# Off-site Levies Bylaw Update Review – Transit & Transportation Infrastructure & Costs: Industry Consultation Meeting Notes

**Date/Time:** Thursday, February 26, 2026 / 10:00 AM-11:30 AM

**Location:** Andrew Davidson Building, Online Teams Call

**Attendees:**

| Internal | External |
|---|---|
| Krista Campbell | Marcello Chiaccia |
| Erin Felker | Glen Thoman |
| Helen Hu | Brian Hahn |
| Pamela Ajoku | Jackie Stewart |
| Natalia Ivanova | Guy Huntingford |
| Brian Arthur | Joel Armitage |
| Sara Alinaghi pour | Keith Haraburda |
| Jarron Storbakken | Mark Wynker |
| Jennifer Syncox | Mohamad Mohamad |
| Braden Gray | Nadia Friesen |
| Derek Power | |
| Quinn Eastlick* | |
| Liz (Elizabeth) Tan | |
| Laura Urbain | |
| | |
| | |
| **Regrets** | |
| | |

*Note taker

## Agenda

1. **Infrastructure locations**
2. **Cost estimation**
3. **Questions and feedback**

## Discussion

- **BRT**
    - What is included in the cost for BRT? Is it infrastructure and busses? Would there be infrastructure upgrades along the length of the line including into existing areas in the northeast?

- When you say this project is driven 100% by growth, how is it differentiated between growth in the established area versus the greenfield?
- When you look at this again, you want to make sure you look through the lens of the need for these transit upgrades being required if the greenfield area was never approved. There will be significant densification in the established area as well, which will necessitate its own transit upgrades.
- Clarify when things are triggered by growth that it is triggered by overall growth versus greenfield growth specifically. Clarify what industry is paying going forward.
- The 50.9% is from the 2024 model? That level of benefit is not quite correct. That is the ratio of levied land versus to be levied land. In the end, this will be 100% paid for by the greenfield. The project itself starts and terminates in the established areas. Important that the benefit allocation be as described in tab 6 of the 2024 model. Would be good to look into for the next meeting.
- You mentioned that the benefit is established through outputs of the regional transportation model. Just to clarify what is the cost sharing split (paid by levy : paid by existing residents) for this project based on those outputs?

- **Segment B, 128 NE widening**
  - Where 128 crosses Deerfoot, is that where the interchange is planned? Is it an interchange or a flyover? It doesn't seem like there is room for an interchange in that area given existing development.
  - It would be helpful if The City could provide a figure showing the functional geometry of the interchange to better visualize how an interchange would fit here given the proximity to Stoney.
- **Saatoohtsi Infrastructure**
  - Do we know if any outline plans have been approved in this ASP?
  - Curious about these four projects. They are all needed, but they were all known to be needed before the last update of the levy. What has changed to include these now, given that they should have been on the radar for the last levy update? This is true generally about all major projects added in this update.
  - In reviewing Tab 6 - Benefit Allocation from the Transportation_Levy_Rate_Model_2024_Off-site_Levies_Bylaw.xlsx which was found on the prior City OSL Engagement portal, it appears that for infrastructure located within Greenfield Areas ultimately (i.e., "ultimately" being at full build out/when DAs have been signed for all of the lands inside the City boundaries) 100% of the benefit is allocated to Greenfield Growth, and correspondingly 100% of the costs, will be recovered by the way of the Transportation Levy. In respect of what was labelled as "Shared benefit infrastructure" in the 2024 Transportation model the benefit allocation to Greenfield growth is ultimately (i.e., again, at full build out of the City) is 41.2%. As described in Tab 6, that benefit allocation is, "... based on the forecast population and jobs in levied lands, unlevied lands and the Established Area." Given the reference that the benefit is established through outputs of the regional

transportation model, is there a change to the Benefit Allocation methodology for this OSL Bylaw update?
    - As per my prior verbal comment, column G "Benefit" shown on Tab 4 - Infrastructure, appears to be mislabeled. The appropriate label would seem to be "Ratio of Levied versus Unlevied Lands"--is that fair?
- **Other interchanges**
    - In terms of looking at funding and continuity between levy bylaws- are we looking at this on a program of projects? It is unclear how the individual projects that are not in all of the levy bylaws are funded
    - If projects are removed but levies been paid towards them, how is that handled?
    - The challenge becomes we don't want to add four or six pieces of infrastructure every time we add an ASP, because it penalizes the developers who are the last ones in.
- **88 and 196/212**
    - If you look at the Mahogany ASP, at 196 and 88 there is a grade separated interchange required there. In the NW corner of that intersection, there is development right to the corner. In Rangeland, there is development right up to the SW corner of that interchange. At 212 and 88, Rose Ranch plan was approved last year, right to the NW corner and there is a stormwater pond. Also, in the outline plan, there was no discussion of an interchange. How did you sort through all these considerations when deciding to put interchanges in these locations?
    - I can see 196 moving east, but there would be gaps with the current interchange. What I understand with 212, the Nostalgia outline plan goes right up to the edge there as well.
    - Where can we source the functional studies? Can you look into whether these could be shared?
    - Looking at these two interchanges, at some point between the ASP and outline plan it was decided that interchanges would not be required as land was not set aside, and now we're talking about interchanges again. It will now cost more to put an atypical interchange into this area. It does not seem right that this cost increase was due to The City's decision making, but the cost is not borne in some way by The City.
- **Cost estimation**
    - Why would the lump sums be the same for 10 items that are totally different from each other? The third-party consultant wasn't questioned about this at the time? Could we take away why this was the case?
    - Admin cost at 12%. What is the basis for this? With industry work on infrastructure, we typically add on a 5% admin fee. 12% seems excessive. Could you provide a breakdown of the 12%?
    - As a suggestion for the line items shown in blue (slide 19), perhaps definition of the costs included in each item could be provided.
    - Can the new and updated detailed cost project estimates all be provide to us?

    - On slide 21, in a previous conversation we were talking about how projects will be added or removed. Were there any projects removed from the last update?
    - For the contingencies, is the 30% for all projects, and for completed projects, how close have they come to that make?
    - Is there a plan that shows locations of all the interchanges included in the levy? Can we get the updated maps sooner than the approval of the new bylaw? More refined maps for project locations would be appreciated
- There were different maps being developed through the past update. Were they abandoned?
- Bunch of questions plunked into the chat. Will it be possible to respond to the questions put directly into the chat and when? Could you create a spreadsheet with the questions in the chat, and show when they will be responded to, what is out of scope and won't be answered.
- Should we look for one more meeting date for Transportation

## Summary of Action Items

- **Administration**
    - Functional geometry drawings and studies for proposed interchanges.
    - Detailed cost estimates and definitions for line items.
    - Breakdown of the 12% administration cost.
    - Updated maps showing all interchange locations.
    - Spreadsheet tracking chat questions and responses.