribution of costs for wastewater projects that benefit specific areas as opposed to the City at large. Refer to Plates 5-1 and 7-1. Prime Recovery Areas are the same as those noted in the 2010 report.

2.3. **Financing**
The City includes the cost of financing the infrastructure in its offsite levies. The financing factors were provided by a financial accounting firm.

2.4. **Recovery Units**
The study examined alternative recovery units and it was determined that the City’s new offsite levy bylaw would:

- Retain land area as a basis for recovering transportation, potable water, wastewater, land acquisition and engineering;
- Revise the residential per unit approach for assigning City recreation/public facility contributions to a residential per acre fee, to be introduced in 2012. This change will ensure greater fairness and predictability in the process and reduce the financial impact on multi-unit housing projects.

2.5. **Transportation, Potable Water and Wastewater Levies**
Transportation (36.0m & wider arterial roadways) and potable water (larger than 300mm oversize) levies are allocated equally over the entire City as these improvements are deemed to be of benefit on a City-wide basis. Wastewater levies are allocated to the catchments areas identified in Plate 5-1 and 7-1 as improvements are deemed to benefit development in those areas.
2.6. Grant Funding
Since 2010, the City has received several grants associated with growth related infrastructure as follows:

- T17 – Veterans Boulevard from 8th Street to 24th Street – approximately $4,200,000. This was a one-time Build Canada Fund grant and was included in the project financing. This grant has been credited to the overall cost of the T17 project;
- Long after the actual construction (and construction financing), the City received Alberta Municipal Water and Wastewater Program grant funding in the spring 2012 for projects W-5/W-6 (NE Reservoir and Pump Station), S1 (West Airdrie Lift Station) and S2 (Forcemain to Calgary). The cumulative amount of these grants was approximately $1,546,000. Since construction financing was previously established for these projects, this grant has been credited to project W20 – Water Supply Main to Calgary.

3. Population Horizons
The City directed that the 2012 study consider population horizons of 60,000 (forecasted to be met in 2022) and 80,000 which is based on complete development of all lands within the existing City limits (forecasted to be met in 2034). It is anticipated that for 70,000 population horizon, the benefitting area is 1,487 acres which was used for W5 and W6.

The total equivalent populations that account for the demands on the infrastructure components in industrial and commercial areas for the 60,000 and 80,000 population horizon are 76,200 and 101,600 respectively.
4. Costs

The previous levy report was completed in 2010 and was based on 2010 dollars.

Construction costs for transportation, water and wastewater infrastructure not yet completed were updated to 2012 dollars.

The costs have been updated based on the following inflationary increases for construction:

- 4% in 2012 – 2014;
- 3% in 2015 – 2021;
- Resulting in an average inflation rate of 3.3%.

5. Infrastructure Improvements – Transportation Component

Monitoring of traffic volumes on existing arterial roadways within the City indicates that these roadways are operating within their designed environmental capacity thresholds. Similarly, existing arterial roadway intersections within the City currently operate at acceptable levels of service.

It is the addition of traffic volumes related to growth and development occurring in many parts of the City that drives the need to upgrade the arterial roadway network. The origin-destination patterns indicate transportation linkages between residential development, commercial/industrial development and regional transportation corridors.

As such, the cost of transportation improvements to identified arterial roadways are allocated equally over all developing lands within the City as they are deemed to be necessary to create the additional transportation capacity necessary to support new growth.

Total construction costs are based on 2012 dollars. Also illustrated is the portion of cost used to calculate the offsite levies for these projects to reflect the anticipated grants that have been applied to each project. See Plate 3-1 and Table 2.0 for project information.

Following is a list of the changes and additions from the 2010 levy report:

- Projects that have the full levy collected previously: T15;
- Project added in 2012: T26;
- Projects that have had the full levy collected and no current levy proposed for 2012: None.
Input from the Development Community noted concerns with the levies for 4 lane roads (36 m ROW and larger) relative to land acquisition/compensation by the City of Airdrie. The 2010/2011 transportation levy did include items such as landscape improvements, pathways and minor road acquisitions.

Based on the 2012 levy review, industry has requested that the transportation levy includes all land acquisition for 36 m ROW and larger, landscape enhancements and pathways. Following are the assumptions for the 2012 levy review:

5.1. **Enhanced Landscaping at $139 per lineal Meter of Roadway**  
     Equates to a 5.1% cost increase over the base price of a 2-lane to 4-lane urban upgrade

5.2. **Pathway / Walkway at $127/m per Lineal Meter of Roadway**  
     Equates to a 4.7% cost increase over the base price of a 2-lane to 4-lane urban upgrade

5.3. **Land Acquisition at $110,000/acre**  
     Please refer to Section 10 of this 2012 levy report for details.

     Land acquisitions have incorporated into transportation projects T13, T20, T23, T24 and T26.

The following is a comparison of the 2010 and 2012 additional transportation levies.

**Table 1.0 - Additional Transportation Levies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Cost of Enhanced Landscaping</td>
<td>$548/acre</td>
<td>$1,354/hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Cost of Pathways/Walkways</td>
<td>$500/acre</td>
<td>$1,235/hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Cost of Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$327/acre</td>
<td>$808/hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INCREASE FOR TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>$1,375/acre</td>
<td>$3,397/hectare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These items have been included in the Transportation levies.
## Table 2.0 - Transportation Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Upgrade Classification</th>
<th>Construction Budget</th>
<th>Developer Contribution</th>
<th>Estimated/Actual Construction Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>40th Avenue Interchange – 1.6 km South of Yankee Valley Blvd. – Land Purchase</td>
<td>Interchange</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>40th Avenue Interchange – 1.6 km South of Yankee Valley Blvd. – Construction</td>
<td>Interchange</td>
<td>$44,450,000</td>
<td>$11,112,500</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Township Road 264 Interchange – 3.2 km South of Yankee Valley Blvd. – Land Purchase</td>
<td>Interchange</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Veterans Blvd. – Phase 1 – West of Highway 2 to West of 8 Street West</td>
<td>4UAD</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
<td>$1,218,000</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Veterans Blvd. – Phase 2 – East of Highway 2 to east of East Lake Blvd.</td>
<td>4UAD</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$1,425,000</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Yankee Valley Blvd. – Phase 1 – Main Street intersection upgrading</td>
<td>4UAD</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Yankee Valley Blvd. – Phase 2- Main Street to 8th Street</td>
<td>4UAD</td>
<td>$4,800,000</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Yankee Valley Blvd. – Phase 3 – Highway 2 to Kings Heights Gate</td>
<td>6UAD</td>
<td>$7,300,000</td>
<td>$7,300,000</td>
<td>2010/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>8th Street West – Phase 1 Veterans Blvd. to First Ave North</td>
<td>4UAD</td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
<td>$2,850,000</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>8th Street West – Phase 2A – First Ave North to Yankee Valley Blvd.</td>
<td>2UAD</td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
<td>$2,325,000</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>8th Street West – Phase 2B – First Ave North to Yankee Valley Blvd.</td>
<td>4UAD</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
<td>2010/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>First Avenue North – Phase 1 – 9th Street West to Main Street</td>
<td>4UAU</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>40th Avenue from 8th Street to 40th Ave Interchange &amp; 8th Street from Yankee Valley Blvd. to 40th Ave</td>
<td>2UAU</td>
<td>$7,550,000</td>
<td>$7,550,000</td>
<td>2009/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T14</td>
<td>THIS LINE INTENTIONALLY BLANK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T15</td>
<td>CPR Pedestrian Over/Underpass</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16</td>
<td>First Avenue North – Phase 2 – 8th Street to Woodside Drive</td>
<td>4UAD</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T17</td>
<td>Veterans Blvd. from 8th Street to 24 Street</td>
<td>4UAD/2UAD</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T18</td>
<td>24th Street – 1st Avenue to Sagewood Entrance</td>
<td>2UAU</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T19</td>
<td>8th Street – 40th Avenue to South City Limit</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T20</td>
<td>24th Street – Sagewood South to Yankee Valley Boulevard</td>
<td>2UAU</td>
<td>$7,800,000</td>
<td>$7,800,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T21</td>
<td>Railway Avenue CPR</td>
<td>2UCU</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T22</td>
<td>Yankee Valley Boulevard CPR Crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T23</td>
<td>Yankee Valley Boulevard from 8th Street to 24th Street</td>
<td>4UAD</td>
<td>$8,050,000</td>
<td>$8,050,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T24</td>
<td>40th Avenue – From 8th Street Windsong Blvd.</td>
<td>2UAD</td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T25</td>
<td>THIS LINE INTENTIONALLY BLANK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T26</td>
<td>40th Street – Yankee Valley Blvd. to Cobblestone Collector A</td>
<td>2UAU</td>
<td>$3,300,000</td>
<td>$3,300,000</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- Offsite levies for projects T1, T2, and T3 based on 25% of the total cost.
- Offsite levies for projects T7, T9, T10, T12, T17, and T18 based on 75% of the total cost.
- Offsite levies for projects T8, T11, T13, T16, T20, T21, T23, T24 and T26 based on 100% of the total cost.
- All projects subject to Council approval.
- Cost recovery has been completed for the highlighted projects above. Areas shaded darker are not levied items.
- Transportation projects prepared by ISL Engineering and Land Services Ltd.
- The following projects are development driven but are not included in this levy update
  - Yankee Valley Boulevard Grade Separation at CPR tracks (23 million)
  - Veteran’s Boulevard Grade separation at CPR tracks (18 million)
- The upgrade classification 4UAD denoted the number of lanes (2, 4 or 6), urban or rural cross-section (U or R), road type (A or C) and divided or undivided roadway (D or U)

**TOTAL:**
$125,250,000
$76,855,500
6. **Infrastructure Improvements – Potable Water Component**

The current potable water system will adequately supply the present population of the City. With growth, there is a fundamental need to expand the system for additional storage, distribution and strengthening of the grid for domestic, commercial, industrial and fire protection needs. The levies are allocated equally over the entire City as these improvements are deemed to be a benefit on a City wide basis.

Table 3.0 provides a summary of projects together with estimated total construction or oversize costs (based on 2012 dollars). Refer to Plate 4-1 for project locations.

- Projects that have had the full levy collected previously: W1, W2, W3, W4, W7, W8, W9, W10, W11, W12, W15, W16, W17, W18, W19 and W21;
- Project added in 2012: W23;
- Projects that have had the full levy collected and no current levy proposed for 2012: None.

It should be noted that the land costs for public utility lots (PUL) are included in the calculations at $316/acre. Please refer to Section 9.1.
## Table 3.0 - Potable Water Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction/Oversize Budget</th>
<th>Estimated/Actual Construction Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>250 mm Main on 8th Street SW North of Yankee Valley Blvd.</td>
<td>$206,200</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>250 mm Main on 8th Street SW South of Yankee Valley Blvd. to Coopers Entrance</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>300 mm Main – CPR Crossing</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>400 mm Main – CPR Crossing</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5</td>
<td>2.50 ML Storage Reservoir in NE</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6</td>
<td>9,000 L/min – Pump Station in NE</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W7</td>
<td>Oversize 400 mm Cooper’s Crossing – Existing and Proposed</td>
<td>$74,000</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W8</td>
<td>Oversize 400 mm Luxstone South (formerly Ridgegate south)</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W9</td>
<td>Oversize 400 mm Luxstone North</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W10</td>
<td>Oversize 400 mm Canals 4</td>
<td>$123,000</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W11</td>
<td>Oversize 400 mm Sagewood</td>
<td>$106,000</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W12</td>
<td>Oversize 400 mm Canals / Bayside</td>
<td>$248,000</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W13</td>
<td>4.5 ML West Side Storage Reservoir</td>
<td>$4,250,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W14</td>
<td>40,000 L/min West Side Pump Station</td>
<td>$4,450,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W15</td>
<td>Oversize 400 mm Reynolds</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W16</td>
<td>Oversize 400 mm Heartland</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W17</td>
<td>Oversize 400 mm Bushfield</td>
<td>$243,000</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W18</td>
<td>Oversize 400 mm Highway 2 Crossing North of SR 567</td>
<td>$367,000</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W19</td>
<td>Oversize 400 mm Ridgegate at Model Train Society</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W20</td>
<td>600 mm Water Supply Line from Calgary</td>
<td>$11,301,575</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W21</td>
<td>Oversize 400 mm Chinook Winds</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W22</td>
<td>THIS LINE INTENTIONALLY BLANK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W23</td>
<td>Oversize 400 mm Southwest Grid Oversize</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$27,851,575</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Council approval required for all projects.
- Cost recovery has been completed for the highlighted projects above.
7. **Infrastructure Improvements – Wastewater Component**

Wastewater infrastructure improvements are required as development occurs in the City of Airdrie. Catchment areas have been identified for wastewater improvements that will benefit these proposed developments within the catchment boundaries. Therefore, wastewater levies are allocated accordingly to development within those catchment areas.

Completed and proposed improvements to the wastewater collection system are summarized in Table 4.0. It includes the estimated or actual construction or oversize cost and estimated or actual year of construction. Project locations and main drainage areas are shown on Plate 5-1. Sub drainage areas are shown on Plate 7-1.

- Projects that have had the full levy collected previously: S5, S6, S7, S13, S14 and S15;
- Projects added in 2012: S18 and S20;
- Projects that have had the full levy collected and there is no current levy proposed for 2012: None.

Project S20, area V-4 Lift Station has been excluded from the average levy calculations. This area does not appear to have any immediate development proposed. When development occurs the lift station will be required, and at this time it will be treated as an endeavour to assist. When future lands are annexed on the east side of Airdrie, wastewater will be conveyed to this lift station and at that time it may be considered as a levied item. Since a larger land area will be serviced by the lift station at that time, it will reduce the per acre levy accordingly.

It should be noted that the land costs for public utility lots (PUL) are included in the calculations at $316/acre. Please refer to Section 9.1.
## Table 4.0 - Wastewater Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction / Oversize Budget</th>
<th>Estimated / Actual Construction Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>New Lift Station – West Airdrie (350 L/s)</td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Forcemain to Calgary</td>
<td>$7,950,000</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Main Lift Station Upgrade (formerly Storage)</td>
<td>$577,500</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Oversize SE – West of Highway 2 Collector Main</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>SE – West of Highway 2 South Lift Station</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
<td>2005/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>SE – West of Highway 2 Forcemain</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>SE – West of Highway 2 Rail Crossing</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>Oversize Existing 450 mm Collector Main – Luxstone South</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>8th Street Parallel Collector Main (or alternative)</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>THIS LINE INTENTIONALLY BLANK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>Oversize 750 mm Collector Main – Luxstone North</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>Oversize 750 mm Collector Main – Canals</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>Oversize 525 mm Collector Main – Canals</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>Oversize 450 mm Collector Main – Canals</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>Oversize 450 mm Collector Main – Hopewell</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>Oversize 450 mm Collector Main – Strassburger</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>Oversize THIS LINE INTENTIONALLY BLANK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>West Airdrie Lift Station Upgrade (to 500 L/s)</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>THIS LINE INTENTIONALLY BLANK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>Area V-4 Lift Station with QEII crossings</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | $17,797,500 | |

**Note:**
- Council approval required for all projects.
- Cost recovery has been completed for the highlighted projects above.
8. **Infrastructure Improvements – Surface Water Drainage Component**

The City continues to support the concept of regional stormwater facilities entirely developer funded. The City will endeavour to assist the Developer in recovering applicable oversize costs. This will be done by inserting the requirement that the other developers who directly benefit from the improvement or oversize reimburse the Developer for such costs when the City enters into development agreements with the other developers.

9. **Purchase Utility Corridors and Public Utility Lots – Effect on Levies & Assessments**

The consideration to have the City of Airdrie purchase land for Public Utility Corridors and Public Utility lots and the effect on Levies and assessments was investigated. Following are the findings:

9.1. **Public Utility Lots – Effect on Levy & Assessments**
- Proposed Area for Public Utility Lots (Windsong Reservoir and South Lift Station) = 6 acres
- Cost for Land Purchase = $110,000 / acre
- Total Cost for Land Purchase = $660,000
- Area of Total Developable Land = 2,091 acres
- Increase in Levies / Assessments = $316 /acre

10. **Purchase Road ROW – Effect on Levy & Assessments**

The consideration to have the City of Airdrie purchase land for the purchase of 36 m road right-of-way and larger, and the effect on Levies and assessments was investigated. These projects include T13, T20, T23, T24 and T26. Following are the findings:

10.1. **Road ROW – Effects on Levy & Assessments**
- Proposed Additional Area for Road ROW = 32 acres
- Cost for Road ROW = $110,000 / acre
- Total Cost for Road ROW = $3,520,000
- Area of Total Developable Land = 2,091 acres
- Increase in Levies / Assessments = $1,683 /acre
11. Total Levied (Current Method) vs. Net Developable Area – For Discussion Purposes

The consideration to use Total or Net Developable area to calculate offsite levies and assessments was investigated. Following is an itemized list of land uses and corresponding areas. Please note that every specific Neighbourhood Structure Plan and Land Use application are unique and each of the components and associated percentages will vary from the historical norm.

11.1. Area Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>80,000 Population Area (acres)</th>
<th>60,000 Population Area (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Area (Total area encompassed by the Developer Land Holdings)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,294</td>
<td>969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Developable Area:</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PUL Acquisitions</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Road R.O.W. Acquisitions</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Reserve (including Nose Creek 1:100 year elevation)</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Developable Area</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>2091</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed levies are based on the Net Developable Area.
### Table 5.0 - 2011 and 2012 Rates Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2011 Rates (/acre)</th>
<th>2012 Rates (/acre)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$30,490</td>
<td>$38,870</td>
<td>$8,380</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater (high/low average)</td>
<td>$8,508</td>
<td>$7,486</td>
<td>-$1,022</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potable Water</td>
<td>$10,449</td>
<td>$13,068</td>
<td>$2,619</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy Report</td>
<td>$391</td>
<td>$425</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Landscaping Pathway and Land Acquisition Fee</td>
<td>$1,375</td>
<td>$2,839</td>
<td>$1,464</td>
<td>106%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utility Lots Land Acquisition Contribution</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$316</td>
<td>$316</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water for Construction</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$53,013</strong></td>
<td><strong>$64,254</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,241</strong></td>
<td><strong>17%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Does not include the prior Recreation Contribution or the proposed Public Facilities Contribution
Transportation Projects

Project T1: 40 Avenue Interchange – 1.6 km S. of Yankee Valley Blvd. – Land Purchase

Project Description
The 40 Avenue interchange will provide a partial connection to/from Highway 2 south, to support expanding urban development in southwest and southeast Airdrie. This project provides for land purchases that will be necessary to construct the interchange. This project was identified as being required at the 45,000 population.

Source Documents
Transportation Master Plan
Chinook Winds Community ASP
Cooper’s Town ASP
South East Community ASP
South Airdrie Community ASP
Highway 2 / Township Road 265 Interchange Functional Planning Study (Alberta Transportation)

Benefitting Areas
Offsite levies have been collected from land developed in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2003 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost (estimated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (estimated)</td>
<td>$ 3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Contribution to Construction Cost (75%)</td>
<td>$ 2,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost (25%)</td>
<td>$ 750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to 2012</td>
<td>$ 117,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$ 632,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$ 892,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$ 1,009,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$ 426.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale for Cost Recovery
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to construction and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
Transportation Projects

Project T2: 40 Avenue Interchange – 1.6 km South of Yankee Valley Blvd. – Construction

Project Description
The 40 Avenue interchange will provide a partial connection to/from Highway 2 south, to support expanding urban development in southwest and southeast Airdrie. This project provides for construction of the interchange. This project was identified as being required at the 55,000 population horizon.

Source Documents
Transportation Master Plan
Chinook Winds Community ASP
Cooper’s Town ASP
South East Community ASP
South Airdrie Community ASP
Highway 2 / Township Road 265 Interchange Functional Planning Study (Alberta Transportation)

Benefitting Areas
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2003 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (estimated)</td>
<td>$44,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Contribution to Construction Cost (75%)</td>
<td>$33,337,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost (25%)</td>
<td>$11,112,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to 2012</td>
<td>$5,814,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$5,297,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$7,839,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$13,654,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$3,749.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale for Cost Recovery
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to debenture and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
Transportation Projects

Project T3: Township Road 264 Interchange – 3.2 km South of Yankee Valley Blvd – Land Purchase

Project Description
The Township Road 264 interchange will provide a full connection to/from Highway 2 south, to support expanding urban development in southwest and southeast Airdrie. This project provides for land purchases within the City of Airdrie that will be necessary to construct the interchange. This project was identified as being required at the 50,000 population horizon.

Source Documents
South East Community ASP
South Airdrie Community ASP

Benefitting Areas
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2003 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (estimated)</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Contribution to Construction Cost (75%)</td>
<td>$1,125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost (25%)</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to 2012</td>
<td>$226,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$148,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$244,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$471,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$117.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale for Cost Recovery
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to debenture and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
Transportation Projects

**Project T4: Veterans Blvd. – Phase 1 – West of Highway 2 to West of 8 Street**

**Project Description**
Veterans Blvd is the primary east-west arterial in north Airdrie, connecting to Highway 2 via an interchange and continuing beyond the City as Highway 567. Significant expansion of the roadway has occurred within the past decade, significant residential, commercial and industrial development along the corridor. This project was identified as being required at the 27,500 population horizon.

**Source Documents**
Transportation Master Plan
North East Community ASP
North West Community ASP

**Benefitting Areas**
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2003 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (883 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

**Project Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (estimated)</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Contribution to Construction Cost (71%)</td>
<td>$2,982,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost (29%)</td>
<td>$1,218,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to Year of Construction</td>
<td>$437,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$780,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$1,109,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution ($Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$1,547,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$1,256.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale for Cost Recovery**
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to construction and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
Transportation Projects

Project T5: Veterans Blvd. – Phase 2 – East of Highway 2 to East of East Lake Blvd.

Project Description
Veterans Blvd is the primary east-west arterial in north Airdrie, connecting to Highway 2 via an interchange and continuing beyond the City as Highway 567. This project provided for expansion of the roadway in concert with interchange upgrades by Alberta Transportation, and has supported significant new residential, commercial and industrial development, particularly in east Airdrie. This project was identified as being required at the 35,000 population horizon.

Source Documents
Transportation Master Plan
North East Community ASP

Benefitting Areas
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2003 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (883 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$ 1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Contribution to Construction Cost (25%)</td>
<td>$ 448,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost (75%)</td>
<td>$ 1,425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to Year of Construction</td>
<td>$ 1,268,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$ 156,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$ 211,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$ 1,479,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$ 239.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale for Cost Recovery
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to construction and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 10 years or 60,000 population.
Transportation Projects

**Project T6**: Yankee Valley Blvd. – Phase 1 – Main Street Intersection

**Project Description**
Yankee Valley Blvd. is the primary east-west arterial in central Airdrie, connecting to Highway 2 via an interchange and providing highway access and transportation capacity for all new communities in Airdrie. This project provided for expansion of the Main Street intersection in concert with interchange upgrades by Alberta Transportation. This project was identified as being required at the 25,000 population horizon.

**Source Documents**
Transportation Master Plan
South Airdrie Community ASP

**Benefitting Areas**
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2003 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (883 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

**Project Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Construction</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Contribution to Construction Cost (75%)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost (25%)</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to Year of Construction</td>
<td>$7,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$292,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$422,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution ( (\text{Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor}) )</td>
<td>$430,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area ( (\text{acres}) )</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Levy/acre \( ($/acre) \)**

\[
\frac{\text{Debenture c/w Finance Factor}}{\text{Benefitting Area}} = \$478.60
\]

**Rationale for Cost Recovery**
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to construction and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 10 years or 60,000 population.
Transportation Projects

Project T7: Yankee Valley Blvd. – Phase 2 – Main Street to 8 Street

Project Description
Yankee Valley Blvd. is the primary east-west arterial in central Airdrie, connecting to Highway 2 via an interchange and providing highway access and transportation capacity for all new communities in Airdrie. This project provided for expansion of the Yankee Valley Blvd corridor to a four-lane divided standard, supporting significant recent residential and commercial development in southwest Airdrie. This project was identified as being required at the 30,000 population horizon.

Source Documents
Transportation Master Plan
Chinook Winds Community ASP
Cooper’s Town ASP
Luxstone ASP
South Airdrie Community ASP
West Airdrie Community ASP

Benefitting Areas
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2003 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (883 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$4,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Contribution to Construction Cost (25%)</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost (75%)</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to Year of Construction</td>
<td>$706,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$2,893,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$4,043,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$4,749,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levy/acre ($/acre) = \frac{\text{Debenture c/w Finance Factor}}{\text{Benefitting Area}} = \frac{4,749,868}{883} = \$4,579.31

Rationale for Cost Recovery
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to construction and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 10 years or 60,000 population.
Transportation Projects

Project T8: Yankee Valley Blvd. – Phase 3 – Highway 2 to Kings Heights Gate

Project Description
Yankee Valley Blvd. is the primary east-west arterial in central Airdrie, connecting to Highway 2 via an interchange and providing highway access and transportation capacity for all new communities in Airdrie. This project provided for expansion of the roadway east of Highway 2 in concert with interchange upgrades by Alberta Transportation, and providing significant capacity for new residential, commercial and industrial development in southeast Airdrie. This project was identified as being required at the 40,000 population horizon.

Source Documents
Transportation Master Plan
South East Community ASP

Benefitting Areas
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2003 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Construction</th>
<th>2010/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (estimated)</td>
<td>$ 7,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost</td>
<td>$ 7,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to 2012</td>
<td>$ 2,401,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$ 4,898,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$ 7,315,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$ 9,716,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$ 3,498.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debenture c/w Finance Factor
Benefitting Area

Rationale for Cost Recovery
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to construction and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
Transportation Projects

Project T9: 8 Street – Phase 1 – Veterans Blvd. to First Ave. North

Project Description
8 Street is an important north-south arterial corridor, providing an alternate parallel route to Highway 2. This project provided for expansion of the roadway north of First Avenue to a four-lane standard, providing significant capacity for new residential and commercial development. This project was identified as being required at the 35,000 population horizon.

Source Documents
Transportation Master Plan
North East Community ASP
North West Community ASP

Benefitting Areas
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2003 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV & VI, V (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Construction</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Contribution to Construction Cost (25%)</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost (75%)</td>
<td>$2,850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to Year of Construction</td>
<td>$894,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$1,955,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$2,926,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$3,821,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$1,399.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale for Cost Recovery
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to construction and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
Transportation Projects

Project T10: 8 Street – Phase 2A – First Ave. North to Yankee Valley Blvd.

Project Description
8 Street is an important north-south arterial corridor, providing an alternate parallel route to Highway 2. This project was the first step in upgrading the corridor to its ultimate standard north of Yankee Valley Blvd, by first reconstructing the former rural range road to a two-lane urban standard. This project was identified as being required at the 40,000 population horizon.

Source Documents
Transportation Master Plan
Chinook Winds Community ASP
Cooper’s Town ASP
Luxstone ASP
West Airdrie Community ASP

Benefiting Areas
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2003 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>3,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Contribution to Construction Cost (25%)</td>
<td>775,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost (75%)</td>
<td>2,325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to Year of Construction</td>
<td>1,420,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>904,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>1,331,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>2,751,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>636.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale for Cost Recovery
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to construction and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
Transportation Projects

Project T11: 8 Street – Phase 2B – First Ave. North to Yankee Valley Blvd.

Project Description
8 Street is an important north-south arterial corridor, providing an alternate parallel route to Highway 2. This project was the final step in upgrading the corridor to its ultimate standard north of Yankee Valley Blvd, by twinning the roadway to a four-lane divided standard. This project was identified as being required at the 40,000 population horizon.

Source Documents
Transportation Master Plan
Chinook Winds Community ASP
Cooper’s Town ASP
Luxstone ASP
West Airdrie Community ASP

Benefitting Areas
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2003 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to 2012</td>
<td>$2,253,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$3,246,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$4,581,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$6,835,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$2,191.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale for Cost Recovery
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to construction and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
Transportation Projects

**Project T12: First Avenue North – Phase 1 – 8 Street to Main Street**

**Project Description**
First Avenue is the primary east-west connector to Downtown Airdrie. This project provided for upgrading the corridor to its ultimate standard, providing a rejuvenated gateway to downtown Airdrie and providing needed capacity for residential and commercial densification of the area. This project was identified as being required at the 35,000 population horizon.

**Source Documents**
- Transportation Master Plan
- Airdrie Downtown Plan

**Benefitting Areas**
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2003 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

**Project Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Contribution to Construction Cost (25%)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost (75%)</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to Year of Construction</td>
<td>$990,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$509,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$776,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$1,766,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$371.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale for Cost Recovery**
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to construction and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
Transportation Projects

Project T13: 40 Avenue – 8 Street to Highway 2 Interchange & 8 Street – Yankee Valley Blvd. to 40 Avenue

Project Description
8 Street and 40 Avenue will be primary transportation routes in the City’s growing southwest area, providing a connection to a new partial interchange on Highway 2 and capacity for these newly-developing communities. The 8 Street portion of the project was completed in 2009 as the first step in upgrading the corridor, reconstructing the former rural range road to a two-lane urban standard. The 40 Avenue portion is planned for construction in 2013 and will provide for greenfield construction of the initial two lanes of 40 Avenue, providing access for the Cooper’s Crossing, Morningside and Hillcrest communities. This project was identified as being required at the 45,000 population horizon.

Source Documents
Transportation Master Plan
Chinook Winds Community ASP
Cooper’s Town ASP
South Airdrie Community ASP

Benefitting Areas
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2003 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Construction</th>
<th>2009/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (8\textsuperscript{th} Street = $3,880,000 + 40\textsuperscript{th} Avenue = $3,670,000)</td>
<td>$7,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost</td>
<td>$7,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to Year of Construction</td>
<td>$5,347,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$2,202,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$3,138,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$8,486,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$1,501.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefitting Areas
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV & VI have paid offsite levies from 2003 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV & VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Rationale for Cost Recovery
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to construction and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
Transportation Projects

**Project T16: First Avenue North – Phase 2 – 8 Street to Woodside Drive**

**Project Description**
First Avenue is the primary east-west connector to Downtown Airdrie. This project provided for upgrading the corridor to its ultimate standard west of 8 Street, continuing the gateway and capacity enhancements already constructed to the east. The upgrades will support ongoing residential and commercial development in the area. This project was identified as being required at the 55,000 population horizon.

**Source Documents**
- Transportation Master Plan
- West Airdrie Community ASP

**Benefitting Areas**
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2006 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

**Project Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (estimated)</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to 2012</td>
<td>$788,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$1,211,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$1,809,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$2,897,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$2,897,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$865.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale for Cost Recovery**
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to debenture and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
Transportation Projects

Project T17: Veterans Blvd. – 8 Street to 24 Street

Project Description
Veterans Blvd is the primary east-west arterial in north Airdrie, connecting to Highway 2 via an interchange and continuing beyond the City as Highway 567. This project provided for upgrading of the roadway west of 8 Street, reconstructing the former rural road to a four-lane divided or two-lane divided standard, and supporting expanding residential development in the area. This project was identified as being required at the 40,000 population horizon.

Source Documents
Transportation Master Plan
North West Community ASP

Benefitting Areas
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2006 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Contribution to Construction Cost (52.5%)</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost (47.5%)</td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to 2012</td>
<td>$2,315,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$1,484,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$2,147,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$4,462,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$1,026.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale for Cost Recovery
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to construction and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 popultaion.
Transportation Projects

**Project T18: 24 Street – First Avenue to Sagewood Entrance**

**Project Description**

24 Street is an important arterial corridor in west Airdrie, running along the former City boundary. This project provided for the first step toward ultimate upgrading of the corridor, with reconstruction of the former rural range road to a two-lane urban standard to support new residential development. This project was identified as being required at the 30,000 population horizon.

**Source Documents**

Transportation Master Plan
West Airdrie Community ASP

**Benefitting Areas**

Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2006 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

**Project Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Construction</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Contribution to Construction Cost (25%)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost (75%)</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to Year of Construction</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$2,322,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$2,322,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$1,110.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale for Cost Recovery**

The project cost and the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
Transportation Projects

Project T20: 24 Street – Sagewood Entrance to Yankee Valley Boulevard

Project Description
24 Street is an important arterial corridor in west Airdrie, running along the former City boundary. This project will provide for the first step toward ultimate upgrading of the corridor, with reconstruction of the former rural range road to a two-lane urban standard to support new residential development. This project was identified as being required at the 45,000 population horizon.

Source Documents
Transportation Master Plan
West Airdrie Community ASP
Chinook Winds Community ASP

Benefitting Areas
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2008 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Construction</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (estimated)</td>
<td>$ 7,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost</td>
<td>$ 7,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to 2012</td>
<td>$ 1,023,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$ 6,776,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$ 9,563,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$ 10,586,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre) ( \frac{\text{Debenture c/w Finance Factor}}{\text{Benefitting Area}} )</td>
<td>$ 4,573.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale for Cost Recovery
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to construction and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
Transportation Projects

Project T21: Railway Avenue / CPR Crossing

Project Description
Railway Avenue will provide a second CPR crossing to Downtown Airdrie, relieving First Avenue and providing for improved circulation in this growing area. The connection will support continuing commercial and residential densification of the area, and improve connectivity for all modes of transportation including pedestrians. This project was identified as being required at the 45,000 population horizon.

Source Documents
Transportation Master Plan
Airdrie Downtown Plan

Benefitting Areas
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2008 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (883 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Construction</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (estimated)</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to 2012</td>
<td>$414,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$1,585,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$2,008,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$2,423,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levy/acre ($/acre) = $2,274.96

Rationale for Cost Recovery
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to construction and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 10 years or 60,000 population.
Transportation Projects

Project T23: Yankee Valley Boulevard – 8 Street to 24 Street

Project Description
Yankee Valley Blvd. is the primary east-west arterial in central Airdrie, connecting to Highway 2 via an interchange and providing highway access and transportation capacity for all new communities in Airdrie. This project will provide for continuing expansion of the corridor west of 8 Street, reconstructing the existing two-lane rural road to a four-lane urban standard. This will support ongoing residential development of the area. This project was identified as being required at the 55,000 population horizon.

Source Documents
Transportation Master Plan
Chinook Winds Community ASP
West Airdrie Community ASP

Benefitting Areas
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2008 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (estimated)</td>
<td>$ 8,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost</td>
<td>$ 8,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to 2012</td>
<td>$ 1,153,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$ 6,896,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$ 10,204,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$ 11,358,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>Debenture c/w Finance Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefitting Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,880.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale for Cost Recovery
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to debenture and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
Transportation Projects

Project T24: 40 Avenue – 8 Street to Windsong Blvd.

Project Description
40 Avenue will be the main east-west arterial corridor in south Airdrie, supporting growth of new residential and commercial development in the area. It is a greenfield roadway that plays no role in the existing transportation network. This project will provide for the first stage of roadway expansion west of 8 Street, providing network capacity for Windsong and other new communities in southwest Airdrie. This project was identified as being required at the 45,000 population horizon.

Source Documents
Transportation Master Plan
Chinook Winds Community ASP

Benefitting Areas
Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI have paid offsite levies from 2008 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V& VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Construction</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (estimated)</td>
<td>$ 2,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost</td>
<td>$ 2,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to 2012</td>
<td>$ 576,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$ 2,023,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$ 2,883,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$ 3,459,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre) Debenture c/w Finance Factor Benefitting Area</td>
<td>$ 1,378.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale for Cost Recovery
The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to debenture and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
Transportation Projects

Project T26: 24 Street – Yankee Valley Blvd. to Cobblestone Collector A

Project Description
24 Street is an important arterial corridor in west Airdrie, running along the former City boundary. This project will provide for the first stage of corridor upgrading south of Yankee Valley Blvd, with reconstruction of the former rural range road to a two-lane urban standard to support new residential development. This project was identified as being required at the 55,000 population horizon.

Source Documents
Transportation Master Plan
Chinook Winds Community ASP

Benefitting Areas
This project will primarily benefit new development along the western corridor of the City. The levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will have residents utilizing this transportation corridor. The beneficiaries of this transportation project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (estimated)</td>
<td>$ 3,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost</td>
<td>$ 3,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to 2012</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$ 3,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$ 4,838,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$ 4,838,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$ 2,313.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale for Cost Recovery
The project cost and the financing factor are being allocated to the benefiting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
Wastewater Project Profile

Project S1: New Lift Station – West Airdrie (350 L/s)

Project Description

The West Airdrie (350 L/s) lift station provides service to the City (see plate 5-1). The lift station was designed to convey the wastewater to the main lift station and ultimately to The City of Calgary for processing. This project was identified as being required at the 38,000 population horizon.

Source Document

Infrastructure and Offsite Levy Review 2003 Update

Benefitting Areas

Offsite levies have been collected from land developed in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI from 2003 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will convey wastewater to this lift station. The beneficiaries of this sanitary project can be defined on an area specific basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (883 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Construction</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost</td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to Year of Construction</td>
<td>$3,672,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$927,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$1,411,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$5,094,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$1,598.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rational for Cost Recovery

The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to construction and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years.
**Wastewater Project Profile**

**Project S2: Forcemain to Calgary**

**Project Description**

Construction of a sanitary forcemain from the City of Airdrie to the City of Calgary. This project was required at the 31,300 population horizon.

**Source Document**

Infrastructure and Offsite Levy Review 2003 Update

**Benefitting Areas**

Existing users in Areas I, II, III, IV, V, & VI have paid offsite levies from 2003 to present to pay for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will convey waste to the main lift station and then onward through the forcemain to Calgary for processing. The beneficiaries of this sanitary project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V, & VI (883 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

**Project Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$7,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost</td>
<td>$7,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to Year of Construction</td>
<td>$5,695,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$2,254,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$3,490,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$9,185,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (remaining acres)</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$3,953.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale for Cost Recovery**

The remaining project cost is the balance after subtracting levies collected prior to construction and multiplying by the financing factor. The remaining project cost than allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 10 years or 60,000 population horizon.
Wastewater Project Profile

**Project S3**: Main Lift Station Upgrade (formerly storage)

**Project Description**

Upgrade of the City of Airdrie main lift station which pumps sanitary waste to the City of Calgary. This project was required at the 31,300 population horizon.

**Source Document**

Infrastructure and Offsite Levy Review 2003 Update

**Benefitting Areas**

Offsite levies have been collected from land developed in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI from 2003 to present for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will convey wastewater to the main lift station and then onward through the forcemain to Calgary for processing. The beneficiaries of this sanitary project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (883 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

**Project Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Contribution to Construction Cost (23%)</td>
<td>$172,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost (77%)</td>
<td>$577,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to Year of Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$577,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$939,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution <em>(Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</em></td>
<td>$939,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$1,063.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rational for Cost Recovery**

The project cost and the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 10 years or 60,000 population horizon.
Wastewater Project Profile

Project S8: Existing 450 mm Collector Main South – Luxstone South. This project was required at the 31,300 population horizon.

Project Description

Upgrade of the sanitary main to 450mm diameter pipe.

Source Document

Infrastructure and Offsite Levy Review 2003 Update

Benefitting Areas

Offsite levies have been collected from land developed in Areas I, II, III, IV, V and IV from 2003 to present for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will convey wastewater through the oversized sanitary main. The beneficiaries of this sanitary project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include Areas I, II, III, IV, V and VI (883 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Construction</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to Year of Construction</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$81,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$81,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>( \frac{\text{Debenture c/w Finance Factor}}{\text{Benefitting Area}} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rational for Cost Recovery

The project cost and the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 10 years or 60,000 population horizon.
Wastewater Project Profile

Project S16: 450 mm Collector Main – Strassburger

Project Description

Oversize of the sanitary main to 450mm diameter pipe to service lands in sub-catchment VI-4. This project was identified as being required at the 45,000 population horizon.

Source Document

Infrastructure and Offsite Levy Review 2003 Update

Benefitting Areas

Offsite levies have not been collected from land developed in Area VI-4 for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will convey wastewater through the oversized sanitary main. The beneficiaries of this sanitary project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include Area VI-4 (480 acres). The development areas are shown on Plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$ 110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost</td>
<td>$ 110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to Year of Construction</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$ 110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$ 161,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$ 161,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$ 161,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$ 337.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale for Cost Recovery

The project cost and the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 15 years or 75,000 population horizon.
Wastewater Project Profile

Project S18: West Airdrie Lift Station Upgrade (to 500 L/s)

Project Description

Upgrade of the West Airdrie Lift Station to increase capacity to 500 L/s. The proposed upgrade will provide service to the City (see Plat 5-1). The lift station will be designed to convey the wastewater to the main lift station (S3) and ultimately to the City of Calgary for processing. This project was identified as being required at the 55,000 population horizon.

Source Document

Proposed 2012 Infrastructure and Offsite Levy Report

Benefitting Areas

Offsite levies have not yet been collected from land developed Areas I, II, III, IV, V, & VI. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will convey wastewater to this lift station. The beneficiaries of this sanitary project can be defined on a area specific basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include Areas I, II, III, IV, V and VI (883 acres). The development areas are shown on Plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (estimated)</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to 2012</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$665,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$665,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$754.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale for Cost Recovery

The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to debenture and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 10 years or 60,000 population.
Water Project Profile

Project W5: 2.50 ML Storage Reservoir in NE

Project Description

Construction of the 2.50 ML storage reservoir to meet the needs of the City of Airdrie to a population of 70,000 (1,487 acres). This project was identified as being required at the 40,000 population horizon.

Source Document

Infrastructure and Offsite Levy Review 2003 Update

Benefitting Areas

Offsite levies have been collected from land developed in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI from 2003 to present for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will receive potable water from the reservoir. The beneficiaries of this water project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (1,487 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year of Construction</strong></td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Cost</strong></td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost</strong></td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leves Collected to Year of Construction</strong></td>
<td>$1,535,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remaining Developer Contribution</strong></td>
<td>$2,464,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</strong></td>
<td>$3,626,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Developer Contribution</strong></td>
<td>Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefitting Area (acres)</strong></td>
<td>1,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Levy/acre ($/acre)</strong></td>
<td>Debenture c/w Finance Factor / Benefitting Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale for Cost Recovery

The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to construction and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 15 years or 70,000 population.
Water Project Profile

**Project W6: 9,000 L/min Pump Station in NE**

**Project Description**

Construction of a new 9,000 L/min pump station to meet the needs of the City of Airdrie to a population of 70,000 (1,487 acres). This project was identified as being required at the 40,000 population horizon.

**Source Document**

Infrastructure and Offsite Levy Review 2003 Update

**Benefitting Areas**

Offsite levies have been collected from land developed in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI from 2003 to present for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will receive potable water from the pump station/reservoir. The beneficiaries of this water project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI, 1,487 acres. The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

**Project Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to Year of Construction</td>
<td>$858,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$1,941,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$2,857,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$3,715,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>1,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$1,921.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale for Cost Recovery**

The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to construction and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 15 years or 70,000 population.
Water Project Profile

Project W13: 4.50 ML West Side Storage Reservoir

Project Description

Construction of a new 4.50 ML storage reservoir to meet the needs of the City of Airdrie to a population of 80,000 (2,091 acres). This project was identified as being required at the 50,000 population horizon.

Source Document

Infrastructure and Offsite Levy Review 2003 Update

Benefitting Areas

Offsite levies have been collected from land developed in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI from 2003 to present for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will receive potable water from the reservoir. The beneficiaries of this water project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Construction</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (estimated)</td>
<td>$4,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost</td>
<td>$4,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to 2012</td>
<td>$2,477,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$1,772,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$2,623,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution <em>(Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</em></td>
<td>$5,100,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Debenture c/w Finance Factor*  

| Levy/acre ($/acre) | $1,254.54 |

Rationale for Cost Recovery

The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to debenture and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
Water Project Profile

Project W14: 40,000 L/min West Side Pump Station

Project Description

Construction of a new 40,000 L/min pump station to meet the needs of the City of Airdrie to a population of 80,000 (2,091 acres). This project was identified as being required at the 55,000 population horizon.

Source Document

Infrastructure and Offsite Levy Review 2003 Update

Benefitting Areas

Offsite levies have been collected from land developed in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI from 2003 to present for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will receive potable water from the pump station/reservoir. The beneficiaries of this water project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (estimated)</td>
<td>$4,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Construction Cost</td>
<td>$4,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to 2012</td>
<td>$1,784,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$2,665,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$3,944,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution (Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td>$5,728,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$1,886.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale for Cost Recovery

The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to debenture and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
Water Project Profile

Project W20: 600 mm Water Supply Line from Calgary

Project Description

Construction of a new 600 mm water supply line from the City of Calgary to the City of Airdrie to supply potable water for consumption and fire protection for future developments. This project was identified as being required at the 45,000 population horizon.

Source Document

Infrastructure and Offsite Levy Review 2006 Update

Benefitting Areas

Offsite levies have been collected from land developed in Areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI from 2006 to present for this project. The remaining levies to be collected are from non-developed areas that will receive potable water through the City of Airdrie distribution system. The beneficiaries of this water project can be defined on a specific area basis. The development zones that benefit from this project include areas I, II, III, IV, V & VI (2,091 acres). The development areas are shown on plate 5-1.

Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost (estimate)</td>
<td>$12,850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Contribution to Cost</td>
<td>$1,548,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contribution to Cost</td>
<td>$11,301,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levies Collected to 2012</td>
<td>$4,154,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$7,147,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Developer Contribution with Finance Factor</td>
<td>$10,086,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developer Contribution</td>
<td>$14,240,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Levies collected prior to debenture plus debenture with finance factor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting Area (acres)</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy/acre ($/acre)</td>
<td>$4,823.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale for Cost Recovery

The remaining project cost after subtraction of the contributions from levies collected prior to construction and the addition of the financing factor are being allocated to the benefitting areas within the City boundaries that are anticipated to develop within 20 years or 80,000 population.
October 24, 2012

City of Airdrie
400 Main Street SW
Airdrie, AB T4B 3C3

Attention: Mayor Peter Brown
Members of Council

Please accept this letter as our response to the invitation to make a presentation to the Developer Public Input session on November 5, 2012.

On September 20, 2012 the representatives from the Development Industry met with City Staff and the City’s engineering consultants to discuss and comment on the third package of information provided for the 2012 Infrastructure & Offsite Levy Review. The Levies outlined in this package were identified as being those that Staff was going to present to Council for First Reading on October 15, 2012.

Our comments are as follows:

1. We are supportive of the Staff proposal to make a recommendation to Council that the new Off-site Levies, as permitted by the Municipal Government Act, become effective January 1, 2013 and that the current Levies remain unchanged for all of 2012.

2. We are appreciative that, through the Off-site Levy discussions, there has been agreement between City Staff and the Development Industry as to the basis for determining the Off-site Levy calculations based on a clearer definition of Net Developable Area. This clarified the method of dealing with land acquisition for Highway Arterial Roads and lands for major Public Utility infrastructure as well as calculations for density, reserve dedication and levy payments.

3. We appreciate the background information and explanations provided for the various infrastructure projects included in the proposed Off-site Levies and thank City Staff for the responses to the many questions put forward.

4. Proposed Offsite Levies:
   We are most disappointed that, after many discussions, submissions and highlighting of the principles set out in the Court of Appeal ruling between Prairie Communities Development Corp. and the Town of Okotoks, the City Staff continues to rationalize the City policy of “Development pays for itself” as meaning new development pays for 100% of the costs for new infrastructure. We would suggest the thought process in Airdrie is similar to that in Okotoks and is captured in Paragraph 57 of the Court of Appeal decision which states:

   **Paragraph 57:** “I add that I have come to the conclusion with reluctance, as the Town, speaking through its elected representatives, clearly believes that it is only fair and proper that developers (and

   *Cooper’s Crossing Joint Venture*
through them, the new residents of the lands under development) should bear these charges attributable in whole, or in part, to the growth of the Town. However, whether section 648 should be expanded to permit off-site levies for additional facilities and infrastructure than presently provided in the MGA is a matter of legislative consideration. Further, as will be evident from the next part of this decision, any expansion of the powers would also engage the allocation of benefit as between the new development and the existing development.’’

The staff report requesting Council to give first reading to Bylaw No. B-22/2012 stated: “It has been the City’s position as per the Airdrie Plan (Municipal Development Plan) that development must support itself in terms of any required capital improvements (growth must pay for itself). The proposed levy structure and accompanying bylaw has been established in conformance with that philosophy and in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Government Act.”

The statement “and in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Government Act” is surprising in view of the clarity provided by the Court of Appeal. Within the context of the Court of Appeal ruling, we have not been able to identify any support for the many arguments staff has provided in defence of the current City policy. It should be noted that there has been no mention made by City Staff verbally or included in the text of the BSEI report that recognizes the principles outlined in the Okotoks case. The judgment set out in the Okotoks ruling speaks only to a sharing of infrastructure costs based on a fair allocation of benefits calculated net after grants. We believe that Paragraphs 70 and 72 (quoted below) in the ruling in the Okotoks case captures the essence of our thoughts.

**Paragraph 70:** “In any event, I agree with McIntyre J. that, in determining whether or not the bylaw complies with the Regulation, it is necessary to address the issue of benefit. The Town is not entitled to offload the whole of the costs of new or expanded off-site infrastructure and facilities upon a developer, in circumstances where it is reasonable to suppose that the existing residents will share in the benefit. In other words, a municipality is not entitled to allocate the whole of the off-site costs of new or expanded infrastructure or facilities upon new development, unless it can be reasonably supposed that the existing residents derive no benefit there from.”

**Paragraph 72:** “Nor do I find the so-called “but for” test determinative, i.e., requiring the new development to pay for all the costs of new infrastructure or facilities in situations where the projects would not have been undertaken but for the new development. The Regulation does not speak in such terms. Rather, the issue is benefit, not necessarily what prompted obtaining the benefit. For example, a new facility may result in greater reliability of service, improved quality of service or longer lifetime of the service. If existing residents derive such benefits, then they should contribute to the costs of the new development whether or not occasioned by new development. It is the responsibility of the municipality enacting an off-site levy bylaw to address the issue of the respective degree of benefit between existing residents and the new development, and allocate the costs in a reasonable and responsible manner. In addition, it must include this allocation in the bylaw.”

We at Westmark are of the opinion that for major infrastructure such as water feeder mains, reservoirs, pump stations, railway underpasses, highway overpasses and highway arterial roads where there are benefits to the existing residents as well as to new development, there must be a fair apportionment of costs. We believe the City of Airdrie policy should be changed to the following for all capital projects where construction has not yet been commenced: **“That development pays for itself net of grants and a fair allocation of the remaining costs to all benefiting parties.”**

We do not believe that anyone has attempted to calculate the financial impact of our recommended change. Staff should be asked to do so. The cost of conforming to the Okotoks decision of “a fair
allocation” may be small in comparison to the costs of refunds to all developers should the current City policy be found to not be in accordance with the Municipal Government Act.

Let’s take a $10.0 M infrastructure cost net after grants as an example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Costs (Net after grants)</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Portion to new development (90%)</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to existing population (10%)</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deduct 15% share to commercial / industrial</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to be recoverable from existing residents</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual cost recoverable over 10 years (placed in reserve fund)</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual cost per dwelling (2012 census = 17,174 dwellings) $4.95

5. **Public Facilities Contribution (Voluntary – For Discussion):**

We wish to note that no specific discussion has taken place to date between the City and the Development Industry pertaining to the proposed Public Facilities Contribution. We believe the City’s position is one of not wanting to appear to be imposing the fee. The developers’ feel that if they talk about Public Facilities Contributions with the City, the industry has therefore agreed to the Contributions.

Our following comments are made on a “without prejudice” basis.

We were encouraged to see that some of the projects included in the discussion document actually reflected an apportionment of costs based on a degree of benefit to the existing residents.

We recognize the value of new development making financial contributions towards some facilities and infrastructure which are beyond the “hard servicing” encompassed by the Off Site Levies in order to make Airdrie a more attractive community. Any contributions would be voluntary, as mandatory levies for these types of facilities are not permitted under the Municipal Government Act. We do not agree with all of the projects included in the Proposed Facilities list, or the benefiting percentages on those we can agree to. In particular, the Gateway Fire Station being identified as being of 100% benefit to only new development is very difficult to fathom when it is replacing an existing fire hall (with no credit for valuable land and perhaps a salvageable building), provides additional coverage for the entire City and provides back up protection for the surrounding Municipalities.

In addition, by the City’s calculations, going from the current $1,200 per unit (translated to $9,600 per acre) Recreation Contribution to the proposed $14,574 per acre is an increase of nearly 52% - an unacceptable increase. Going forward in 2013, we would consider a voluntary contribution amount that would be comparable to the existing rate of approximately $9,600 per acre with perhaps a modest 5% increase to $10,080 per acre. However, the issue of Public Facility Contributions is one that still needs more in depth review and discussion of what those Public Facilities consist of, who they benefit, what are considered essential, what serve the whole existing population, what serve only a portion of the population, and what are “nice to have”. Once these are determined, then the degree of benefit to the existing population and the new development areas can be agreed to.

We at Westmark want to state the following:

a) We wish to make voluntary contributions for outlays that make Airdrie a better place to live and assist in attracting more people to purchase or rent our new homes and lots.

b) Further, we wish to continue our contributions to other worthy causes as well.
c) We wish to protect the interests of the new home buyers and renters.

6. **City of Calgary Potable and Wastewater Acreage Assessment Rates for Regional Servicing:**

We support the efforts of the City of Airdrie to eliminate the proposed charging of an acreage assessment fee by the City of Calgary. However, should the charges become a reality, they should be imposed on all citizens through the monthly water bill in relation to usage. This method will encourage more efficient water use in keeping with Airdrie’s Sustainable Community initiatives.

We believe that the City of Airdrie proposed Levies for 2013 and beyond should be adjusted to provide for a fair allocation of the costs to all benefiting parties for major infrastructure projects started in 2013 and subsequent years. While we are sympathetic to the benefits of making contributions to certain Public Facilities, we do not believe that it is appropriate to set the proposed rate at this time without further in depth discussion. We must keep in mind that the burden of what we believe are extra costs of major infrastructure about to be passed on to the home buyer, as well as a charge for Public Facilities, which is not permitted by the Municipal Government Act, and a possible capital charge for water and waste water, is just too much.

**In summary, we recommend the following:**

1. The City of Airdrie conforms to the principles outlined in the Okotoks Court of Appeal decision for new infrastructure construction commencing in 2013 and beyond.
2. That development pays for itself net of grants and a fair allocation of the remaining costs to all benefiting parties.
3. That a more realistic and reduced “voluntary” facilities and recreation fee be determined.
4. That, should the City of Calgary Potable Water and Waste Water fee be imposed on Airdrie, it is passed on to all citizens in relation to the individual usage.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Rod Gerla, President
Westmark Holdings Ltd.

Copy: Alderman Murray Buchanan
      Alderman Fred Burley
      Alderman Glenda Alexander
      Alderman Ron Chapman
      Alderman Kelly Hegg
      Alderman Allan Hunter
      Paul Schulz – City of Airdrie
      Lorne Stevens – City of Airdrie
      Tracy Corbett – City of Airdrie

Enclosures: Excerpts from the Court of Appeal Okotoks decision that we feel are indicative of the judges thought process and opinion that all infrastructure costs must be reviewed and allocated in a fair proportion to the benefiting parties.
Para 3

(1) There is to be a full and open disclosure of all levy costs and payments

(3) There is a shared responsibility between the municipality and developers for addressing and defining existing and future infrastructure requirements and all beneficiaries of development are to be given the opportunity to participate in the cost of providing and installing infrastructure in the municipality on an equitable basis related to the degree of benefit.

Para 7

Subsection 648(2) of the MGA limits that application of the off-site levy to certain discrete kinds of infrastructure, as follows:

(2) An off site levy may be used only to pay for all or part of the capital cost of any or all of the following:

(a) new or expanded facilities for storage, transmission treatment or supplying of water;

(b) new or expanded facilities for the treatment, movement or disposal of sanitary sewage;

(c) new or expanded storm sewer drainage facilities;

(c.1) new or expanded roads required for or impacted by a subdivision or development;

(d) land required for or in connection with any facilities described in clauses (a) to (c.1)

[emphasis added]

Para 28

The municipality has no power to arbitrarily expand the authority vested in the municipality to approve development or subdivision by imposing conditions requiring the applicant to enter in agreement to recover costs except as expressly authorized by the act.
Para 50

The MGA spells out the facilities and infrastructure for which off-site levies may only be made. The natural person powers cannot be used to impose levies on other facilities and infrastructure.

Para 57

I add that I have come to this conclusion with reluctance, as the Town, speaking through its elected representatives, clearly believes that it is only fair and proper that the developers (and through them, the new residents of the lands under development) should bear these charges attributable in whole, or in part, to the growth of the Town. However, whether section 648 should be expanded to permit off-site levies for additional facilities and infrastructure than presently provided in the MGA, is a matter of legislative consideration. Further, as will be evident from the next part of this decision, any expansion of the powers would also engage the allocation of benefit as between the new development and the existing development.

Para 58

The Developer’s principal argument is that the Bylaw did not comply with the Regulation, because it failed in many instances to allocate the costs of the new infrastructure and facilities amongst all the anticipated users. The issue is framed, as follows, in the Developer’s factum:

Do the MGA and Regulation require the application of a “user pay” principle of assessment concerning off-site levies or does it allow levies to be assessed only upon new development which allegedly creates the need for such infrastructure regardless of who benefits?

Para 59

The Developer points out that the majority of the common levies impose the whole of the net cost (after deduction of provincial grants related to these projects) of the new or expanded facilities or infrastructure upon the new development, so that the existing Town residents bear no share of such costs. It was that this burden is imposed upon the developers even when it is clear that the existing residents of the Town will benefit from the new or improved infrastructure. The Developer argues that the failure to allocate a portion of the costs to the Town, where it is clear the Town will benefit, is contrary to the principles and criteria in the Regulation.
Para 64

Interpreting the principles and criteria of the Regulation as a whole, it is reasonable to divine an intent that those benefiting from the types of infrastructure and facilities identified in section 648 should contribute to their costs. As observed by Professor Lau at 14-40, fn 203, of his text:

In practice, the type of facilities described in s. 648(2) are likely to benefit not just new developments and subdivisions, but also the existing community. For that reasons, fairness dictates that a municipality ought not to place the burden of the entire costs of the facilities on newcomers.

Para 65

In Keyland Developments Corp v Cochrane (Town), 2007 ABQB 160, 32 MPLR (4th) 180, McIntyre J. quashed the municipality’s off-site levy because it cast substantially the whole of the cost of certain off-site projects upon the developer, when it was apparent that the project benefited residents not only of the proposed new development, but also existing residents of the Town. He held at para 24: “the Regulation mandates a sharing of cost based on the benefits obtained. Most importantly there must be a correlation between the levy and the impacts of the development.”

Para 70

In any event, I agree with McIntyre J. that, in determining whether or not the bylaw complies with the Regulation, it is necessary to address the issue of benefit. The Town is not entitled to offload the whole of the costs of new or expanded off site infrastructures and facilities upon a developer in circumstances where it is reasonable to suppose that the existing residents will share in the benefit. In other words a municipality is not entitled to allocate the whole of the offsite costs of new or expanded infrastructure or facilities upon new development unless it can be reasonable supposed that the existing residents derive no benefit therefrom.

Para 72

Nor do I find the so-called “but for” test to be determinative, i.e., requiring the new development to pay for all the costs of new infrastructure or facilities in situations where the projects would not have been undertaken but for the new development. The Regulation does not speak in such terms. Rather, the issue is benefit, not necessarily what prompted obtaining the benefit. For example a new facility may result in greater reliability of service, improved quality of service or longer lifetime of service if existing residents derive such benefits then they should contribute to the roads of the new development
whether or not occasional by new development. It is the responsibility of the municipality enacting an off-site levy bylaw to address the issue of respective degree of benefit between existing residents and the new development and allocate costs in a reasonable and responsible manner. In addition, it must include this allocation in the bylaw.

Para 79

In my view, the explanation proffered by Mr. Oness is not adequate to relieve the town from contributing to the costs of these projects. The Bylaw fails to disclose the methodology adopted by the Town for making its proposed contribution at some future time through widening of the bridge and corridor roads, nor is there certainty that the Town will ever share in these costs. While Mr. Oness spoke of negotiations at unspecified times in the past with unspecified developers, there is no contractual commitment, nor is there evidence of any understanding in that regard with the Developer. Further, the intention of the present administration does not bind future administrations. The Town may be successful in obtaining future grants to cover the whole future widening, if and when it is ever carried out. Further, it seems likely that the new development expect to bear the costs of the current projects will also participate, as residents of the Town, in paying for the widening if and when it occurs. In any event, none of these matters are addressed in the Bylaw. As for carrying charges, section 648(2) speaks only in terms of an off-site levy being used to pay for all or part of the “capital costs” of certain new or expanded facilities or infrastructure.

Para 80

The intention of the town planners that the Town pay the whole of the costs of future widening projects, if carried out, does not satisfy the principles and criteria for off-site levies as set out in the Regulation. The Bylaw does not address the sharing of costs between the new development and the Town on an equitable basis related to the degree of benefit. In fact, the common levies made under the Bylaw with respect to these projects give no recognition whatsoever to allocation of cost based upon degree of benefit. The Town has failed to comply with the Regulation in relation to the off-site levies for the bridge and corridor roads, and consequently common levies for projects CT19, CT20 and CT21 are declared invalid. These parts of the Bylaw are separate, so are neither integral nor indispensable parts of the whole, so that severance is appropriate in this instance: Rogers at para 195.7
October 1, 2012

City of Airdrie  
400 Main Street 
Airdrie, AB  
T4B 3C3

Attention: Lorne Stevens, Director of Community Infrastructure

Dear Sir:

Re: City of Airdrie – 2012 Infrastructure & Offsite Levy

We would like to thank the City of Airdrie for our ongoing discussions regarding the 2012 Infrastructure & Offsite Levy and for hosting members of the development industry at the most recent forum on September 20, 2012. We appreciate the open dialogue and subsequent information provided to help satisfy the development industry’s concerns stated in UDI’s letter dated June 28, 2012.

UDI has reviewed the information provided and would like to propose that the 2012 Infrastructure and Offsite Levies be implemented January 1, 2013 using the base rate of $64,230 per acre except in sub-recovery area VI-4 which would be $64,567 per acre. UDI’s proposal does not include the Public Facilities Contribution or City of Calgary Water and Wastewater Levy for the reasons indicated below.

In response to UDI’s letter dated June 28, 2012, the City of Airdrie has provided more information on each water, wastewater and transportation project to be in compliance with the MGA and the Principles and Criteria for Off-site Levies Regulation. We appreciate the transparency from the City of Airdrie and support the water, wastewater and transportation levies as presented.

Based on recent court decisions in the Town of Okotoks, and legal advice provided by UDI’s council, the development industry will not enter into agreement with the City of Airdrie for the payment of the Public Facilities Contribution. The items listed that make up the Public Facilities Contribution do not fall within the acceptable categories of items subject to the levy bylaw according to the MGA Section 648, nor does the City of Airdrie have the power to compel a developer to sign a contract (development agreement) to do anything more than is expressly set
out in the MGA by the use of its natural person power. If there are other options available to support public facilities in the City of Airdrie, UDI is open to further discussion and consideration.

We appreciate the City of Airdrie is not in agreement with the City of Calgary regarding the City of Calgary Water and Wastewater Levy charge on new development within Airdrie city limits and is having ongoing discussions regarding this matter. We support the City of Airdrie’s position that City of Calgary cannot legally charge this levy on new development within Airdrie.

We value the relationship we have enjoyed with the City of Airdrie, City staff and the greater Airdrie community and we hope to continue to be a partner in the growth of the City in the future. UDI is prepared to support the base rate for Offsite Development Levies and Acreage Assessments, but cannot support the Public Facilities Contribution or the City of Calgary Water and Wastewater Levy as presented.

We trust you will find the development industry and home building community to be willing participants in the sustainable growth of Airdrie, both socially and financially.

Yours truly,

URBAN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

Michael Flynn
Executive Director

cc. Peter Brown, Mayor, City of Airdrie
    Paul Schulz, City of Airdrie
    UDI – Airdrie Task Force
City of Airdrie
400 Main Street SE,
Airdrie, Alberta Canada
T4B 3C3
Attn: Director of Community Infrastructure

RE: PROPOSED OFFSITE LEVY BYLAW

Dear Lorne,

In response to the September 20 meeting regarding the 2012 offsite levy bylaw, I would like to present my concerns on several items. Some discussion related to my concerns has previously taken place during earlier meetings, yet I still believe there are gaps in information that are critical to the achieving a successful collaboration on the material. Those items are as follows:

1. The guiding principle of fairness and allocating proportional costs to benefitting parties remains an item that has not been fully addressed, in my opinion. I realize that BSEI provided their version of a response to this lingering concern yet I still feel unsatisfied in agreeing with their rationale. There is no doubt in my mind that the entire existing population of Airdrie will benefit, to a degree, from the host of infrastructure improvements listed in the bylaw. Accordingly, I believe that some of the costs related to the infrastructure improvements should be borne by the existing population. The degree to which relative cost sharing is allocated between future and current residents is not adequately reported in the background package of information assembled to support the proposed bylaw. The Okotoks example and resulting legal advice should provide your administration with an indication of the minimum level of supportive material required to substantiate cost allocations related to a proposed offsite levy bylaw. I’m afraid that the Airdrie team has fallen short of clearly providing this advice.

2. The transportation system upgrades represent a significant portion of the proposed offsite levy bylaw. While I’m not a transportation engineer, the proposed City-wide transportation upgrades appear to be overly excessive, over engineered, and well beyond what is required to support the projected population. I’m of the opinion that Airdrie administration need to appreciate the level of service that the grid is obligated to provide to the community. Moving vehicles is a basic need that must be met, but expecting free flow traffic systems throughout all parts of the day is completely unnecessary. The resultant costs associated with the varied and extensive transportation upgrades is, in my opinion, a careless waste of land and irresponsible waste of monetary resources to build and maintain the
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improvements. Revisiting the extent of the transportation system improvements within the proposed bylaw should be undertaken rather than including the extensive array of City-wide improvements currently noted. A careful examination of the allocation of proportional costs related to the same improvements is also requested as the bulk of costs tied to the transportation related improvements are shown as developer paid costs.

3. The “voluntary” public facilities contribution remains an item of contention. I interpret this contribution as illegal tax placed upon the development industry, yet it continues to be part of the program going forward. Even in spite of an earlier ruling from Okotoks declaring the tax illegal, the City of Airdrie continues to feel obliged to stick the industry with another cost. Administration continues to advise that this contribution is “voluntary” but the words of caution you shared with the group advising that failure to pay would have “consequences” leaves me feeling threatened with no option but to pay the contribution.

   Debating this item has fallen on deaf ears hence the repeated inclusion of this tax in all current and previous correspondence related to the proposed offsite levy bylaw. All new residents moving into a Melcor community will pay for the facilities once (due to increased lot pricing) and then twice as part of their re-occurring yearly tax assessments. In this regard, all future residents are not treated equal to existing residents. The public facilities “voluntary” contribution is plain wrong – it is illegal and should be abolished.

   In sum, I believe there are lingering issues that remain ambiguous and heavy handed. I believe that many of the wish list improvements contained within the bylaw are excessive and well beyond what is required to support the projected population. Offsite levies in Airdrie over the last few years have skyrocketed out of control beyond what I would consider reasonable. I believe there is not one partner in the development industry who objects to paying for their fair share of municipal improvements required to sustain growth in the community, but the table has begun to turn so that the impression or fairness is skewed against the industry.

   Thank you for accepting comments of the proposed Bylaw. Please keep me updated on progress as the item moves through the process from Administration to Council.

   Sincerely,

Trevor Sholdice
Regional Manager – Calgary West
Melcor Developments Ltd.
AGENDA REPORT

Meeting Date (M/D/Y): 11/5/2012

Subject: Bylaw Nos. B-13/2012 & B-14/2012

Boards Routed Through: Municipal Planning Commission Date:
City Council 9/20/2012
City Council 10/15/2012
City Council 11/5/2012

Description:

Staff is presenting a proposal to amend the South Airdrie Area Structure Plan and the Land Use Bylaw by re-designating a total of 2.58 acres from Industrial Park Two District (IB-2) to Commercial Convenience (C-C).

Background:

Proposal

A land use amendment application has been received to re-designate three consecutive parcels in Sierra Springs from Industrial Business Park Two District (IB-2) to Convenience Commercial District (C-C), which is also commonly referred to as “Highway Commercial.” The applicant is the owner of the three subject parcels which comprise 1.046 hectares or 2.58 acres.

Before the land use amendment request could be considered, the applicant was informed by Planning that the South Airdrie Area Structure Plan (ASP), which is the statutory planning document for that area, also needed to be amended. The applicant was informed that both the ASP and land use amendment could be submitted concurrently. The Sierra Springs Outline Plan, which guides land use planning and circulation for the area, also requires amendments resulting from the land use re-designation request. Since the Outline Plan is not a statutory document, it requires a resolution for adoption by Council, and not a bylaw amendment.

In the spring of 2012, a retailer contacted the applicant and inquired into locating on the northernmost of the subject parcels. However, the IB-2 designation does not include retail sales as a discretionary use. IB-2 does allow for “Storage and Distribution Centres”, 
providing that the sales floor area does not exceed 30% of the total building floor area. This provision would exclude the retailer, since their display/sales floor would occupy the majority of the total floor area. Therefore, the applicant was informed by staff that a land use amendment was necessary to accommodate retail sales and advised him to make an application to extend the C-C District to all three of his parcels, since he wished to have the option to attract retail-type businesses to all of his properties. This approach would also benefit the City from a planning perspective because it would avoid spot-zoning of a single parcel.

**Location Map**

![Location Map Image]

**Application Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>** Applicant **</th>
<th>Focus Corporation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>** Owner **</td>
<td>1230169 Alberta Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Legal Description **</td>
<td>Plan 0512433; Block 3; Lots 15, 16, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Location **</td>
<td>In the Sierra Springs area; 2926, 2934 &amp; 2942 Main Street South</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Planning Designation Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Designation Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airdrie City Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Airdrie Area Structure Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Bylaw District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Uses</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stakeholder Review**

The proposed amendments were circulated to City departments, utility companies, Provincial agencies and the City’s engineering consultants. Although there were no concerns resulting from the circulation for the proposed land use amendment, there were a few comments that more scrutiny may be needed during the Development Permit process with particular regards to site planning, vehicle accessibility and the possibility of increased traffic that may be associated with retail-type businesses. Planning and Engineering will evaluate these concerns upon receipt of a Development Permit for the subject parcels.

**Planning Considerations**

In reviewing the proposed land use amendment for the subject parcels from IB-2 to C-C, Planning considered the following rationale:

1. **The intent and purpose of the C-C District is more compatible with the commercial character of Sierra Springs than the intent and purpose of the IB-2 District.**

   Sierra Springs is a regional commercial centre containing a variety of large and small retailers. The existing land use designation is predominantly Regional Commercial District (C-3), with some C-C located near the Highway 2 – Yankee Valley interchange. The purpose and intent of the C-C District is “to provide a broad range of commercial uses to serve the convenience needs of the travelling public and local residents.” The purpose and intent of the IB-2 District is “to provide for light manufacturing, warehousing and service industrial uses.” Based on these interpretations and given the commercial nature of Sierra Springs, Planning considers the C-C designation to be more appropriate than the IB-2 designation.

2. **Many of the discretionary uses listed under the IB-2 District are not compatible with the existing commercial uses in Sierra Springs.**

   Sierra Springs is dominated by retail sales businesses and has become Airdrie’s largest commercial area. Under the IB-2 designation, a land owner would be able to accommodate such discretionary uses as light manufacturing, heavy and light equipment rental and sales, food and beverage processing, manufactured and
modular home sales, storage facilities, and recreational vehicle sales and storage. Considering the existing retail uses, Planning would discourage most IB-2-type uses from being located in Sierra Springs.

3. The specific context and characteristics of the subject parcels are more suited for C-C District designations than for IB-2 District designations.

Aside from being located in a large regional commercial centre, the subject parcels may be more suited for a commercial designation rather than an industrial designation due to its size and specific location in Sierra Springs:

a) Each parcel is less than 1 acre in area, which may not be suitable for a manufacturing or processing business, and certainly not large enough for a storage facility or a vehicle sales lot.

b) Typically, retail sales rely on good location and exposure to high volumes of traffic more than industrial businesses. The subject parcels are adjacent to Highway 2, thus making the property a prime location for retail.

c) The existing IB-2 uses located directly south of the subject parcels are comprised of small retail and service-oriented business, which are situated in multi-bay buildings and would be compatible with C-C-type uses.

d) The approval of the proposed land use amendment would result in a new, logical division that separates commercial-designated areas to the north from industrial-uses to the south (refer to the location map).

Review Boards:

The proposed amendments were presented to the Municipal Planning Commission (MPC) on September 20, 2012. There was some concern expressed over the loss of industrial lands in favour of commercial lands. Planning responded to MPC by referring to the recently annexed lands which are anticipated to provide ample industrial opportunities in more suitable areas such as the East Lake Industrial expansion and the Airdrie Airport area. Planning also emphasized the underutilization of Airdrie’s current industrial land supply in the southern portion of the City and in Gateway. MPC voted unanimously to recommend that Council adopt the proposed bylaws.

Alternatives/Implications:

Council has three alternatives with respect to the proposed bylaws:

Alternative One: That Council gives Final Readings to Bylaw Nos. B-13/2012 and B-14/2012 as presented, and adopts through resolution the Sierra Springs Outline Plan.

Alternative Two: That Council tables Bylaw Nos. B-13/2012 and B-14/2012 and the Sierra Springs Outline Plan if additional information is required.

Alternative Three: That Council defeats Bylaw Nos. B-13/2012 and B-14/2012 and does not adopt the Sierra Springs Outline Plan.
**Recommendation:** That Council gives Final Readings for Bylaw No. B-13/2012 to amend the South Airdrie Area Structure Plan and Bylaw No. B-14/2012 to amend the Land Use Bylaw and adopts through resolution the amended Sierra Springs Outline Plan.

Mark Spence  
Senior Planner

**Presenter:** Mark Spence  
**Attachments:** Bylaw Nos. B-13/2012 & B-14/2012; South Airdrie ASP Amendments; Sierra Springs Outline Plan Amendments
BEING A BYLAW of the City of Airdrie, in the Province of Alberta, to amend Bylaw No. B-21/1991, being the South Airdrie Area Structure Plan.

WHEREAS under the authority and subject to the provisions of the Municipal Government Act, Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000, Chapter M-26, and amendments thereto, the Council of the City of Airdrie may adopt an Area Structure Plan; and

WHEREAS Council has adopted the South Airdrie Area Structure Plan as Bylaw No. B-21/1991; and,

WHEREAS Council deems it desirable to enact that the said Bylaw be amended in the manner outlined below;

NOW THEREFORE the Municipal Council of the City of Airdrie in Council duly assembled, enacts that the Bylaw No. B-21/1991 “South Airdrie Area Structure Plan” be amended by adopting Bylaw No. B-13/2012, which amends Figure 7 “Development Plan” (as shown in Schedule A), and updates all associated text and tables.

READ a first time this ___________ day of ____________________, 2012.

READ a second time this ___________ day of ____________________, 2012.

READ a third time this ___________ day of ____________________, 2012.

EXECUTED this ___________ day of ____________________, 2012

________________________________________
MAYOR

________________________________________
CITY CLERK
BYLAW NO. B-13/2012
SCHEDULE 'A'

SUBJECT AREA
BYLAW NO. B-14/2012
OF THE CITY OF AIRDRIE
IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA

BEING A BYLAW of the City of Airdrie, in the Province of Alberta, to amend Bylaw No. B-09/2005, the City of Airdrie Land Use Bylaw.

WHEREAS under the authority and subject to the provisions of the Municipal Government Act, Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000, Chapter M-26, and amendments thereto, the Council of the City of Airdrie has adopted Land Use Bylaw No. B-09/2005; and

WHEREAS Council deems it desirable to enact that the said Land Use Bylaw be amended in the manner outlined below, and illustrated in the attached Schedule A;

NOW THEREFORE the Municipal Council of the City of Airdrie in Council duly assembled, enacts that Section 2-8 (3) (b) (Land Use Map) of Land Use Bylaw No. B-09/2005 be amended with Bylaw No. B-14/2012 by re-zoning a total of 1.046 hectares (2.58 acres) from Industrial Business Park Two District (IB-2) to Convenience Commercial District (C-C) for Lots 15, 16 and 17; Block 3; Plan 0512433, as illustrated in the attached Schedule A.

READ a first time this __________ day of ____________________, 2012.

READ a second time this __________ day of ____________________, 2012.

READ a third time this __________ day of ____________________, 2012.

EXECUTED this __________ day of ____________________, 2012

________________________________________
MAYOR

________________________________________
CITY CLERK
Bylaw No. B-14/2012
Schedule A

SUBJECT AREA

2926
2934
C-C
2942

IB-3
IB-2
P-1
P-1

MAIN ST S

OE II
South Airdrie

Office Consolidation
Ptn. of SE / NE 1/4 Sec. 36 - 26 - 01 - W5M
Project No.: 130220-10
The Focus Corporation
#300, 2891 Sunridge Way N.E.
Calgary, AB T1Y 7K7
www.focus.ca

area structure plan
revised september 2012
bylaw no. B-13/2012

Adopted By City Council Bylaw B-38/2009
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to conform to neighbourhood planning requirements utilizing quality urban design principles;

- to promote the establishment of a heterogeneous community and establish a hierarchy of neighbourhood and sub-neighbourhood units containing a variety of housing types;

- to conform to “density guidelines” established by the City to ensure compatible relationships;

- to create sub-neighbourhood sectors which are flexible to change at subsequent planning stages dependent upon area analysis and market conditions at that time;

3.2.5. Open Space Objectives

- to meet the needs of future residents for parks and open space;

- to recognize Nose Creek as an open space and passive recreation opportunity;

- to fulfill the statutory requirements of the Municipal Government Act by providing up to 10% of the area as Municipal Reserve in the form of land or money-in-place of land or a combination thereof;

- to provide a continuous pathway system along the Nose Creek corridor in accordance with the City's standards;

3.3. Design Concept and Principles

The intent of any area structure plan is to establish a development plan for a large tract of land at a cursory level only. In addition to formulating the objectives and principles as presented above, the plan identifies anticipated land uses, the spatial relationship between said uses, and the order of development. The plan, once adopted, provides assurances to developers, the City, and the general public that a specific development intention will be undertaken across an area or each will be duly notified if there is a desire to seek a variance from the plan. Similarly, a servicing program consisting of both scheme and staging is presented to assure the development intention can be adequately serviced to municipal standards.

All of these items are more exact at the Neighbourhood Structure Plan stage and further refined and confirmed during detailed engineering design. As a result, the road network presented is of a conceptual nature in that the exact alignment may change to reflect lotting preferences, servicing requirements, and topography.

3.3.1. Design Concept – Commercial

The proximity to the highway combined with the excellent arterial access makes the northeast corner of the plan area the preferred location for commercial development. Approximately 45.22 ha (111.7 ae) 26.3 ha (65.0 ac) have been identified as future commercial lands capitalizing on the exposure to Highway 2 and the pending improvements to the interchange with Yankee Valley Boulevard. Uses are expected to be a concentration of large box retailers. With the majority of this development falling along the east perimeter maximizing visibility from the highway, a concentration of highway commercial uses is planned.

- Maintain the concentration of commercial development near the highway and
Yankee Valley Boulevard.
- Provide for a visually appealing view from Highway #2 through enhanced landscaping, signage and building design.
- Reduce the impacts of development on the natural environment by implementing the recommendations of the AXYS Environmental and Spencer environmental reports.

3.3.2. Design Concept - Industrial

The majority of the plan area has been identified for industrial development. The +/-168.9 ha (417.4 ac) 176.5 ha (436.1 ac) of industrial development will be light industrial. The uses anticipated will be in conformance to the land use district parameters established within the Land Use Bylaw. Outdoor storage accompanying any industrial use will be located adjacent to the railway or on other internal sites with limited visibility. In addition, each site will be required to maintain appropriate screening and buffering. Industrial development in close proximity to residential areas will be of a light industrial nature so as not to generate noise, air, or visual pollution to the adjacent residents. Similarly, each facility will be required to provide visual buffering in the form of increased setbacks, berming, fencing and landscaping. The setback requirements and development controls will ensure a sensitive transition is maintained. These parameters will be further expanded upon during Neighbourhood Structure Plan preparation.
- Restrict outdoor storage visibility.
- Do not negatively impact adjacent residential development.
- Use setbacks to improve overall aesthetics.

3.3.3. Design Concept - Residential

Approximately 66.8 ha (165.5 ac) 68.3 ha (168.8 ac) of residential development is planned for the northwest portion of the lower half of the subject lands. Upon full development, the community will house approximately 3000 persons in 1000 residential units. The natural topography and mountain views deem this area a superb residential enclave. Lower density development will be from single-family dwellings on typical residential lots. Higher density development will come from duplex and multi-family precincts anticipated near the primary entrance locations and nearer the collector road system. Actual densities and locations are to be determined during Neighbourhood Structure Plan preparation and identified within that document.
- Capitalize on topographical features of the site.
- Keep higher densities along the collectors.

3.3.4. Design Concept - Open Space

For the commercial and industrial development areas, open space will be limited to the Nose Creek corridor and high interface areas. In addition to the actual creek alignment, open space will be provided to encompass the floodway and adjacent lands. The combination of Municipal Reserve and Environmental Reserve will protect the creek, its alignment, and water quality.

Potential impacts in high interface areas, by one use on another, (e.g. Industrial / residential) should be minimized and/or mitigated by the obtrusive use through berming, buffering, landscape design, and/or site design. Details in high interface areas are to be
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### 3.4. Density and Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Summary Of Land Uses (Projected Area In Hectares)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Gross Area</strong></td>
<td>321.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nose Creek</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Developable Area</strong></td>
<td>319.0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks / Open Space</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermittent Wetland</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management Ponds</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Land</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Land</td>
<td>177.5176.5</td>
<td>55.6%55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area “A”</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Land</td>
<td>25.326.3</td>
<td>7.9%8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Residential Area Average Density equal to 17.3 units / hectare
Sierra Springs

outline plan
revised september 2012
bylaw no. B-14/2012

Pttn. of SE / NE ¼ Sec.36 - 26 - 01 - W5M

Project No.: 130220-10

The Focus Corporation
#300, 2891 Sunridge Way N.E.
Calgary, AB T1Y 7K7
www.focus.ca
3. Development Concept

The plan prepared and presented as the Sierra Springs Outline Plan is the product of various inputs and objectives. It represents and supports municipal policy in terms of land uses, site servicing, and accessibility. It establishes a development program that will meet the needs and objectives of the developer, including capitalizing on the exposure and proximity to Highway 2. Traffic will be accommodated through improvements and adequate on-site roadways providing an accessible and safe environment. (Figure 7)

3.1. Commercial

Commercial development planned for the subject site will fall under one of three zonings dictating the nature of each. Highway Commercial is planned for the area along the east access roadway. The size of these developments will be controlled through the respective parking requirements but are assumed to be in the order of 465 – 745 m² (5,000 – 8,000 ft²). In total, approximately 4.3 ha (10.6 ac) 5.3 ha (13.2 ac) will be developed as highway commercial.

Approximately 25.6 ha (63.2 ac) will be developed as Regional Commercial development accommodating 'big box' retail formats with structures in the range of 1100 – 9300 m² (12,000 – 100,000 ft²). This pocket will be concentrated around the intersection of Main Street and the east access road.

As both a power centre and subsequent employment centre, this development is not anticipated to negatively affect the CBD as the uses and tenants are of a different nature and target a different market niche. The retailers locating in this area are of a warehouse format whereby they occupy large buildings catering to more bulk purchases.

3.2. Industrial

The proximity of the railway along the west side of the subject site will provide an inherent advantage to the industrial lots planned for this area. The opportunity for spur lines and direct rail access can be explored at the time of Development Permit. The 19.5 ha (25.9 ac) 9.4 ha (23.4 ha) of industrial development will consist of a variety of parcel sizes and configurations reflective of market demands and to be confirmed at the time of subdivision. Uses will be limited to internal and self-contained operations exclusive to the facilities constructed on each lot. Any operation requiring outside storage will be obligated to provide adequate screening and buffering both internal to the subject site and external to the adjacent residential development. No operation that will produce noise, air, or ground pollution will be permitted within the area. Uses are anticipated to include light manufacturing, offices, automobile dealerships, and other similar employment generators. All uses will be confirmed at the Development Permit stage and will be in conformance to the list of Permitted and Discretionary Uses identified.
under Restricted Light Industrial and General Light Industrial District within the Land Use Bylaw.

3.3. Open Space Concept Plan

As a commercial/industrial precinct, open space opportunities will be intentionally limited to the Nose Creek corridor. In addition to the creek, open space will be preserved along the length to include both the floodway, as well as additional setback and buffering areas. City of Airdrie policies combined with Federal and Provincial Flood Risk Reduction Programs have identified a +/- 20m development setback within the floodway to be dedicated as Environmental Reserve through the subdivision and redistricting process.

The Airdrie/Calgary Regional Trail will be constructed to parallel the creek within this open space corridor to maximize the aesthetic benefit while improving user safety. Small pocket parks providing access to the internal road system will be created for pedestrians, maintenance personnel, and emergency services. (Figure 8)

3.4. Densities and Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Summary Of Land Uses (Projected Area In Hectares)</th>
<th>% Gross Developable Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross Area</td>
<td>61.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nose Creek</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Reserve</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Developable Area</td>
<td>54.56</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Reserve</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management Ponds</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Lands</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadways</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Road Widening</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Land (N-1/M-2)</td>
<td>49.46-9.41</td>
<td>49.2% 17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Land (C-3)</td>
<td>25.63</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Land (C-HWY)</td>
<td>4.26 5.33</td>
<td>7.6% 9.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Airdrie Properties Inc.
Sierra Springs
Outline Plan

Legend
- - - - - - Outline Plan Boundary
- - - - City Boundary
----------- Railway
------------- Regional Pathway
- - - - Flood Way

- Highway Commercial (C-HWO)
- Regional Commercial District (C-5)
- Restricted Light Industrial (M-1)
- General Light Industrial (M-2)
- Parks / Open Space
- Environmental Reserve
- Stormwater Management Pond
- Special Study Area
- Nose Creek
- Regional Lifes Station

Notes: All Lots are conceptual only and are subject to change with formal subdivision applications.

Development Concept Plan
Figure 7
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AGENDA REPORT

Meeting Date (M/D/Y): 11/5/2012

Subject: Bylaw B-20/2012

Boards Routed Through: Date:
Municipal Planning Commission 10/18/2012
City Council 11/5/2012
City Council 11/19/2012

Description:

Staff is presenting a proposed Land Use amendment for a land parcel located in Ravenswood, which would re-designate 3.48 acres from Urban Holding District (UH) to Residential Medium Density Multi Dwelling District (R-4).

Background:

Proposal

An application has been received from Casola Koppe Architects on behalf of the land owner, Slokker Canada West, to re-designate a parcel of land 1.41 hectares (3.48 acres) in size. The subject parcel is located at 2802 King’s Heights Gate SE and is currently zoned UH. The proposed amendment is consistent with the approved Land Use Concept plan located in the Ravenswood Neighbourhood Structure Plan (NSP).

Application Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Casola Koppe Architects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Slokker Canada West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Part of NW ¼ - 34-26-29-4; Plan 0811941; Block 9; Lot 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>2802 King’s Heights Gate SE, in the Ravenswood neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Planning Designation Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Municipal Development Plan</strong></th>
<th>The proposed amendment complies with the Airdrie City Plan’s Land Use Concept, which designates the subject area as “General Urban Use”, which includes residential uses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Structure Plan</strong></td>
<td>The proposed amendment complies with the Southeast Airdrie Community Structure Plan, which identifies the subject site as “Residential (Townhouse, Apartment)” on the Concept Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Structure Plan</strong></td>
<td>The proposed amendment complies with the Ravenswood NSP, which designates the subject parcel as “Medium Density Multi Family” on the Land Use Concept, allowing for a density range of 13-26 units per acre (upa).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Bylaw District</strong></td>
<td>Currently Urban Holding District (UH). The proposed R-4 District would be an appropriate Land Use designation to achieve the density range and housing typology as prescribed in the NSP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Uses</strong></td>
<td>Farmstead. The former owner is in the process of re-locating the house.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vicinity Map**

[Map of the subject site and its vicinity]
Stakeholder Review

Bylaw No. B-20/2012 was circulated to City Departments, utility companies, and Provincial agencies. No outstanding issues were raised for the proposed land use amendment.

Planning Considerations

1. The proposed R-4 land use amendment complies with the area identified in the Ravenswood NSP’s Figure 6: Ravenswood Land Use Concept (refer to the map on next page), which identifies the subject parcel as “MDMF – Medium Density Multi Family.” Residential Uses policy # 6.1.5 anticipates the MDMF designation to consist of multi-family units having a density range of 13 – 26 units per acre. This description is aligned with the R-4 District.

2. The applicant has been working closely with Planning to produce a preliminary site plan (refer to the next page) to ensure that all circulation and planning issues would be addressed prior to moving forward with the land use amendment. For example, upon being informed of the proposed school to be located across the street on Ravenswood Drive, the applicant has modified the site plan to show that private driveways of residential townhomes adjacent to the school site would be accessed from the interior of the site, thus mitigating potential traffic congestion during peak school hours. It should be noted that this preliminary plan is conceptual only and will be finalized through the Development Permit process.
Boards Routed Through:

This land use amendment proposal was presented to the Municipal Planning Commission (MPC), on October 15, 2012. No concerns or issues were raised. MPC unanimously recommended that Council adopts Bylaw No. B-20/2012 as presented.

Public Relations/Marketing Plan:

Newspaper notification ads of the proposed land use amendment will be advertised in the City View for two consecutive weeks prior to the Public Hearing. Onsite signage of the proposed amendment is also required.

Alternatives:

Council has three alternatives with respect to this Bylaw:

Alternative One: That Council gives First Reading to Bylaw No. B-20/2012 with or without revision or recommendations.

Alternative Two: That Council tables Bylaw No. B-20/2012 if more information is required.

Alternative Three: That Council defeats Bylaw B-20/2012.

Recommendation: That City Council gives First Reading to Bylaw No. B-20/2012 as presented.

Mark Spence
Senior Planner
BYLAW NO. B-20/2012
OF THE CITY OF AIRDRIE
IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA

BEING A BYLAW of the City of Airdrie, in the Province of Alberta, to amend Bylaw No. B-09/2005, the City of Airdrie Land Use Bylaw.

WHEREAS under the authority and subject to the provisions of the Municipal Government Act, Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000, Chapter M-26, and amendments thereto, the Council of the City of Airdrie has adopted Land Use Bylaw No. B-09/2005; and

WHEREAS Council deems it desirable to enact that the said Land Use Bylaw be amended in the manner outlined below, and illustrated in the attached Schedule A;

NOW THEREFORE the Municipal Council of the City of Airdrie in Council duly assembled, enacts as follows:

That Section 2-8 (3) (b) (Land Use Map) of Land Use Bylaw No. B-09/2005 be amended with Bylaw No. B-20/2012 by re-zoning a portion of NW ¼ Section 34, Township 26, Range 29, West 4 Meridian; Plan 0811941, Block 9, Lot 1, comprising of 1.41 hectares (3.48 acres), from Urban Holding District (UH) to Residential Medium Density Multi Dwelling District (R-4).

READ a first time this ___________ day of ____________________, 2012.

READ a second time this ___________ day of ____________________, 2012.

EXECUTED this ___________ day of ____________________, 2012

________________________________________
MAYOR

________________________________________
CITY CLERK
Schedule A
Bylaw No. B-20/2012

Subject Area
2802 King’s Heights Gate SE
Plan 0811941; Block 9; Lot 1
3.48 ac. from UH to R-4
AGENDA REPORT

Meeting Date (M/D/Y): November 5, 2012

Subject: Debenture Bylaw No. B-32/2012
RCMP Tenant Improvements to 2nd floor of the Municipal Police Building

Boards Routed Through: City Council
Date: November 5, 2012

Description:

Council is being asked to approve the capital project to develop the second floor of the Municipal Police Building and give first reading to Debenture Bylaw No. B-32/2012 for the leasehold improvements.

Background:

Administration has been working on an opportunity with the RCMP to house the Southern Alberta District office (currently in Calgary) on the second floor of the Municipal Police Building. Preliminary plans have been developed with the RCMP’s needs in mind, and final drawings will be completed within the next few months. Administration has reached the stage where the debenture process needs to be carried out in order to ensure that the construction schedule and move in dates are retained.

The City has agreed to renovate the space in order to facilitate the RCMP's needs as part of a 20-year lease agreement. The renovations will include common washroom facilities, reception area for both the RCMP and the un-leased space, offices, and various meeting/interview rooms. There will be three different RCMP user groups relocated to this facility, leaving approximately 9000 square feet of un-leased space. Having the Southern Alberta District complements the existing detachment, secures a long-term tenant, and increases the police presence in Airdrie.

Debentures are required to finance the proposed leasehold improvements for the second floor of the Municipal Police Building, with the RCMP being the major tenant to occupy over 18,000 square feet of the space. The debenture component is being presented to Council for First Reading.
Leasehold improvements are estimated at $2,500,000 which includes a preliminary estimate of costing, design and a contingency amount. Once the final design and construction costs are determined, only the necessary funds will be drawn upon. In return, the City will recover the tenant improvement costs over the 20-year lease.

A request for debenture would normally go through Finance Advisory Committee prior to going to Council. However, leasing the space is contingent upon debenture funding approval and due to the short time constraints for construction and move–in, this request is being presented to Council for approval.

**Boards Routed Through:**

N/A

**Alternatives/Implications:**

There are three alternatives regarding this bylaw:

1. Council can approve the addition of the RCMP second floor development, amend the 2012 Capital Plan, and give first reading to Debenture Bylaw No. B-32/2012. The lease with the RCMP will go forward.

2. Council can defeat Bylaw No. B-32/2012 at first reading. The lease will not go forward, and alternatives to accommodate the City’s space needs will be sought.

3. Council can table Bylaw No. B-32/2012 and request more information.

**Public Relations/Marketing Plan:**

The debenture will be publicly advertised as per the *Municipal Government Act* requirements.

**Recommendation:**

1. That City Council amends the 2012 Capital Budget by $2,500,000 for the leasehold improvements to the 2nd floor of the Municipal Police Building, funded by the debenture and gives First Reading to Bylaw No. B-32/2012.

Chris Reason, Corporate Properties
This bylaw authorizes the Council of the Municipality to incur indebtedness by the issuance of debenture(s) in the amount of $2,500,000 for the purpose of completing the Second Floor Tenant Improvements Municipal Police Building.

WHEREAS:

The Council of the Municipality has decided to issue a bylaw pursuant to the Municipal Government Act, Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000, Chapter M-26, and amendments thereto, to authorize the financing, undertaking and completion of the Second Floor Tenant Improvements Municipal Police Building.

Plans and specifications have been prepared and the total cost of the project is estimated to be $2,500,000 and the Municipality estimates the following grants, debentures and contributions will be applied to the project:

| Grants     | $0.00 |
| Reserves   | $0.00 |
| Debentures | $2,500,000 |

In order to complete the project it will be necessary for the Municipality to borrow the sum of $2,500,000 for a period not to exceed twenty (20) years from the Alberta Capital Finance Authority or another authorized financial institution by the issuance of debentures and on the terms and conditions referred to in this bylaw.

The estimated lifetime of the project financed under this bylaw is equal to or in excess of forty (40) years.

The principal amount of the outstanding debt of the Municipality at December 31, 2011, is $41,189,251 and no part of the principal or interest is in arrears.

All required approvals for the project have been obtained and the project is in compliance with all Acts and Regulations of the Province of Alberta.
NOW, THEREFORE, THE COUNCIL OF THE MUNICIPALITY DULY ASSEMBLED ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. That for the purpose of the completion of the Second Floor Tenant Improvements Municipal Police Building and related improvements the sum of two million five hundred thousand ($2,500,000) dollars be borrowed from the Alberta Capital Finance Authority or another authorized financial institution by way of debenture on the credit and security of the Municipality at large, of which amount the full sum of two million five hundred thousand ($2,500,000) dollars is to be paid by the Municipality at large.

2. The proper officers of the Municipality are hereby authorized to issue debenture(s) on behalf of the Municipality for the amount and purpose as authorized by this bylaw, namely the completion of the Second Floor Tenant Improvements Municipal Police Building.

3. The Municipality shall repay the indebtedness according to the repayment structure in effect, namely semi-annual or annual equal payments of combined principal and interest instalments not to exceed twenty (20) years calculated at a rate not exceeding the interest rate fixed by the Alberta Capital Finance Authority or another authorized financial institution on the date of the borrowing, and not to exceed ten (10%) percent.

4. The Municipality shall levy and raise in each year municipal taxes sufficient to pay the indebtedness.

5. The indebtedness shall be contracted on the credit and security of the Municipality.

6. The net amount borrowed under the bylaw shall be applied only to the project specified by this bylaw.

READ A FIRST TIME THIS _____ DAY OF ________________, 2012.

READ A SECOND TIME THIS _____ DAY OF ________________, 201__.

READ A THIRD TIME THIS _____ DAY OF ________________, 201__.

EXECUTED this _____ day of ________________, 201__.

____________________________________
MAYOR

____________________________________
CITY CLERK
AGENDA REPORT

Meeting Date (M/D/Y): 11/5/2012


Boards Routed Through: Date:
City Council 11/5/2012

Description:

City Council is required to adopt a budget annually pursuant to Section 242(1) of the Municipal Government Act. Administration is presenting the 2013 Operating and Capital Budget for Council's approval. The 2014-2015 operating and 2014-2022 capital plan are also presented for information.

Background:

Administration is pleased to present Council with the 2013 Operating and Capital budget for approval. The proposed budget ensures City of Airdrie citizens continue to receive the same level of services and protects the community investment. The budget provides infrastructure and services to the community in an efficient, equitable and sustainable manner. Tax rate increases are considered fair in relation to services provided to the community.

Short- and long-term planning is essential for ongoing fiscal stewardship and proactively implementing sustainable development under the umbrella of Airdrie One. Annually, three-year planning is conducted for the City's operational needs and ten-year planning is conducted for the City's capital needs.

Operating Budget

The City's operating budget includes resources to support activities needed to provide municipal services. The following highlights facts as related to the overall operating budget.

The 2013 proposed budget includes resources to deliver the following:

- Maintained 2012 services and service levels
- 2013 Council strategic priorities
2013 Corporate strategic priorities

New initiatives

Strategic planning is important for moving the organization forward. In most cases, strategic priorities require the infusion of financial resources to be successful. The resources funneled into priorities, as well as new initiatives, act as an investment to the community's future prosperity. Good examples of this are the priorities aimed at business attraction. The 2013 budget calls for approximately $100,000 as an investment to this initiative. Community investment into Council’s economic prosperity priority today is anticipated to result in additional future commercial activity. Any added commercial business within the City has great positive impact, specifically in additional job opportunities and increasing the portion of the non-residential assessment base.

Budget Assumptions

A number of assumptions facilitate the preparation of the budget. These assumptions are as follows:

- The Alberta economy is expected to see modest growth consistent with 2012. Projections are 3.1% in 2013 for Alberta and 3% for the Calgary Economic Region.

- Inflation for the Calgary region is projected to be 2.3% for 2013.

- Population growth is expected to continue at high levels. The projection into 2013 is a 5.8% increase bringing total population to 48,360. The subsequent two years are each projected at a 5.5% increase; 2015 population is expected to reach 53,800. The City will continue to face growth pressures.

- Development activity is projected to be 200 acres annually through 2013 to 2015. This value is up 50 acres over the 150 acre historical trend.

- Residential building permits for 2013 are expected to lower than at 2012 projected levels with 1,100 units (2012 projected 1,203).

- Total construction value for 2013 is projected at $304MM up from $287MM in 2012.

- The growth in taxable parcels is estimated to increase by 7.51% for 2013 and 5.5% for both 2014 and 2015.

- Energy prices remain stable for power and gas as the City is in a long-term contract which comes due at the end of 2013. For 2013 distribution costs are estimated to increase 5% for natural gas and 4% for power.

- Salaries, wages and benefits for unionized personnel have been increased in accordance with the collective agreement and projected increases.

- Salaries, wages and benefits for non-unionized personnel have been increased by a blend of cost of living index and contemplated wage increases of comparable communities.
Group benefits are projected to increase 8% in 2012

Local Authorities Pension Plan contribution rate increases went up 6% for members and 5% for employers.

The Cost of Providing Service in 2013

The operating budget is made up of two parts: the general operating fund and the utility fund. The following section provides data associated with this budget as a whole. Further highlights are provided specifically to each of the two parts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total budget</td>
<td>$86,942,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New tax revenue from growth</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional tax dollar investment (6.7% tax increase)</td>
<td>$2,278,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in personnel costs</td>
<td>$4,213,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in long-term debt</td>
<td>$576,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added to reserves</td>
<td>$448,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The impact to the average residential tax payer is $98 per year or $8 per month. The impact on the average non-residential tax payer is $887 per year or $74 per month.

The General Operating Fund

The purpose of the general operating fund is to facilitate the delivery of tax supported services to Airdrie citizens. The fund is projected to experience a 9% increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$64,999,721</td>
<td>$59,632,738</td>
<td>$5,366,983</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>68,225,617</td>
<td>62,493,728</td>
<td>5,731,889</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution from Utility Fund</td>
<td>2,860,990</td>
<td>3,225,896</td>
<td>364,906</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In total, it is expected to cost $68MM to provide City services in 2013. Cost increases year-over-year are attributed to the increased cost of providing services at current levels, resourcing strategic and corporate priorities and introducing new initiatives. The following breaks out these additional costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 Cost of providing service</td>
<td>$62,493,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase to maintain 2012 service levels</td>
<td>4,538,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Priorities – projected cost</td>
<td>642,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Priorities – projected cost</td>
<td>70,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New initiatives</td>
<td>480,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed 2013 Operating Fund Budget</td>
<td>$68,225,617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenue sources are few for municipalities. Services are funded through raising tax dollars, applying sales and user charges and generating franchise fees. Revenues have increased by $5.4MM with major factors highlighted as follows:

- New tax revenue from growth: $1,600,000
- Additional tax dollar investment (6.7%): 2,278,000
- Sales and user charges (primarily Genesis Place): 757,000
- New franchise fee revenue - growth: 171,005
- Increase in Fortis franchise fee 2% (approved by Council September 17, 2012): 294,000
- Increase in revenue from license and permits: 458,366
- Other revenue (arenas, leases): 298,894
- Draw from operating reserve: (450,000)
The most significant pressures within this budget are personnel costs, cost of utilities and police protection. Cost of fire and policing services have increased $2,410,000 or 18%, $1.8MM representing salary increases. These costs are driven mainly by the fire collective agreement ($1,334,808) and increases experienced in the policing contract ($455,386). Fire and police protection services are a significant piece of the municipality’s budget however noted as a service which citizens value highly. Expenses have increased by $5.7MM with major factors highlighted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unionized personnel – increased cost for salaries, wages and benefits</td>
<td>$1,334,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-union personnel – increased cost for salaries, wages and benefits</td>
<td>2,662,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policing contract for 39 members – increased cost passed on from federal government</td>
<td>445,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities – increased costs</td>
<td>379,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other goods, material and supplies</td>
<td>225,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to other groups (2014 Summer Games and APL)</td>
<td>264,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term debt</td>
<td>329,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added to reserves</td>
<td>(126,701)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where ever possible operational costs for departments have been held at 2012 levels. Contracted and general services have increased a mere $27,000 year-over-year.

**Human Resources**

With personnel costs making up 52% of this fund, it is not surprising that costs in this area are a challenge. Many City services are provided through human resources, and maintaining talented, trained staff is essential to providing excellence in service and innovation. The 2013 proposed budget includes the addition of 26.42 FTEs. The chart below provides a summary by area of requested staff. Staffing is noted as required, firstly to maintain current service levels and deal with growth, and secondly to facilitate new initiatives and priorities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total FTE increase</th>
<th># of new FTEs relating to Priorities and New Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Council / City Manager</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People and Organizational Effectiveness</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Infrastructure</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>11.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Priorities, Corporate Priorities and New Initiatives**

It is the mandate of Administration to implement Council’s strategic priorities. The 2013 budget includes the resources necessary to move forward on Council’s priorities for well managed growth, customer service, fiscal balance, social sustainability and economic prosperity. Corporate priorities are aligned to Council’s priorities and new initiatives are a result of the City’s corporate culture that promotes innovation. The following provides a listing of some of the initiatives with related costs. As mentioned previously, these projects represent investment into the future prosperity of the community.

- Programs, marketing and strategies for commercial investment attractions | $101,800
- Fiscal Balance and Asset management | 191,000
- Increase web options and allow citizens to do business on-line | 260,844
- Progression Planning | 70,845
- NEW - Additional Community Safety Officer | 86,400
- NEW – Facilities planning and enhanced land management | 114,400
- NEW – Town & Country Center parking lot renewal | 35,000
- NEW – Customer Service model/improving on targets | 63,700
The Utility Fund

The utility fund contains all the revenue and expenses necessary for providing water, sewer and waste services to the community. The fund is self-supporting meaning that costs incurred to run the utility must be recovered through rates. The fund makes a contribution back to the general operating fund.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$21,941,786</td>
<td>$19,676,593</td>
<td>$2,265,195</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td>18,715,890</td>
<td>16,815,603</td>
<td>1,900,287</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contribution to the Operating Fund</strong></td>
<td>3,225,896</td>
<td>2,860,990</td>
<td>364,906</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, it is expected to cost $18.7MM to provide utility services in 2013. By far the most significant cost in the utility is the cost of water provided by Calgary and the cost of shipping waste water back to Calgary. Calgary announced rate increases in 2012 of 11.27% for 2012 and 11.33% for 2013. Inevitably, the utility is facing increases to rates to keep pace with the rise in costs. The following breaks out these additional costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012 Cost of providing service</th>
<th>$16,815,603</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in service cost</td>
<td>1,730,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Priority (asset management)</td>
<td>84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New initiatives</td>
<td>86,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed 2013 Operating Fund Budget</strong></td>
<td>$18,715,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenues have increased by $2.2MM with almost all of this increase attributed to increases in sales and user charges. The following details the proposed rate increases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013 (proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Flat Rate</td>
<td>$27.55</td>
<td>$27.55</td>
<td>$27.55</td>
<td>$27.55</td>
<td>$28.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Flat Rate</td>
<td>$24.53</td>
<td>$24.53</td>
<td>$24.53</td>
<td>$24.53</td>
<td>$26.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Variable Rate</td>
<td>$0.7815</td>
<td>$0.8643</td>
<td>$0.8643</td>
<td>$0.9817</td>
<td>$1.0532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Variable Rate</td>
<td>$1.2048</td>
<td>$1.2939</td>
<td>$1.2939</td>
<td>$1.4194</td>
<td>$1.6592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage Collection Fee</td>
<td>$19.66</td>
<td>$20.48</td>
<td>$19.69</td>
<td>$20.34</td>
<td>$23.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Fee</td>
<td>$10.20</td>
<td>$13.78</td>
<td>$13.44</td>
<td>$12.79</td>
<td>$12.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bi-Monthly Utility Bill for 30 m³ consumption</strong></td>
<td>$141.53</td>
<td>$151.09</td>
<td>$149.96</td>
<td>$157.24</td>
<td>$172.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year over Year % increase</strong></td>
<td>6.75%</td>
<td>-0.75%</td>
<td>4.86%</td>
<td>9.95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expenses have increased by $1.9MM with major factors highlighted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-union personnel – increased cost for salaries, wages and benefits</td>
<td>$215,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases from other governments</td>
<td>864,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities – increased costs</td>
<td>44,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted goods and services</td>
<td>107,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term debt</td>
<td>246,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added to reserves</td>
<td>574,240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the last few years, the targets in the utilities have not been met. Actual revenue collected to cover the cost of sewer operations has been consistently under. As a result, transfers to reserves over the last few years have been reduced from the planned budget in order to meet contributions to the operating fund. As a new initiative for this fund, a review of the rate setting model will be conducted. The review will ensure that accurate costing is captured and rates reflect cost recovery necessary to operate a sustainable utility fund. A secondary new initiative is planned with the establishment of Alberta One Call. Waste management has planned a pilot project for curbside organics.

**2013 Capital Budget Planning**

The capital plan maps out the City’s infrastructure needs over a ten-year period and tests for affordability.

Influencing factors

**Council’s strategic priorities**

Council’s strategic priorities guide the development of the ten-year plan. Council’s priority of sound fiscal balance is a principle supporting the plan. Capital needs for the City are mapped out over the short and long term; the plan aims to provide appropriate funds to meet immediate capital needs and those of the future. Fiscal health is measured and debt limits are tested. Little progress has been made on an asset management strategy due to the lack of a dedicated resource to this initiative.

Council priorities of ‘arts and culture in motion’ and ‘social sustainability’, are considered when determining projects included and their priority within the plan.

The City of Airdrie transit expansion plan continues to evolve within this ten-year plan. The implementation of ICE services and expansion of local services which took place over 2010 and 2011 is beginning to show excellent ridership growth. Although 2012 plans were stalled due to a delay in GreenTRIP grant funds, the 2013-2022 plan includes projects to build north and south terminals as well as planning for a future busing facility and vehicle needs.
Transit expansion projects are funded with Gas Tax dollars as there is no provincial commitment currently for the timing of the next phase of GreenTRIP grant dollars.

The design work for the Bert Church Theatre is virtually complete. The project is planned to be completed by October 2013. The expansion and improvement to the City’s theatre is a welcome improvement for the arts community.

**Community needs assessment**

A community needs assessment is conducted every three years. This survey is an important driver to understanding our community’s wants and needs. The survey was conducted in the spring of 2011 in conjunction with the annual census. Twenty-three percent of people surveyed responded yes when asked if they would like to see additional services in Airdrie. The services specifically mentioned include improvements to recreation/facilities, more parks and better transit. When asked what new facilities should be developed, 14 percent indicated arenas/skating facilities.

The ten-year capital plan balances the primary need for protective services and infrastructure with the desire to provide recreational, cultural and public transit services. The second year component of Genesis Place Phase III is included in the 2013 budget. Continued expansion of transit is also included. Parks projects include the next phase of development in Chinook Winds Regional Park as well as improvements to Monklands, pathways and lifecycling of playgrounds.

The results of the needs assessment indicate high usage of the City’s walking/trail system, playgrounds, Nose Creek Park and Genesis Place.

Approximately 30 percent of those surveyed use arenas and rinks and approximately 25 percent use soccer facilities.

**Inflation factors**

Department submission of capital projects were estimated at 2012 values. Inflationary factors have been applied to the original cost submission for most projects as detailed in the following table. The Calgary and Region Economic Outlook report is used to determine non-residential CPI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-residential CPI</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4% increase)</td>
<td>(6.6% increase)</td>
<td>(3.4% increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI – (vehicles, IT, machinery, equipment)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI – (land)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grant Revenue

The following table provides information regarding grant revenue assumptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Municipal Transportation Grant</th>
<th>Remains consistently applied over the ten-year period at $60 per capita.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Gas Tax</td>
<td>Current agreement provides approximately $2MM annually through until 2013. Considering the federal government commitment to continuing this grant, the assumption has been made that the grant will continue at $2.2MM for years 2014-2017, an additional four-year period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSI</td>
<td>Original MSI grant announcements detailed grant dollars for a ten-year period 2007-2016. Municipal Affairs has provided information regarding an increase to the capital grant program. The City of Airdrie share is expected to increase from $7.6MM annually to $9.06MM. Assumption - that this grant will continue to be available beyond 2016. MSI projects have been limited to projects that are in excess of 5% of annual allotment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Grants</td>
<td>GreenTRIP dollars have not been incorporated for transit expansion considering that the next phase is pending. Yankee Valley Boulevard Grade Separation includes planning of $14.8MM in grant dollars. Applications are currently out for the Canada Cultural Spaces Fund (CCSF), and Community Infrastructure Improvement Fund (CIIF) potential grant streams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Summary - Is the plan fundable? Does it meet the City’s debt limit requirements?

The current 2013-2022 capital plan is fundable and meets the City’s debt limit requirements.

How does Council know the plan is financially sound? The following factors are tested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considering the various funding methods, are there available resources to fund the planned projects?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reserve balances – over the ten-year period, do reserve balances remain in a positive balance at the end of any given fiscal year?

Yes. Reserve funds have not been overdrawn.

Debt Limits - Have provincial and self-imposed debt limits been maintained?

Yes. All debt limits have been met through all of the ten years.

Grant sources – Are year end balances of grant streams within acceptable levels?

Yes, although 2013 and 2015 year end balances for the MSI grant stream are overdrawn. Cash flow manages this condition as future years make up differences. Genesis Place Phase III, Bert Church Theatre Expansion, an additional Fire Hall, and a Library Facility are major projects planned over the three-year period.

Further detail regarding debt limits and reserves follow.

**Debt limits**

The Capital Ten Year Planning Summary indicates that the proposed plan remains within provincially imposed limits. The City of Airdrie works well within these legislated requirements. See page 2 of the capital summary for details.

The plan indicates that self-imposed debt limits have been met. This indicator rises to a high of 6.2% in 2013 and then proceeds to fall over the next seven years as a number of debentures come due. Refer to the following chart. The self-imposed debt limit is 10% of general
Debt payments will rise by approximately $630,740 in 2013, $1,120,904 in 2014 and $1,450,288 in 2015. Note the total effect on the operating budget for 2013 is $485,468. This takes into account the additional transfers to reserves required to fund planned capital projects (does not include the drop in utility transfers).

Utility supported debt payments will continue to remain well within the targets established.

Offsite supported debt increases from $2.7MM in annual payments to approximately $7.2MM over the ten-year period. Although debt levels rise, development levies are also expected to rise. Offsite reserves are capable of managing the current ten-year capital plan.

**Reserve balances**

At the end of December 2011, the City’s reserve balance was just over $67MM. This plan shows reserves dropping to approximately $56MM by 2015 and increasing to $84MM by 2022. Much of the increase can be attributed to offsite levy funds.

The General Operating Reserve fluctuates and retains balances in and around the $9.5MM mark and down to $6.2MM in 2022. The purpose of the General Operating Reserve is to ensure that a prudent level of available financial resources is maintained to protect against fluctuating revenue and expenditures in the operating budget. The optimum value of this reserve is 7% of the operating budget per Council policy. The projected balance for 2013 is approximately $8MM and therefore within the optimal range. As the City moves out over the ten-year horizon, the 7% goal is not being met and would indicate that further transfers to the reserve are needed.

The General Capital reserve is projected to fluctuate over the ten-year horizon ranging between $1MM-$4MM. The purpose of this fund is to fund the capital needs that cannot be managed by other designated capital funds. This fund balance is low and has been used to fund projects that other reserves are not able to accommodate. The projected balance in this fund as at the end of 2022 is $3.2MM. City of Airdrie policy aims to contribute 2% of the
prior year’s value of capital assets to capital reserves. This value is not being met. Further work on Asset Management strategies will work to align this need.

This plan assumes no new grant revenue (i.e. GreenTRIP, CCSF, CIIF). Future announcements that award grant dollars to the City will affect the reserves positively.

Transfers to reserves remain stable and increase only gradually. The graph below provides an illustration based on current assumptions.

![Graph showing 2013-2022 Transfers to Reserve]

The 10 Year capital plan – detail and major projects over the next three years

Over the next three years, the City’s capital spending is projected to be within the $29MM-$38MM range. The approved capital budget for 2012 was $31MM.

**2013 - $29,249,980**

Dollars allocated to engineering structures and building/major renovations remain consistent. In 2013 building and major renovation projects are projected to cost $12.5MM. Genesis Place Phase III continues construction into its second year projected at $9.4MM in 2013. Theatre renovations will also begin at a cost of $3.1MM.

The total cost allocated for engineering structures is estimated at $10.2MM. The larger projects are 40th Ave – 8th Street to Reynolds Gate at a cost of $3.9MM, cross connection of water supply line at a cost of $1.5MM, the construction of a transit park and ride facility at a cost of $1.2MM, and arterial, collector and local road works projects for 2013 at $1.8MM.

Machinery, equipment and furniture costs are estimated at $2.3MM, and remain fairly consistent over the next few years. The larger items included in this number are the IT capital pool at $0.4MM, theatre furniture and equipment at $0.3MM, extrication tools replacement at $0.2MM, and the Sunridge lift station electrical upgrades at $0.2MM.
Vehicle costs are projected to cost $2.0MM. The larger items include replacement of a rescue truck at $0.7MM and ICE Fleet expansion at $0.9MM.

Land and improvements to land include work at Chinook Winds $0.9MM, 40th Avenue – 8th Street to Reynolds Gate landscaping $0.6MM and Monklands landscape improvements $0.3MM. A total of $2.0MM is projected for 2013 in this category.

Sources of funding for this year’s projects are $14.7MM in grants, $9.3MM from reserves, $5.1MM from debentures and $0.1MM from other sources (estimated salvage value/trade in).

2014 - $37,608,000

Capital costs for 2014 are estimated to increase by approximately $8.4MM from 2013. The focus remains on engineering structures and buildings/major renovations.

The buildings/major renovation projects amount to $10.6MM and include the following projects:

- Construction of Gateway fire hall $3.7MM
- Library expansion design $1.0MM
- Civic spaces construction $3.3MM
- Plainsmen change rooms $1.3MM

Engineering structures amount to over $17.3MM in project costs.

- The vast majority of this cost can be attributed to the construction of a reservoir in west Airdrie at a projected cost of $9.7MM.
- 40th Avenue – 8th Street to Windsong Drive $4.1MM
- Arterial, collector and roadworks projects plus traffic and pedestrian signals for 2014 are projected at $2.0MM

Machinery and equipment is estimated at $2.7MM and includes numerous projects from many different departments. The major expenditures in this category include:

- IT capital budget pool $392,300.
- Shared loader $336,800
- Salt storage facility upgrades $523,000

Vehicle expenditures are estimated at $2.0MM. The planned capital cost includes:

- Additional tandem plow truck $340,000
- Replacement of a sander/plow $377,600
• Replacement of water/sewer truck $431,000

Land and improvements to land amount to $4.9MM and includes the following:

• Land acquisition ($1.6MM)
• Further site development at Chinook Winds Regional Park ($622,400)
• Transit expansion plan which calls for the purchase of land to accommodate a transit facility; projected cost is $2.1MM.

Sources of funding for this year’s projects are $10.6MM in grants, $19.5MM from reserves and $7.0MM from debentures.

2015 - $38,025,300

Spending is projected to remain consistent. The focus remains on engineering structures and buildings major renovations.

Building/major renovations are predicted to cost approximately $17.1MM. Major projects include:

• Library expansion $10.2MM
• Chinook Winds Parks building $1.0MM
• Construction of a transit facility $4.8MM

Spending on engineering structures is estimated at $15.0MM. Major projects in this category include:

• 24th Street – two lanes - Yankee Valley Blvd. to 40th Avenue ($4.1MM)
• Rehabilitation of annexed roads ($1.0MM)
• Cobblestone Boulevard oversize ($2.3MM)
• South reservoir upgrade ($1.9MM)
• Arterial, collector and roadworks projects plus traffic and pedestrian signals for 2013 are projected at $2.0MM

Machinery and equipment is estimated at $2.4MM and includes the cost of playground lifecycle replacement, a loader and replacement of a sweeper. The IT Capital Budget Pool is $401,300.

Vehicles are estimated to cost $1.5MM in 2015. The larger vehicles include the replacement of a public works sander/plow and replacement of a fire truck at a cost of $909,500.
Land and improvements to land are $1.9MM. The major projects are the Nose Creek Regional Park Enhancement for $1.4MM and land for an RV Sanitary Station second location for $428,000.

Sources of funding for this year’s projects are $21.1MM in grants, $13.7MM from reserves and $3.2MM from debentures.

**Fair Tax Rate Increases for Services Provided**

Benchmarks, price indices and the municipal indicators provide comparatives for measuring efficiencies and fair tax increases. The 2011 Municipal Indicators have been made available with results being in line with prior years. These indicators compare the City of Airdrie with the other Alberta mid-sized cities. The City of Airdrie works well below cost and revenue levels of the other municipalities, indicating that services are provided in Airdrie more efficiently than the comparative communities.

The consumer price index (CPI) and Municipal Price Index (MPI) are used to gauge tax increases. Calgary and Edmonton maintain corporate economic units that model and produce MPI as well as other indices. MPI indices better reflect the cost of inflation for municipalities and generally run 1-1.5% higher than CPI. Communities experiencing excessive growth face additional pressure and are advised to take growth rates into consideration when setting tax rates. The Canadian Taxpayer Federation recommends tax rates as a combination of CPI and growth increases. The City of Calgary tax rates are lined with MPI plus growth.

The chart below provides historical data for the factors discussed. Not keeping up with cost increases leads to a deterioration of services and the eventual need for a municipality to adjust services provided. For budget planning purposes, the City of Airdrie uses inflation factors produce by Calgary’s corporate economic department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population % Increase</th>
<th>CPI</th>
<th>MPI (Calgary)</th>
<th>Total Population and CPI</th>
<th>Tax Increases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>4.097%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4.54%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.34%</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>11.65%</td>
<td>-.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>11.55%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>8.26%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>11.46%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2012 citizen satisfaction survey inquired about preferred taxation strategy. 54% of citizens polled indicated that they would support increases sufficient to maintain current service levels and 24% stated they would be willing to have further increases to improve service levels.

**Next Steps**

The next step in the budget process is to forward the budget to Finance Advisory Committee (FAC). FAC will deliberate the budget over the month of November. The FAC recommended budget will be presented to Council on December 3, 2012. Recommendations can be made to increase or decrease revenue or expenditures as related to services and service levels. Council’s approved budget will establish services and service levels for 2013.

**Alternatives/Implications:**

N/A

**Public Relations/Marketing Plan:** N/A

**Recommendation:** That City Council forwards the Administration recommended 2013-2015 operating plan and the 2013-2022 capital plan to Finance Advisory Committee for deliberation.

________________________________
Lucy Wiwcharuk, CMA
Director of Corporate Services
AGENDA REPORT

Meeting Date (M/D/Y): 11/5/2012

Subject: Rescind Staff Appointments to the Airdrie Rodeo Ranch Association

Boards Routed Through: City Council

Date: 11/5/2012

Description:
To rescind motion 2012-C-115, Staff Appointments to the Airdrie Rodeo Ranch Association.

Background:
At the Organizational Meeting held October 22, 2012, Council made appointments to the Airdrie Rodeo Ranch Association (formerly Airdrie and District Rodeo Association) in accordance with the 1987 lease agreement with the Association. At that time, Council queried whether the 25-year term lease was still in place and if not, whether this requirement had carried over into the new lease. Staff reviewed the agreement and there is no longer provision in the new lease for representation on the Association’s Board. The liaison role that Community Development fills with other community groups will continue and include the Association.

Boards Routed Through:
N/A

Alternatives/Implications:
N/A. Council no longer has the authority to appoint City representatives to the Association under the new lease agreement.

Corporate Communications:
The Association will be advised that there will no longer be a City representative appointed to serve on their Board of Directors.
**Recommendation:** That City Council rescinds motion 2012-C-115 and withdraws the appointment of Kim Harris and Lorri Laface to the Airdrie Rodeo Ranch Association.

Kari Kitiuk
Assistant City Clerk
AGENDA REPORT

Meeting Date (M/D/Y): 11/5/2012

Subject: Municipal Policing Advisory Board Terms of Reference

Boards Routed Through: City Council

Date: 11/5/2012

Description:

Council is being asked to amend the Municipal Policing Advisory Board Terms of Reference to reflect that City of Airdrie employees not employed within the Directorate of Community Safety are eligible to sit on the Municipal Policing Advisory Board.

Background:

At the October 22, 2012 Organizational Meeting of Council, Council disbanded the Municipal Police Commission and established the Municipal Policing Advisory Board (MPAB) effective January 1, 2013.

At that time, Council also adopted the terms of reference for the new MPAB. Since adoption, it has been noted that employees of the City of Airdrie are ineligible to sit on the Board. The City’s practice has been to allow City of Airdrie employees to volunteer on Council’s boards and committees providing the volunteer position does not relate to the area they are employed in. Staff are recommending that this practice also be adopted for the MPAB. The amended terms of reference are attached for your information.

Boards Routed Through:

None

Alternatives/Implications:

1. Council can choose to adopt the amended terms of reference. Employees that do not work within the Directorate of Community Safety are eligible to sit on the MPAB.
2. Council can choose to maintain the current terms of reference. All employees of the City of Airdrie will be ineligible to volunteer for the MPAB.

**Corporate Communications:**

The new Municipal Policing Advisory Board Terms of Reference will be distributed to members of the Board.

**Recommendation:** That City Council adopt the amended Municipal Policing Advisory Board Terms of Reference.

Kari Kitiuk
Assistant City Clerk

| Presenter: | S. Pollyck |
| Attachments: | Terms of Reference |
CITY OF AIRDRIE

MUNICIPAL POLICING
ADVISORY BOARD

Terms of Reference
Municipal Policing Advisory Board

1. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

   a) The Board shall:

      i) make recommendations to Council and City Administration on all policy matters relating to the maintenance of law and order within the City of Airdrie regarding the R.C.M.P. and Airdrie Municipal Enforcement (A.M.E.);

      ii) provide community feedback to the R.C.M.P., A.M.E. and City Administration on policing, strategies and activities;

      iii) in consultation with the R.C.M.P., A.M.E. and City Administration provide input with the development of respective yearly plans of priorities and strategies for municipal policing;

      iv) carry out any further duties and powers as Council may from time to time assign by resolution.

2. COMPOSITION

   a) The Board shall consist of a maximum of seven (7) voting members serving without remuneration who shall be appointed by resolution of Council as follows:

      i) two (2) member of City Council; and

      ii) five (5) citizen members from the public at large.

   b) The Officer in Charge of the Airdrie R.C.M.P. or his designate shall attend the Board meetings in an advisory non-voting capacity and is not considered a member of the Board.

   c) The Manager of Airdrie Municipal Enforcement and R.C.M.P. and/or his designate shall attend the Board meetings in an advisory non-voting capacity and is not considered a member of the Board.
d) The Director of Protective Services and/or his designate shall attend the Board meetings in an advisory non-voting capacity and is not considered a member of the Board.

e) A Recording Secretary shall attend the Board meetings in a non-voting capacity to provide administrative support services to the Board. The Recording Secretary is not considered a member of the Board. Minutes shall be prepared and submitted to the Board for approval at the next meeting. The Recording Secretary shall forward a copy of these minutes to Council for information.

f) All persons appointed to the Board shall:

i) undertake a criminal records review and suitability screening through the R.C.M.P. at the City of Airdrie’s expense;

ii) swear an Oath of Office in the form prescribed by the City of Airdrie;

iii) not be an employee of Airdrie Municipal Enforcement, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, any Provincial or Municipal Police Force, the Provincial Attorney General’s Department or the Department of the Solicitor General of Alberta;

iv) be a Canadian Citizen or landed immigrant and resident of the City of Airdrie for at least six (6) consecutive months immediately preceding the date of applying for a position as citizen member; and

v) be of the full age of eighteen (18) years, except for a youth representative, who shall be at least sixteen (16) years of age.

3. MEMBER TERMS

a) Two (2) Council members shall be appointed by Council to the Board at each Organizational Meeting of Council. A Council member’s appointment to the Board terminates at the Organizational Meeting of Council following the Organizational Meeting of Council at which they were appointed to the Board or upon the end of the Council member’s term on Council.

b) Five (5) citizen members shall be appointed by Council to the Board at each Organizational Meeting of Council. The term of any citizen member shall be for a period of one (1) year and commence on January 1st following the Organizational Meeting at which the citizen member was appointed to the Board and terminate on December 31st, unless as otherwise specified by Council. A citizen member may be re-appointed to the Board for subsequent one (1) year terms at the Organizational Meeting of Council. There is no maximum number of times a citizen member may be re-appointed.
c) Where a member ceases to be a member of the Board before the expiration of his term, Council may appoint another eligible person for the remainder of that term.

4. RESIGNATION AND REMOVALS

a) Any citizen member may resign from the Board at any time upon sending written notice to Council to that effect.

b) The appointment of a citizen member to the Board may be revoked by Council if the citizen member:

i) fails to attend three (3) consecutive meetings of the Board unless that absence is caused through illness or is authorized by resolution of the Board;

ii) ceases to be a resident of the City of Airdrie;

iii) is hired in a full-time, permanent capacity with the City of Airdrie or the R.C.M.P.; or

iv) is convicted of a crime under the Criminal Code of Canada.

5. CHAIRMAN

a) The Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Board shall be appointed by Council at the annual Organizational Meeting of Council.

6. MEETINGS

a) The Board shall hold regular meetings at a frequency to be determined from time to time by the Board. A minimum of four (4) meetings must be held each year.

b) Special meetings may be called by the Chairman or, in his absence, the Vice Chairman by providing the members with twenty-four (24) hours’ notice. The Board may, by two-thirds (2/3) written consent of the members, waive notice of a special meeting at any time so long as a quorum is present.

c) One-half (1/2) of the total number of members shall constitute a quorum for a meeting to be held. For this Board, a quorum equals four (4) voting members.

d) An agenda shall be prepared and circulated to the members prior to each Board meeting.

e) Each member shall have one vote. Each member shall vote on every motion unless he has a pecuniary conflict of interest. Motions shall only be carried upon receiving a majority of votes. In the event of a tie vote, the motion is defeated.
f) Meetings of the Board shall be open to the public. All matters relating to personnel; conduct; contracts with the R.C.M.P. or Airdrie Municipal Enforcement; and security of police operations shall be conducted in camera in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act as amended or replaced from time to time.

g) The Board may report to Council on matters of public concern as the Board deems appropriate and believes are in the public interest. The Board shall also report to Council on any matter when requested to do so by resolution of Council.

7. LIMITATIONS

a) Neither the Board nor any individual member shall have the power to pledge the credit of the City in connection with any matter whatsoever nor shall the Board or any individual member thereof have any power to authorize any expenditure to be charged against the City.

8. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

a) No member shall participate in any discussion nor vote upon any matter that may involve a pecuniary interest as defined in the Municipal Government Act.

b) In the event of a member having a pecuniary conflict of interest, he shall:
   i) disclose that he has a pecuniary conflict of interest and its general nature;
   ii) leave the room until the matter has been dealt with;
   iii) abstain from any discussion of the matter;
   iv) abstain from voting on the matter; and
   v) ensure the abstention is recorded in the minutes.

9. LIABILITY

a) Members of the Board shall not be held liable for any actions or claims or claims arising out of the exercise of the powers granted to the Board pursuant to these Terms of Reference.
## OUTSTANDING COUNCIL FOLLOWUP

### 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Director Contact</th>
<th>Alderman and Date Originated</th>
<th>Expected Return Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report back re potential of bylaw for combat sports</td>
<td>M. Lock</td>
<td>Hegg - Jan 16/12</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised to Nov 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report back re future use of Monklands site</td>
<td>M. Locking</td>
<td>Alexander - Feb 21/12</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report back re issuance of brokerage licenses under Taxi Bylaw</td>
<td>M. Locking/ L. Wiwcharuk</td>
<td>Buchanan-Mar 5/12</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report back in one year re success of responsible cat ownership education campaign</td>
<td>M. Locking</td>
<td>Hegg - Mar 19/12</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report back with info on Sagewood pond (circulation, intent, lack of fountain, and fit into City waterway plan)</td>
<td>L. Stevens</td>
<td>Hunter - July 16/12</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report back re Genesis Place therapeutic programs and allowing patrons to pay for use of specific amenities as opposed to full services (informal direction – no motion)</td>
<td>M. Lock</td>
<td>Brown - Aug 20/12</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report back on information being received regarding permitting recreational vehicle sales within Industrial Business Park One (IB-1) District</td>
<td>L. Stevens</td>
<td>Hegg - Sept 4/12</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report back re supplementary transit service model (taxi cabs) including operational requirements, financial model, and effectiveness in other communities</td>
<td>M. Lock</td>
<td>Alexander - Sept 17/12</td>
<td>Q2 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report back on Community Standards Bylaw – re amended provisions for RV parking, construction bins, graffiti, and ponding; and confirmation of snow removal</td>
<td>M. Locking</td>
<td>Alexander – Oct 1/12</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report back after November TAC meeting re potential of establishing short-term parking on 2nd Ave NW adjacent to Anna’s Café Europa</td>
<td>L. Stevens</td>
<td>Buchanan – Oct 15/12</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated to Council Synopsis October 15, 2012

### 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Director Contact</th>
<th>Alderman and Date Originated</th>
<th>Expected Return Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report back on use of sprinkler systems or other fire retardant materials in homes built within the City of Airdrie (Coming forward as part of Fire Master Plan)</td>
<td>M. Locking</td>
<td>Buchanan - May 16/11</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised to Nov 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>