



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Project overview

Ward boundary changes are governed by the Municipal Government Act and the [Ward Boundary Determination and Review Policy \(the Policy\)](#). As part of its review of ward boundaries, The Returning Officer determined that Wards 3, 7 and 12 have population deviations and Ward 5 has an elector count deviation inconsistent with the Policy. Council directed the Returning Officer to conduct a minor review of ward boundaries and will include public engagement on proposed changes to be considered by Council.

Engagement overview

The purpose of the public engagement is to gather input from Calgarians to inform the Returning Officer's independent recommendations to Council on proposed ward boundary changes.

The engagement started on 2020 February 19 and ended on 2020 April 3. The majority of feedback was collected online through the engage website, and through a direct email address and in-person events. In addition, the Calgary Catholic School District and Calgary School Board were engaged and individual trustees were invited to provide their input online through the engage website. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the final in-person event was cancelled; however ten in-person events were completed prior and the online opportunity was extended by 15 days. Additional email follow up with all community associations was undertaken to encourage online participation.

There were [two \(2\) proposed scenarios](#) developed for feedback based on the Ward Boundary Determination and Review Policy. The Policy directs The Returning Officer to consider criteria from the Ward Boundary Determination and Review Policy.

What we asked

The following is the list of questions that participants were asked to provide input on.

1. Which ward do you currently live in?
2. Which community do you currently live in?
3. What do you think are the main advantages of scenario A?
4. What do you think are the main disadvantages of scenario A?
5. What do you think are the main advantages of scenario B?
6. What do you think are the main disadvantages of scenario B?
7. Which scenario do you prefer?
8. Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries?

Other information was also asked that was not used in project decision making, however does help us to learn for future public engagements. This included how participants heard about the project, how they felt about the process, and demographic information.




Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Participation

The online participation had a total of 597 visitors that provided feedback, and 8,193 unique visitors to the site. The following graphic shows the overall online participation:



- Views:** The cumulative number of times a visitor visits the page in a site.
- Visits:** The number of end-user session associated with a single visitor.
- Visitors:** The number of unique public or end-users in a site. A visitor is only counted once.
- Contributions:** The total number of response of feedback collected through the participation tools.
- Contributors:** The unique number of visitors who have left feedback through the participation tools.

A total of 268 participants attended the in-person engagement events. All participants were provided a business card with details on how to submit feedback online. Participants were also given the option to submit feedback in writing and two written submissions were received from participants at in-person engagement events.

Three letters were received from the Riverbend Community Association during the process requesting that Riverbend be contained in the same ward as Quarry Park and Douglasglen/Douglasdale.

10 emails were also submitted to the ward boundary review email account.



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

A total of 613 unique participants provided feedback through online, in-person, and email mechanisms. The following table shows the in-person events and the number of citizens that participated:

Date	Location	Citizens
2020 February 24	Municipal Building – Power Reception Hall	31
2020 February 25	Cranston Residents Association	26
2020 February 26	Huntington Hills Community Association	26
2020 February 27	Glenmore Aquatic Centre	28
2020 March 2	Remington YMCA / Quarry Park Library	37
2020 March 3	Vivo for Healthier Generations / Country Hills Library	27
2020 March 4	North Mount Pleasant Arts Centre	8
2020 March 7	Cold Garden Beverage Company (Inglewood / Ramsay)	38
2020 March 10	Forest Lawn Library	25
2020 March 11	Judith Umbach Library	22
2020 March 16	CANCELLED Beltline Aquatic and Fitness Centre	N/A
	TOTAL In-person	268

What we heard

The following table is the number of participants that shared what ward they currently live in:

Ward	Percent of Participants	Number of Participants
1	3.54%	19
2	2.24%	12
3	7.09%	38
4	6.53%	35
5	1.31%	7
6	4.29%	23
7	12.69%	68
8	6.90%	37



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Percent of Participants	Number of Participants
9	18.10%	97
10	1.87%	10
11	16.79%	90
12	11.38%	61
13	2.99%	16
14	4.29%	23

See [Appendix A](#) for a number of participants per community.

Participants were asked their preference between the two scenarios. The preference poll below does not reflect a statistically valid vote, rather provides a snapshot of how participants perceived the two scenarios overall at a point in time. A total of 418 participants took the poll, with the rest opting to skip the question.



Answer choices	Percent	Count
Scenario A	46.89%	196
Scenario B	53.11%	222
Total	100.00%	418



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

The preference poll shows a slight preference to Scenario B of those that participated. Represented in the table above, participants that preferred a particular scenario often commented “no advantage” towards the other scenario, while often commenting “no disadvantage” for the scenario they preferred.

Participants commented on both scenarios a strong preference that similar communities remain together within the same ward, such as the sample quote “It connects like communities that face the same issues”. While not direct criteria in the Policy, there were disadvantage comments about having more inner city/urban communities in the same ward as more perceived suburban communities. The comments reflected that priorities and interests were much different, including age of homes and infrastructure. A sample quote was “Seems to better group communities together that have infrastructure in common”.

For the advantages heard on scenario A, the next highest theme heard was fewer communities were impacted and there were fewer changes overall compared to scenario B. A sample quote was “Few communities impacted, changes appear minor, so easier for citizens to grasp the changes”.

For the advantages heard on scenario B, the next highest theme heard was it more effectively reduced population deviation between wards in comparison to scenario A between wards as set out in the Policy. A sample quote was “Brings deviations for all wards into better balance”.

There were diverse perspectives about changes to urban wards (7, 8, 9 and 11), including some participants stating fewer Councillors as an advantage, while other participants stating a higher number of Councillors as an advantage. While there were comments that reflected a change of Councillor to be an advantage or disadvantage, this is not a criterion considered in the review by the Returning Officer, as set out in the Policy.

Participants referenced criteria in the feedback not currently included in the Policy, especially in the additional comments section. A theme throughout the feedback, particularly in the additional comments section, is a desire for an independent election commission to have led the review, and concern that Council will direct their own ward boundary changes, despite the recommendations presented.

- For a detailed summary of the input that was provided, please see the [Summary of Input](#) section.
- For a verbatim listing of all the input that was provided, please see the [Verbatim Responses](#) section.

Next steps

June 2020 – Report back to Council with recommendations, including proposed ward boundary maps

July 2020 – First reading of bylaw to adopt ward boundary changes with Public Hearing

July 2020 – Public notice, opportunity to submit petition regarding ward boundaries

October 2020 – Second and third reading of bylaw to adopt ward boundary changes



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Summary of Input

THEME	SAMPLE QUOTES
Scenario A - Advantages	
No advantages	“None. As long as policy criteria are met there's nothing controversial”
Similar communities with similar interests are kept together	<p>“Less substantial shifts in boundaries. Appears to group together similar neighborhoods”</p> <p>“I believe the socioeconomic factors within the communities are better accurately represented in the first split”</p> <p>“Keeping neighbourhoods together that have existing relationships”</p> <p>“It connects like communities that face the same issues”</p>
Fewer changes and less communities are impacted than scenario B	<p>“Less communities affected, wards seem to be grouped around type of neighbourhood”</p> <p>“Keeps communities with similar makeup and politics together, minimal communities affected”</p> <p>“Better balance than the existing ward boundaries, fewer communities will be displaced into new wards compared to Scenario B”</p> <p>“Few communities impacted, changes appear minor, so easier for citizens to grasp the changes”</p>
Scenario A - Disadvantages	
Population deviation is still too high	“Large deviations between wards still exists and doesn't prepare for growth in new communities”
No disadvantages	“None. As long as policy criteria are met there's nothing controversial”
Similar communities are not aligned or kept together	<p>“I think the downtown and inner-city communities have greater social challenges that most suburbs, so it may be a lot for one representative. Equal doesn't always mean fair when it comes to the burden each councillor will carry”</p> <p>“Some communities linked appear to be separated, however they likely share issues”</p> <p>“Communities with similar needs that are next to each other are not in the same ward”</p>
Boundary doesn't address future growth	<p>“Increased Ward 14 considerably and will likely need to be changed again in a few years. Cranston is still growing, Walden and Legacy have a large growth. Big mistake “</p> <p>“My [might] require future adjustments as the outskirts continue to grow”</p>



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

	<p>“Boundaries may need to be redrawn again very soon”</p> <p>“Seems like fairly small changes. Would need to do this all over again in a few years?”</p>
Scenario B - Advantages	
No advantages	“Totally wrong, do not see any advantages”
Better reduction in population deviation between wards in comparison to scenario A	<p>“Brings deviations for all wards into better balance”</p> <p>“Lower levels of population deviation between wards. Looking at the boundary maps, it better encapsulates "like" communities (central urban vs. suburban) together”</p> <p>“More even distribution of population by ward, smaller deviations”</p> <p>“Equalized population means each Councillor represents a similar number of Calgarians, so no individual Councillor appears to be more important or more representative than another”</p>
Similar communities with similar interests are kept together	<p>“Best option. Combines communities that have common interests. Makes the River the boundary”</p> <p>“Communities with similar needs are placed together in the same ward making it easier for their needs to be addressed by the same alderman”</p> <p>“Putting 'like communities' together”</p> <p>“More aligned with neighbouring communities all in same ward, better boundary lines, more clear than random pockets of plan A”</p>
Scenario B - Disadvantages	
No disadvantages	“None. There are no perfect solutions, but this ensures an equal voice far more than Scenario A”
Communities and their priorities are too different	<p>“Includes neighborhoods that are 20 years older than the rest of the ward. Different demographic, different priorities”</p> <p>“Communities may not identify which each other as some of the residents are more centrally located and could have different concerns than those of new growth areas”</p> <p>“Placing what are essentially inner city neighborhoods with higher density mixed with more suburban single family neighborhoods further from downtown. Different needs from transport to development”</p> <p>“Mixing/adding a large industrial area to a primarily residential riding could cause the councillor to have to split focus by having to represent two potentially conflicting perspectives”</p>
New boundaries do not fit with communities	“Splitting up communities along 16 Ave that share similar characteristics does not make sense”



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

	<p>“The communities in ward 7 that would become Ward 4 are not part of that community, Ward 7 is inner city”</p> <p>“It pushes out ward 9 from inner city to completely suburb”</p> <p>“Ward 11 now covers far too wide a swath of voters, with different needs and viewpoints, and will weaken the ability of our Councillor to advocate for our best interests”</p>
More communities are impacted	<p>“More communities change wards”</p> <p>“Inflicts a major geographical change to more electors”</p> <p>“More communities impacted and the changes are larger than for option A”</p>



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Appendix A – number of participants per community

Community	Participants
Abbeydale	3
Acadia	1
Albert Park / Radisson Heights	2
Altadore	1
Applewood	3
Auburn Bay	7
Banff Trail	3
Bankview	2
Bayview	1
Beddington Heights	4
Beltline	12
Bowness	4
Braeside	2
Brentwood	2
Briar Hill	1
Bridgeland / Riverside	13
Bridlewood	2
Cambrian Heights	2
Canyon Meadows	2
Capitol Hill	2
Castleridge	1
Cedarbrae	3
Chaparral Valley	3
Charleswood	2
Citadel	1
Cliff Bungalow	1
Coach Hill	2
Connaught	1
Copperfield	7
Cougar Ridge	1
Country Hills	2
Coventry hills	15
Cranston	11
Crescent Heights	8
Currie Barracks	1
Dalhousie	2
Deer Run	1



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Community	Participants
Douglasdale / Douglasglen	3
Dover	2
Downtown Commercial Core	1
Downtown West	1
East Village	1
Eau Claire Community	3
Elbow Park	3
Erin Woods	2
Erlton	8
Evanston	2
Evergreen	1
Fairview	6
Fonda	1
Forest Lawn	4
Garrison Woods	3
Glamorgan	4
Glenbrook	2
Glendale	1
Hamptons	1
Hanson Ranch	1
Harvest Hills	3
Haysboro	4
Hidden Valley	9
Highland park	1
Highwood	1
Hillhurst	3
Hounsfeld Heights	1
Huntington Hills	2
Inglewood	17
Killarney	1
Kincora	1
Lake Bonavista	1
Lake Chaparral	1
Lakeview	29
Legacy	3
Livingston	1
Lower Mount Royal	1
Lynnwood	2



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Community	Participants
MacEwan	6
Mahogany	8
Manchester	1
Maple Ridge	1
Marda Loop	3
Marlborough Park	3
Martindale	1
McKenzie Lake	2
McKenzie Towne	7
Meadowlark Park	2
Midnapore	3
Millrise	2
Mission	1
Mission / Cliff Bungalow	1
Monterey Park	1
Montgomery	3
Mount Pleasant	13
Mount Royal	1
Mountview	1
New Brighton	2
Nolan Hill	1
North Glenmore Park	2
North Haven	3
Oakridge	7
Ogden	4
Palliser	2
Panorama	7
Park Hill	1
Parkdale	1
Parkland	2
Patterson	2
Penbrooke Meadows	3
Pineridge	1
Point McKay	1
Quarry Park	2
Queensland	1
Radisson Heights	1
Ramsay	10



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Community	Participants
Red Stone	1
Renfrew	22
Richmond	3
Rideau Park	2
Riverbend	21
Rosscarock	3
Roxboro	1
Royal Oak / Rocky Ridge	1
Saddleridge	1
Sage Hill	3
Sandstone Valley	6
Scarboro	1
Scenic Acres	4
Sherwood	1
Signal Hill	1
Silverado	1
Skyview	1
South Calgary	2
Southview	3
Southwood	4
Springbank Hill	2
Strathcona	1
Sunalta	3
Sundance	2
Sunnyside	4
Taradale	2
Temple	1
Thornccliffe / Greenview	1
Tuscany	4
Tuxedo Park	3
University Heights	1
University Heights	1
Valley Ridge	6
Varsity	1
Victoria Park	5
Vista Heights	1
Walden	2
West Hillhurst	4



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Community	Participants
West Springs	2
West Sunalta / Scarboro	1
Westgate	3
Wildwood	3
Windsor Park	2
Winston Heights / Mountview	14
Woodlands/Woodbine	8



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Verbatim Comments

The verbatim comments have not been edited for spelling, grammar or punctuation. Language deemed offensive or personally identifying information has been removed.

All comments will be reviewed by the project team. Comments (all or in part) outside the scope of the ward boundary review process are noted as “Out of Scope” and cannot be considered.

Ward	Community	3) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
1	Bowness	Less people are affected.	
1	Bowness	simpler boundaries around wards 7 and 14	
1	Montgomery	No advantage, leave as is	
1	Royal Oak/ Rocky Ridge	It provided a minimal mitigation	
1	Scenic Acres	fewer people effected	
1	Tuscany	Downtown is no longer split between two wards.	
1	Tuscany	SE communities stay in ~ one Ward	
1	Valley Ridge	None	
1	Valley Ridge	Few communities impacted, changes appear minor, so easier for citizens to grasp the changes.	
1	Valley Ridge	None	
1	Varsity	Less. Impact on community districts and electors, boundaries clearly defined	
2	Citadel	None	
2	Sage bluff	No advantage	
2	Sage Hill	Larger numbers. Busier polls. Less representation.	
2	Sage Hill	The boundaries are still somewhat similar to the current ones, so it might be easier for residents to keep track in which Ward they reside.	
2	Sage Hill	Impacting the fewest number of communities and making what seem to be relatively small changes.	
2	Sherwood	Same	
3	Country Hills	Macewen and Sandstone Valley are both frequently accessed by people in Ward 3 so their voice/community requirements will likely align with the rest of Ward 3	
3	Country Hills	Equal number in ward 3	
3	Coventry hills	I see no real advantages	
3	Coventry hills	The areas are a neighborhood with common amenities impacting	
3	Coventry hills	Communities that are in the same ridings federally and provincially will be together municipally.	
3	Coventry hills	More reasonable increase in Ward population within an area with similar needs	
3	Coventry hills	Only 2 additional communities are added to the ward.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	3) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
3	Coventry hills	None. I don't get? We already get ignored way in the north so why would adding adding these communities benefit us at all? I think it's awkward that they would be included in our boundary. Beddington seems like a natural buffer	
3	Coventry hills	Fewer impacts of change	
3	Coventry hills	I feel like including MacEwan and Sandstone Valley would even out the population a bit better for a more even representation.	
3	Coventry hills	Nothing for ward 3	
3	Coventry hills	Slightly bigger population is affected	
3	Hanson Ranch	Both scenarios are to keep Nenshi yes men in their seats for next election, we are not stupid.	Out of scope
3	Harvest Hills	Since I don't live near the areas in question, these proposals are mute.	
3	Harvest Hills	It balances population	
3	Harvest Hills	Please delay changes	Out of scope
3	Hidden Valley	Lots of similarities to Sandstone Valley and MacEwan	
3	Hidden Valley	cost	Out of scope
3	Hidden Valley	None. I don't understand why we have so many wards	
3	Hidden Valley	It allows for growth in Ward 3 as Livingston and Carrington grow	
3	Hidden Valley	zero	
3	Hidden Valley	Minimal change.	
3	Hidden Valley	Smaller change to inclusion of Sandstone Valley	
3	Livingston	I feel option B is better as it will create opportunities for development along the new area.	
3	Panorama Hills	I leaves room for growth in the new communities of Livingstone and Carrington	
3	Panorama Hills	Leaves buffer for future growth in new areas	
3	Panorama Hills	None.	
3	Panorama Hills	Absolutely none	
3	Panorama Hills	Minimal impact to adjacent ward	
4		None	
4	Beddington	For Beddington? Perhaps larger/diverse representation.	
4	Beddington	None	
4	Beddington	It's okay because I would still be a part of ward 4, & the overall changes are not too large, but are sensible slight adjustments based on more recent population densities & current main freeways	
4	Brentwood	Minimizes change	
4	Cambrian Heights	Nil	
4	Charleswood	Limited changes between current ward boundaries and proposed new boundaries.	
4	Charleswood	None	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	3) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
4	Dalhousie	None. As long as policy criteria are met there's nothing controversial	
4	Highwood	fewer communities affected	
4	Huntington Hills	Keeps Beddington within the same ward.	
4	Huntington Hills	Fewer changes than B	
4	MacEwan	For my community I see no advantage to Scenario A, we would be represented by a councillor who's focus would be on Country Hills and has no interest in Nose Hill Park area.	
4	MacEwan	It properly reflects my interest regarding where I live, along with neighbors and how we are regarded in city matters.	
4	MacEwan	No longer being in Sean Chu's ward	Out of scope
4	MacEwan	Fewer communities will change wards.	
4	Mount Pleasant	Less communities affected	
4	North Haven	Not much change.	
4	North Haven	Fewer communities move wards	
4	North Haven	less change	
4	Sandstone Valley	None	
4	Sandstone Valley	none	
4	Sandstone Valley	None	
4	Sandstone Valley	I do not find advantages, as Sandstone Valley is part of Beddington Community for many activities and with that scenario the communities will be from different wards	
4	Sandstone Valley	None	
4	Sandstone Valley	I am not sure if it is a advantage but you are keeping Sandstone Valley MacEwan together which is a good choice since we're one community association for the two areas.	
4	Winston Heights	I like that I would move to Ward 7 and would be the same ward as the rest of my Community.	
4	Winston Heights	I like scenario A because it keeps me in my community which is Winston Heights where I actively participate.	
4	Winston Heights - Mountview	Fewer areas/people would be impacted by these changes than in scenario B. Also the community alignment to Ward boundaries seems to make more sense	
5	Castleridge	None	
5	Martindale	Not Applicable	
5	Red Stone	I think to raise more tax if the city too big like Toronto.	Out of scope
5	Saddleridge	The only advantage is that it is better than the status quo.	
5	Skyview	None	
5	Taradale	Minor changes to existing boundaries, means less logistical headache for people living in the area?	



Ward	Community	3) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
6	Coach Hill	I have no faith in city council to do this. It must be done independent of gerrymandering hacks like Gian-Carlo Carra who admits he wants to rig the system.	Out of scope
6	Coach Hill	None, it's a waste of money in a down economy	Out of scope
6	Cougar Ridge	Less people affected by the change	
6	Glamorgan	I don't see much difference than what it is now.	
6	Glamorgan	None	
6	Glamorgan	While my area is not impacted, this proposal has the lesser impact to communities. This means more familial boundaries are maintained and units are relatively unchanged.	
6	Glamorgan	N/A	
6	Glenbrook	Less communities 'moving' within Ward boundaries, but still creates a better proportional balance	
6	Glenbrook	There are 3 Wards that seem to be at issue here in both scenarios. All other wards are done in block format whereas these 3 are gerrymandered probably at the councillor request.	Out of scope
6	Glendale	Consistent	
6	Patterson	None	
6	Patterson	I disagree with moving ward boundaries.	
6	Richmond Hill	An independent commission should oversee this process	Out of scope
6	Richmond Road	There is less population loss in Ward 11.	
6	Signal Hill	None!!	
6	Springbank Hill	NONE	
6	Springbank Hill	I really don't understand this survey	
6	Strathcona	I don't care which scenario you choose as long as it is based on keeping communities voting together. I would like to see fewer Wards because we have too many career politicians .	
6	West Springs	None	
6	West Springs	?	
6	Westgate	Less extreme changes in overall boundaries.	
6	Westgate	None	
7	Banff Trail	More "blocky" wards	
7	Banff Trail	there is not enough information and the map does not come up	
7	Capitol Hill	Keep children in same sports/school zones	
7	Capitol Hill	less communities affected, wards seem to be grouped around type of neighbourhood	
7	Crescent Heights	Balances the wards better while maintaining a grouping of communities that would have been constructed at similar time frames. This allows a more unified representation of infrastructure needs in the community.	
7	Crescent Heights	Less modifications	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	3) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
7	Crescent Heights	Not affected	
7	Crescent Heights	None	
7	Crescent Heights	better geographic separation	
7	Crescent Heights	Don't know of how this has changed .	
7	East Village	Few changes, I suppose	
7	Eau Claire	neither scenario affects Eau Claire	
7	Hillhurst	Fewer changes to which ward residents live in	
7	Hillhurst	Less disruption than Scenario B	
7	Montgomery	Less change	
7	Mount Pleasant	1. Most importantly - I would not be in Sean Chu's ward. Mount Pleasant continues to be represented by a Ward Councillor who considers both downtown and inner city.	Out of scope
7	Mount Pleasant	I would stay in my current ward, which I appreciate.	
7	Mount Pleasant	A-OK	
7	Mount Pleasant	makes ward 7 tighter and more aligned	
7	Mount Pleasant	That Bridgeland and Renfrew join the other communities on the west side of Deerfoot, and we avoid changing our councillor.	
7	Mount Pleasant	Would stay within Ward 7 along with other communities with which we have many similar concerns and issues.	
7	Mount Pleasant	None	
7	Mountview	similar issues to communities in Ward 7 rather than Ward 4, especially in the NW. Currently Ward 7 has more core issues than suburban issues.	
7	Mount Pleasant	Including the two areas west of Deerfoot. Doesn't make sense to lump them into the other side. DO THE BEST OF BOTH: move Ren/Bridge to 7, annex MtP/Tux/WH to 4. THAT is the best scenario for these areas!!!!	
7	Mount Pleasant	My community remains connected to an "inner city" ward. Renfrew and Downtown West are added to Ward 7 where they are a natural fit..	
7	Point McKay	Provide a larger ward for the city Centre. The wards are better defined by being more boxy	
7	Renfrew	None	
7	Sunnyside	Relatively small tweaks. Like how all Downtown is in Ward 7 and all Beltline is in Ward 8.	
7	Sunnyside	Adding Bridgeland and Renfrew to include them with the rest of the "north shore" makes way more sense. Using Deerfoot-Stoney as a logical barrier between Wards 12 + 14	
7	Sunnyside	Keeps more historic neighbourhoods together	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	3) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
7	Tuxedo Park	These are all the neighbourhoods we participate in as a family. It encompasses our local school, parks, several community centres where we seek programs and connection. These neighbourhoods are very linked together by people and even by foot or bike.	
7	Tuxedo Park	Advantages of being in inner city	
7	Tuxedo Park	Keeps North inner city together, group would have similar issues	
7	Tuxedo Park	Keeps Mount Pleasant, Tuxedo Park & Winston Heights all together	
7	Tuxedo Park	My Neighbourhood would remain in ward 7. My political views align better with others in the city centre.	
7	Tuxedo Park	Makes sense, groups more similar inner city communities together.	
7	Tuxedo Park	That Tuxedo Park stays in the Ward 7, where our city shaping priorities align with the surrounding inner-city communities	
7	University Heights	none	
7	University Heights	geographic boundaries make more sense; Aligns better with CPS District 3 & common issues; common major roads 16th Ave and Memorial Dr; Keeps North Hill Plan Groups together; better for other multicomunity plans in future;	
7	West Hillhurst	Population is better dispersed	
7	West Hillhurst	Fewer communities will be impacted by Ward changes.	
7	West Hillhurst	Continuity of communities included	
7	West Hillhurst	With close proximity to downtown the community shares common values and concerns with the other inner city neighbourhoods	
7	Winston Heights	Keeps me in a ward with similar communities and wants/needs	
7	Winston Heights	Community cohesion, Adding NE inner city and DT west to ward 7 makes sense, it doesn't belong in the primarily SE ward 9	
7	Winston Heights	Keeping neighbourhoods together that have existing relationships	
7	Winston Heights	Joining Renfrew and Bridgeland with the rest of Ward 7 makes sense as these communities along 16 Ave and the bow River share similar characteristics	
7	Winston Heights	For my neighborhood, stays the same as current and fits better with similar neighborhoods. Older neighborhood with increasing density. Mixed demographic of young professionals & families. Influenced by being close to downtown.	
7	Winston Heights	Bridgeland/Renfrew join with rest of communities adjacent to them in a similar ward. These communities are very intertwined	
7	Winston Heights/Mountview	None	
7	Winston Heights/Mountview	we remain part of the inner core	
7	Winston Heights-Mountview	We stay with the same ward and surrounding communities. Ones that are familiar with the needs and workings of the inner city.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	3) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
7	Winston Heights/Mountview	Keeps existing councilor in power	Out of scope
7		Keeps neighbourhoods of similar age/issues in same ward, makes sense geographically	
8	Bankview	Although it affects more people, it affects fewer communities, which may result in less confusion.	
8	Bankview	None	
8	Beltline	Beltline is together	
8	Beltline	I don't like either of them, we have far fewer wards with multiple winners using the Single Transferable Vote (Droop Quota).	Out of scope
8	Beltline	None	
8	Cliff Bungalow	None	
8	Connaught	does not make a difference to me	
8	Currie Barracks	None	
8	Downtown West	May incentivize more cooperation between multiple wards on Centre City issues. Maybe there are advantages for westward alignment, although nothing has materialized.	
8	Garrison	Fixing past boundary issues, and since this addresses current residents, the likelihood of these changing again is low, as well as only 4 areas without residents will be addressed so if there are changes in the future, it will be minimal.	
8	Garrison Green	Ward 8 seems to stay the same but incorporates Lakeview, which is fine. There is a bit of the west-end includes as well, which doesn't make a difference really.	
8	Garrison Woods	Better alignment to neighborhoods	
8	Killarney	Not as much change that would impact the election process.	
8	Lower Mount Royal	Changes are distributed more evenly.	
8	Marda Loop	Nothing, stop wasting money!	Out of scope
8	Rosscarock	Scrap the whole process, and put it to an independent provincial authority!	Out of scope
8	Rosscarock	I see no important difference between the two	
8	Scarboro	less area-map visual change - lesser confusion, maybe?	
8	Sunalta	Appears to be the most even distribution	
8	Sunalta	I appreciate that the City of Calgary needs to balance its wards in terms of population, but I don't see a discussion of any other factors here, and I think others should be taken into consideration as well.	
8		Can't see any.	
8	Wildwood	familiarity with old boundaries	
8	Wildwood	Better than the status quo.	
9	Albert Park / Radisson Heights	NA	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	3) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
9	Applewood	It keeps East Calgary together. It keeps the Max Purple / Route 1 corridor largely intact. It also ensures that the transportation corridor of 9th Avenue/17th Avenue SE together. It unites Ogden and Riverbend which are sister communities.	
9	Applewood	It increases the size of the size of the ward into the core, will this increase our taxes and funding coming to the ward? IE Police	
9	Bridgeland	None	
9	Bridgeland	It keep the inner city looked after by more councillors. Helping to keep some focus on the inner city and not just the burbs.	
9	Bridgeland	I don't know	
9	Bridgeland	Groups Bridgeland into a more logical geographic community that we have day-to-day interaction with	
9	Bridgeland	Keeps most of the inner city wards under one councillor	
9	Bridgeland	I prefer this based on how it impacts my ward and my former ward (11).	
9	Bridgeland	little differences between the scenarios. No batter which ward people end up in they will have incompetent representation	
9	Bridgeland	We are grouped with more like communities that make more geographic sense	
9	Bridgeland/Riverside	Neither here nor there	
9	Dover	None - should be done be independent body; councillors should not have a say	Out of scope
9	Dover	Fewer changes.	
9	Erin Woods	none	
9	Fairview	Fairview will then be included with its neighbouring communities (Acadia, etc). this is great	
9	Fairview	That our ward is unchanged; we are grouped with other neighbourhoods of similar socio-economic backgrounds	
9	Fairview	Industrial lands currently in ward 9 stay in ward 9. Fairview residential/community moves to a primarily residential riding, therefore presumably having a more focused representative who is more likely to focus on the needs of the community.	
9	Fairview	Belong to other like communities in terms of transportation and age. Ward 9 is too large and it's all about Ramsey & Inglewood	
9	Fairview	More consistent with current geography	
9	Fairview	Similar communities within the Ward	
9	Forest Lawn	Keeps Ward 9 cohesive	
9	Forest Lawn	We're not ghettoized.	
9	Inglewood	Puts Bridgeland in a grouping more consistent with its community values. Matching it with Hillhurst, Kensington etc.	
9	Inglewood	None	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	3) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
9	Inglewood	Ward 8 would take on areas that would fit well with them. Deerfoot is a true boundary, not just physically, but in cohesive understanding of the community.	
9	Inglewood	We can have more people in the ward to vote our current councillor out next time!	Out of scope
9	Inglewood	Less change, but I don't think for residents that is much of an advantage	
9	Inglewood	None	
9	Inglewood	Less significant change to boundaries. Fewer communities impacted	
9	Inglewood	From a ward perspective, I can't see any.	
9	Inglewood	There really aren't any.	
9	Inglewood	None	
9	Inglewood.	i can't think of any advantages to this scenario.	
9	Lynnwood	It's better than Plan B.	
9	Manchester	Minimal change to the wards, geographically. Similar areas/communities remain within the same ward.	
9	Ogden	None	
9	Ogden	Ward boundaries are maintained closed to present configuraton	
9	Ogden	perhaps easier to implement? fewer communities impacted.	
9	Penbrooke Meadows	Not a fan, but it shrinks boundaries for 9 making it smaller. I guess would be better to handle. my optimistic view	
9	Penbrooke Meadows	The present Ward 9 boundaries best represent the Calgary East and the Greater Forest Lawn culture. Scenarios A and B fail to include the present balance between 4 and 5 wards. Doing anything to compromise the ideal found in Ward 9 is a travesty.	
9	Penbrooke Meadows	As I am legally blind, I cannot comment on the advantages as represented in the map	
9	Ramsay	My ward tends to stay the same	
9	Ramsay	Mission Leaves Ward 11 and Joins Ward 8, a much more compatible ward	
9	Ramsay	The only advantage to A is that a smaller number of communities are affected, and people tend to identify themselves by community.	
9	Ramsay	The explanation of why this is needed need to be more dtailed	
9	Ramsay	cant open it	
9	Ramsay	None	
9	Renfrew	Less substantial shifts in boundaries. Appears to group together similar neighborhoods	
9	Renfrew	Better integration of inner city communities into one ward	
9	Renfrew	More wards have "inner city" & suberbia with the wards. Will reduce inner city vs suberbia council. Hopefully more democratic.	
9	Renfrew	too complex to answer	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	3) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
9	Renfrew	None	
9	Renfrew	It connects like communities that face the same issues	
9	Renfrew	it represents small adjustments only	
9	Renfrew	Seems to link Renfrew to the inner city, rather than the suburbs	
9	Renfrew	Bringing our community better in line with similar communities	
9	Renfrew	Like the idea of moving Renfrew into a Ward with more North Hill communities, rather than the current Ward 9 configuration with Inglewood/Ramsay	
9	Renfrew	It brings neighbourhood on the east side of the riding under the same Ward, also keeps communities with common interests together.	
9	Renfrew	That Ward 9 area stays on the South side of the river. Ward 7 takes up most of the inner city north communities. Noticed changes to Ward 8.	
9	Renfrew	I think the main advantages is that it would bring me more inline with my direct neighbours. Allowing us to care about more similar problems in our area.	
9	Renfrew	More similar to other political boundaries. Residents between 16 Ave NE - 32 Ave NE are more closely connected to Renfrew & Bridgeland than to other neighbourhoods north of them.	
9	Renfrew	The main advantages are that fewer communities overall are impacted.	
9	Renfrew	More in common with Ward 7 residents and businesses and their concerns	
9	Riverbend	Riverbend should maintain in the same ward as quarry park as they are our closest neighbors and we share a major route (18th street) and need to plan around that area together.	
9	Southview	None!	
9	Southview	Smaller geographical area	
9	Southview/Dover	No comment	
10	Abbeydale	none	
10	Abbeydale	n/a	
10	Abbeydale	Lower impact	
10	Marlborough Park	None	
10	Pineridge	Ward 7's boundary is makes more sense.	
10	Temple	Keeps communities with similar makeup and politics together, minimal communities affected.	
11	Bay View	Ward boundaries should be made by an independent group. This scenario appears is to be the better of the two	Out of scope
11	Beltline	Relatively minimal changes. Some of the geographic changes make sense, such as including Lakeview in Ward 8.	
11	Beltline	None.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	3) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
11	Beltline	Fewer changes	
11	Beltline	Less communities change wards	
11	Victoria Park	Un-gerrymanders true ward 8 people out of the strange suburban driven ward 11 boundary.	
11	Braeside	14 city councillors is not enough to be effectively represented	Out of scope
11	Cedarbrae	smaller ward	
11	Elbow Park	There aren't any	
11	Elbow Park	None	
11	Elbow Park	Follows laws and guidelines, less drastic change to my ward	
11	Erlton	Large mix of interests and socio-economic communities/residents	
11	Erlton	None	
11	Erlton	None	
11	Erlton	Brings the number of residents impacted close to average for ward size.	
11	Erlton	I don't agree with any of these changes, this is just another waste of taxpayer dollars by city bureaucrats, it should be left as is.	Out of scope
11	Erlton	Each ward should have the same amount of people in on. This is a complete waste of time! Why is the city spending their time on such a useless project!	Out of scope
11	Haysboro	Like communities are kept together (schools, sports)	
11	Haysboro	Fewer electors and fewer community districts will be impacted.	
11	Lake view	None	
11	Lakeview	None	
11	Lakeview	Reducing the size of ward 11	
11	LAKEVIEW	I AGREE WITH RETURNING LAKEVIEW TO " NORTH OF THE RESERVOIR"	
11	Lakeview	aligns lakeview more with central west	
11	Lakeview	The wards encompass similar neighbourhoods, house size, incomes, etc that will be easier to be represented together	
11	Lakeview	I don't see any advantages and question the motive behind any change being made.	
11	Lakeview	Keeps Inglewood and Ramsey in Ward 9	
11	Lakeview	Lakeview joins communities to the north of it in ward 8, which is a better geographic fit	
11	Lakeview	None - I want to remain in Ward 11	
11	Lakeview	There are none, except for prettying up the ward boundary map.	
11	Lakeview	Nothing	
11	Lakeview	Gerrymandering	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	None	
11	Lakeview	I see no advantages.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	3) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
11	Lakeview	None	
11	Lakeview	minimal changes	
11	Lakeview	Jeromy has been incredibly inclusive in the challenges that we residents of this community have been experiencing in the last five years due to the Stoney Trail construction and the fact we are sandwiched into an aging neighbourhood.	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	There are no advantages to Scenario A	
11	Maple Ridge	Looks more well rounded in the inner city.	
11	Marda Loop	The explanatory information given is completely incomprehensible. You would need an advanced degree in statistics to understand it! it	
11	Marda Loop	less gerrymandering. Too many wards are connected to the downtown / inner city.	Out of scope
11	Meadowlark Park	Minimizes the amount of change in communities	
11	Meadowlark Park	I would like to see what the INDEPENDENT COMMISSION recommended. This is NOT the job for City Council	Out of scope
11	Mission	Mission and Cliff Bungalow both appear to be in the same ward	
11	Mission / Cliff Bungalow	I'm out of Ward 11. I think it's stupid to have the same person representing more suburban communities like Willow Park with inner city communities like Mission. We have different needs and would be better represented with other inner city communities	
11	Oakridge	Do need see ANY NEED FOR CHANGES TO CURRENT WARD BOUNDARIES	
11	Oakridge	It would be a more accurate reflection of the area. Both Lakeview and Oakridge have a vested interest in the reservoir.	
11	Oakridge	unsure	
11	Oakridge	We keep Councillor Farkas	Out of scope
11	Palliser	Shrinks ward 11 - somewhat more homogeneous ward	
11	Palliser	Too confusing - not clear at all	
11	Rideau Park	none, how am I supposed to decide when you give me standard deviations. I'm not a math or stats major. This survey is a waste of time as designed.	Out of scope
11	Rideau Park	I don't see any	
11	Southwood	I think it has no advantages at all.	
11	Southwood	For ward 11 it is making the area smaller and allowing better focus to like minded communities	
11	Southwood	Ward 11 is closer to the desired deviation	
11	Victoria Centre	Reunites the communities in the Beltline Community Association, currently served by 2 Councillors.	
11	Victoria Park	We move to Ward 8!	
11	Victoria Park	Reconnecting Vic Park with the rest of the beltline	
11	Victoria Park	I am not group with SW suburbs when I live downtown	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	3) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
11	Windsor Park	Smallest changes, least disruption	
11	Windsor Park	I'd need to see the map, not these nonsensical numbers.	
12	Auburn Bay	The line is very clear (Deerfoot)	
12	Auburn Bay	I don't see any difference between current and A	
12	Auburn Bay	I'm not sure I see many advantages. Cranston out and Douglasdale and Riverbend in. So more of a focus on Greenline communities?	
12	Auburn Bay	Please refer to the independent commission report on boundaries!	Out of scope
12	Auburn Bay	There are none	
12	Auburn Bay	McKenzie lake, McKenzie town, Auburn Bay, mahogany, Cranston all function together. Lines at 130th and bow River. Weight Councillor votes by ward population citywide	
12	Auburn Bay	Does not seem to affect me in Auburn Bay.	
12	Copperfield	Very little change to Ward 12	
12	Copperfield	we will remain in the same ward - however making it a smaller ward may provide the elected official to better mitigate and represent the constituents	
12	Copperfield	for Ward 12, it creates a neat box of neighbourhoods east of the Deerfoot. Aligns Cranston with the communities west of the Deerfoot.	
12	Copperfield	Nothing	
12	Copperfield	None	
12	Copperfield	There are none and you still screw Ward 3 and 12	
12	Copperfield	Less changes for my community	
12	Cranston	No advantages	
12	Cranston	None.	
12	Cranston	Newer communities are together with similar issues easier to address under the same elected official.	
12	Cranston	Less change overall	
12	Cranston	None	
12	Cranston	None	
12	Cranston	Decreased the size of the ward	
12	Cranston	Some correction to populations of wards	
12	Cranston	This isn't the best.	
12	Cranston	none	
12	Douglasdale/glen	Less impact and creates some balance. My community won't be split between 9 and 12. I feel the communities in 12 will have similar issues than those in 9.	
12	Mahogany	Ward 12 is projected to see significant growth over future years, so it will grow without quickly becoming an over-populated ward than others (as it currently is). Adding douglasdale is a natural fit geographically and socio-economically.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	3) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
12	Mahogany	None	
12	Mahogany	Smaller area	
12	Mahogany	None	
12	Mahogany	This isn't mobile friendly/optimized?	
12	McKenzie Towne	One less ward...	
12	McKenzie Towne	Fewer communities impacted by changes	
12	McKenzie Towne	Less change, plans for growth in Seton	
12	New Brighton	Minimal impacted citizens	
12	Quarry Park	Smaller amount of communities impacted with change.	
12	Quarry Park	Fewer communities with changes	
12	Riverbend	The map does not show clearly any differences, would be better if you also wrote out the scenarios.	
12	Riverbend	None	
12	Riverbend	none for Riverbend	
12	Riverbend	We stay in the same ward	
12	Riverbend	None I don't like how my community is parceled out	
12	Riverbend	It groups similar communities together	
12	Riverbend	Geographical similarity	
12	Riverbend	City council should not be deciding wars boundaries. An independent panel should be.	Out of scope
12	Riverbend	Keeps Riverbend with Quarry Park and Douglasdale.	
12	Riverbend	NONE	
12	Riverbend	Keeping Riverbend, Quarry Park and Douglasglen groupes in the same ward makes much more sense since we share the same issues (traffic on 18th and 24th St, south hill development etc).	
12	Riverbend	Riverbend has more issues in common with inner city neighbourhoods than SE suburbs. For example, Mackenzie, Copperwood, Auburn Bay.	
13	Bridlewood	Follow policy	
13	Bridlewood	none	
13	Canyon Meadows	None.	
13	Evergreen	None	
13	Millrise	There is no change	
13	Silverado	I like it the best	
13	Woodbine	I can't see the scenarios on my iPhone. Please optimize to mobile.	
13	Woodbine	For me, none.	
13	Woodbine	MANY SEE IN THE ORDER! 1. LESS COUNSELORS ON TAXPAYERS SHOULDERS 2. EQUAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTED CITIZENS, 3. MIX OF NEW AND OLD COMMUNITIES	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	3) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
13	Woodbine	Nonw	
13	Woodlands	Appeals to all the people who don't like change, any change.	
13	Woodlands / Woodbine	Less intense deviations in population per ward	
14	Chaparral Valley	I believe the socioeconomic factors within the communities are better accurately represented in the first split.	
14	Douglasdale	I was in A before and it looks like I would be back in Ward 12 which suits me just fine	
14	Lake Chaparral	Less changes	
14	Legacy	Ehhhhhhhhh.	
14	Legacy	None	
14	McKenzie Lake	smallest change to boundries	
14	McKenzie Lake	I don't see any.	
14	Midnapore	Better balance than the existing ward boundaries, fewer communities will be displaced into new wards compared to scenario b	
14	Sundance	Not sure	
14	Walden	makes more sense as it aligned with communities on the exterior of the city.	
14	Walden	No impact	
	No Ward/Community given	Getting a better Alderman.	Out of scope

Ward	Community	4) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
1	Bowness	Deviation is very close to the min/max allowed at -15/15. So boundaries may need to be redrawn again very soon.	
1	Bowness	not sure what you accomplish with the change around the 9 to 11 boundary	
1	Royal Oak Rocky Ridge	Did not fully address the situation in Ward 12	
1	Tuscany	Huge population deviations exist especially in growing areas of the city like Ward 14 and 3	
1	Tuscany	seems like frairly small changes. Would need to do this all over again in a few years?	
1	Valley Ridge	Why the change. We are in recession instead of wasting time and tax payer money!!!!	Out of scope
1	Valley Ridge	More citizens impacted. Deviation is higher than B and may widen such that another correction will be needed in a short timeframe.	
1	Valley Ridge	More money waisted	Out of scope



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	4) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
2	Citadel	Too much population variation	
2	Sage bluff	No point	
2	Sage Hill	Smaller numbers. More representation. Less voters taken from radical left wing ridings.	
2	Sage Hill	Equalizing the number of residents per ward isn't as close as it could be.	
2	Sage Hill	Does not narrow the gap in variance nearly enough, if changes need to be made it makes the most sense to take the opportunity to narrow the gap as much as possible.	
2	Sherwood	Change	
3	Country Hills	This could mean less focus for Ward 3 initiatives, particularly those that focus on positive impact for the East side of the Ward.	
3	Country Hills	May have redo the boundaries in a few yeats	
3	Coventry hills	Slitting a district	
3	Coventry hills	Ward 3 gets bigger which means there is increased diversity of issues relevant to the ward.	
3	Coventry hills	None	
3	Coventry hills	None.	
3	Coventry hills	I don't see what the benefit is.	
3	Coventry hills	My require future adjustments as the outskirts continue to grow	
3	Coventry hills	It is still not even enough I believe.	
3	Coventry hills	Panorama Hills is split into 2 wards. The Northern Hills Community would be much better served if all the northern hills communities they were all in one ward.	
3	Coventry hills	We miss Beddington, which is just as if not more connected to the ward 3 area than MacEwan and Sandstone Valley.	
3	Coventry hills	The deviation is still too large	
3	Harvest Hills	See above	
3	Harvest Hills	Geography it does quite line up	
3	Harvest Hills	Please delay changes	Out of scope
3	Hidden Valley	None	
3	Hidden Valley	none do more with less like all industries	
3	Hidden Valley	Wards 7 and 8 look pretty darn small to me. Again, why do we need so many wards? It's not as though our councillors listen to us.	
3	Hidden Valley	I don't see any	
3	Hidden Valley	zero	
3	Hidden Valley	Doesn't do enough to equal the population.	
3	Hidden Valley	Splits an existing community	
3	Livingston	Area sharing between existing communities.	
3	Panorama Hills	Some big deviations still	

Ward	Community	4) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
3	Panorama Hills	Still means ward 3 has a materially lower population, and as such has over representation in council	
3	Panorama Hills	Being the other side of Beddington Trail, they don't have the same experience for commuting.	
3	Panorama Hills	This plan is flawed as it was not designed by an independent non-vested person or committee	Out of scope
3	Panorama Hills	None	
4	Beddington	None	
4	Beddington	For Beddington? Isolation from central city focused policies. We should be looking at updating and building up...not out.	
4	Beddington	Trying to remove a popular Councillor that goes against the socialist city hall mentality, by rearranging boundaries in order to keep them from being re-elected	Out of scope
4	Beddington Heights	I can't think of much	
4	Brentwood	Not a long term solution	
4	Cambrian Heights	Gerrymandering to disadvantage incumbents in Wards 4 and 11 instead of addressing the issues within Wards 3, 7, 5 and 12 with minor tweaks.	Out of scope
4	Charleswood	Can't think of any.	
4	Charleswood	My community should be moved back to Ward 7. We don't have anything in common with the communities North of John Laurie. I work at the University of Calgary. I use the University LRT. All my connections are with Ward 7.	
4	Dalhousie	None. As long as policy criteria are met there's nothing controversial	
4	Highwood	larger deviations	
4	Huntington Hills	No opinion	
4	Huntington Hills	Doesn't address as effectively	
4	MacEwan	Our new Councillor would no longer have interest in 14th Street, Centre Street, Beddington, Nose Hill Park, basically the areas that MacEwan residents live and use every day.	
4	MacEwan	None for me.	
4	MacEwan	None. The city should be putting resources towards easing tax burden and not changing political lines.	Out of scope
4	MacEwan	I don't see any	
4	MacEwan	Community associations may not be in the same ward.	
4	Mount Pleasant	Still higher variances than Scenario B	
4	North Haven	Not much change. Why bother at all. Don't like that Beddington community is split.	
4	North Haven	Contributes to strange/un-intuitive ward boundaries where Wards 8, 9, and 11 meet	
4	North Haven	less change. deviation is still great and more people are impacted	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	4) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
4	Sandstone Valley	It separate Sandstone Valley and MacEwan from the communities we are most connected to for services and retail, and shares common needs re transit & infrastructure & renewal.	
4	Sandstone Valley	Ward 3 will grow with new communities so these options appear to have lack of foresight.	
4	Sandstone Valley	Doesn't have future of growing communities in mind??	
4	Sandstone Valley	The same as I mentioned before, Sandstone Valley is part of Beddington Community for many activities and with that scenario the communities will be from different wards	
4	Sandstone Valley	We are in Ward 3 separated by a major thoroughfare where issues affecting issues the newly added communities will not be addressed	
4	Sandstone Valley	We would lose Sean Chu I believe and he is quite helpful and involved in our community association.	Out of scope
4	Winston Heights	None that I can see.	
4	Winston Heights - Mountview	There are still some high deviations present in some areas	
5	Castleridge	manipulating populations - no gerrymandering needed	Out of scope
5	Martindale	Not Applicable	
5	Red Stone	2 and 3 need to reduce the boundary, so Calgary it is not too big city does not increasing taxes because of population need more money funding.	Out of scope
5	Saddleridge	Still far too much deviation.	
5	Skyview	Skyview needs to become part of ward 3	
5	Taradale	There are some inner city communities that are being cut sliced into different wards.	
6	Coach Hill	I have no faith in city council to do this. It must be done independent of gerrymandering hacks like Gian-Carlo Carra who admits he wants to rig the system.	Out of scope
6	Coach Hill	None, it's a waste of money in a down economy	Out of scope
6	Cougar Ridge	Still a lot of discrepancies in ward population	
6	Glamorgan	None	
6	Glamorgan	Border should be Darcee not 37 st.	
6	Glamorgan	If the process is to balance out the elector population across the city, less impact means less redistribution, which means the objective is not met.	
6	Glamorgan	N/A	
6	Glenbrook	Not sure if it deals with future growth as well as Scenario B	
6	Glendale	None	
6	Patterson	alignment still out	
6	Patterson	I disagree with moving ward boundaries.	
6	Richmond Hill	An independent commission should oversee this process	Out of scope
6	Richmond Road	Too much population loss in Ward 4.	
6	Signal Hill	It arbitrarily changes the boundaries unnecessarily	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	4) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
6	Springbank Hill	STILL HAVE POOR POPULATION DEVIATION BETWEEN WARDS	
6	Springbank Hill	You should be more clear in your maps and how these changes will impact people	
6	Strathcona	Just don't let the Council tinker with it for political purposes.	Out of scope
6	West Springs	Less equal representation. Less democratic as some Votes will be worth more than others	
6	West Springs	Still significant deviation	
6	Westgate	Not enough balance in current population but may become more balanced with future planned growth.	
6	Westgate	None	
7	Banff Trail	More demographically uniform voters in ward blocks	
7	Banff Trail	there is not enough information	
7	Capitol Hill	none.	
7	Crescent Heights	With an increased amount of density for communities in closer proximity to downtown. Those population numbers may increase.	
7	Crescent Heights	Larger deviations,	
7	Crescent Heights	Not affected	
7	Crescent Heights	Still a large variance for Wards 3, 7 and 14.	
7	Crescent Heights	not sure	
7	Crescent Heights	Don't have that known	
7	East Village	Still a lot of population deviation	
7	Eau Claire	Eau Claire should not be part of Ward 7 - it's needs are too different from the rest of the ward.	
7	Hillhurst	The population is not evenly distributed between the wards	
7	Hillhurst	Mayland Heights, Vista Heights and Belfast should be part of Ward 7 due to the historical patterns of travel related to business and recreation/personal trips.	
7	Hillhurst	A lot of changes to still have a huge spread and Wards like 3 and 14 close to needing to be re-evaluated again.	
7	Montgomery	Too much discrepancy in population between wards	
7	Mount Pleasant	There are none.	
7	Mount Pleasant	higher deviations remain. It's not clear that either scenario adequately accounts for population growth.	
7	Mount Pleasant	N/A (no impact to me/my community)	
7	Mount Pleasant	none	
7	Mount Pleasant	The little jogs at Edmonton Trail and north of 32nd Ave seem pointless and exclusionary of a small group of residences.	
7	Mount Pleasant	Would have a fairly high positive deviance.	
7	Mount Pleasant	None	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	4) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
7	Mountview	may not have some similar issues to those downtown	
7	Mount Pleasant	Mt. P and Tuxedo Park are still lumped in with a downtown mentality. Up on the hill, it's different, more residential than commercial and high rises.	
7	Mount Pleasant	None for my area. Ward 8's loss of downtown areas is unfortunate.	
7	Point McKay	The weird thing with the boundary around Edmonton trail & the Golf Course. The boundary should be 32 ave throughout.	
7	Renfrew	Not proportionate	
7	Sunnyside	Ward 7 includes too many communities. It would have heavy concentration of issues like Downtown, Green Line, several universities, major institutions, and lots of redevelopment. These all mean a lower population and fewer communities would be good.	
7	Sunnyside	The redistribution just causes a swing in deviation, shifting it to different communities instead of closing it.	
7	Sunnyside	N/A	
7	Tuxedo Park	None.	
7	Tuxedo Park	nothing	
7	Tuxedo Park	8 9 11 alignment strange	
7	Tuxedo Park	The variance is bigger	
7	Tuxedo Park	Can't think of any.	
7	University Heights	doesn't rectify the disparities	
7	University Heights	larger deviation, may increase faster to +15%; adds complex commercial issues from downtown.	
7	Hillhurst	Makes too few changes to representation in the outer suburbs.	
7	Hillhurst	Can't think of any except gerrymandering	Out of scope
7	Winston Heights	Ward 9 seems to be huge - lots of different interests to represent	
7	Winston Heights	Ward 9 should grow more to the south as in Scenario B	
7	Winston Heights	None	
7	Winston Heights	Since there is no change for our neighborhood, I don't see any.	
7	Winston Heights	None	
7	Winston Heights/Mountview	Putting dissimilar area together	
7	Winston Heights-Mountview	Currently don't see any	
7	Winston Heights / Mountview	none	
7		Cuts Inglewood in half in terms of wards, for no apparent reason	
8	Bankview	Gerrymandering	Out of scope
8	Beltline	Still large deviations on Wards 3, 7, and 12	
8	Beltline	Inglewood and Ramsay aren't included	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	4) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
8	Beltline	Lakeview tends to vote more conservative. I dont want another Ward 11 situation where the voice of those in Erlton and Mission are drowned out by people in the suburbs.	
8	Beltline	The population divergence between wards remains very high.	
8	Beltline	That it isn't STV. We used STV from 1917 to 1971, it's clear that politicians can't be trusted to make ward boundaries. Let's just split the city into four quadrants with 4 councilors each, elected under STV.	Out of scope
8	Beltline	This concentrates power even more into the hands of those representing the suburbs.	Out of scope
8	Cliff Bungalow	Massive variation in representation.	
8	Connaught	does not make a difference to me	
8	Currie Barracks	That you are deliberately screwing up ward 11 because Jeromy is outspoken against the current Council.	Out of scope
8	Downtown West	Grouping Downtown West with Sunalta and Beltline is challenging due to daunting physical barriers (e.g. CP Rail Tracks, Planetarium, West Village Site) - our community has much more in common with areas to the east than west with respect to issues.	
8	Garrison	Affects more people and has a larger deviaton points,	
8	Garrison Green	Nothing	
8	Garrison Woods	unsue	
8	Killarney	Boundaries not staying the same.	
8	Lower Mount Royal	Parts of the core remain in the relatively suburban Ward 9	
8	Marda Loop	Nothing, stop wasting money!	Out of scope
8	Rosscarock	Scrap the whole process, and put it to an independent provincial authority!	Out of scope
8	Rosscarock	I see no important difference between the two	
8	Scarboro	Less fair on the overall population deviations.	
8	Sunalta	None I can think of	
8	Sunalta	I'm concerned about the approval of 14 new suburban communities in Calgary at a time when Council is facing budgetary constraints. Do ward boundaries have any influence on the interests that are represented at Council, and the way the city grows?	Out of scope
8		You're projecting population growth in Ward 12 (which hasn't happened) and skewed Ward 14 out of line. Too many outliers in this scenario.	
8	Wildwood	The ward has too much focus on downtown. Residential communities are lumped into the same issues as downtown which forces unwanted assumtions and clusters ward issues to the core.	
8	Wildwood	Not addressing the problem of disproportionate representation. Doesn't fix the existing problem.	
9	Albert Park / Radisson Heights	NA	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	4) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
9	Applewood	Nothing, it is the preferred option.	
9	Applewood	It increases the size of our Ward with no increase to our funding directly to police and other resorces.	Out of scope
9	Bridgeland	Our ward is largely non-inner city residential. How can one councillor represent such a diverse area with conflicting interests well?	
9	Bridgeland	Nothing	
9	Bridgeland	I don't know	
9	Bridgeland	Takes the two communities who are seriously unhappy with Carra away from his lack of attention.	Out of scope
9	Bridgeland	little differences between the scenarios. No batter which ward people end up in they will have incompetent representation	Out of scope
9	Bridgeland / Riverside	Deviation further from 0. Increased chances of having to change boundaries again.	
9	Dover	Gerrymandering	Out of scope
9	Dover	The variance of 25 is pretty large.	
9	Erin Woods	Communities west of teh Bow River have nothing in common with those east of the Bow river	
9	Fairview	Don't see any	
9	Fairview	none	
9	Fairview	No disadvantage	
9	Fairview	None	
9	Fairview	Larger deviations	
9	Forest Lawn	Affects quite a few people	
9	Forest Lawn	n/a	
9	Inglewood	Leaves Inglewood and Ramsay in a ward as an outlier of its Ward. To represent ward 9 is not to represent the desires of Inglewood or Ramsay as they are too different.	
9	Inglewood	Weird shape, confusing	
9	Inglewood	Inglewood needs to be part of an area that is more similar with other communities.	
9	Inglewood	We have to put up with the current counsellor	Out of scope
9	Inglewood	Not much changes, Inglewood is still bundled with communities east of Deerfoot that do not have much in common with the River District and inner city	
9	Inglewood	It doesn't balance out representation much better than the current situation	
9	Inglewood	Having a city councillor with his own agenda, who doesn't listen to his constituents.	Out of scope
9	Inglewood	Slightly higher deviation points	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	4) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
9	Inglewood	The size becomes very unwieldy and by extending the boundary to the east makes it even more disparate as far as sharing common issues. The deviation is higher.	
9	Inglewood	Dissimilar communities with very divergent interests and concerns	
9	Inglewood	None	
9	Inglewood.	It creates a ward that is such a mixed bag that it would be impossible to represent.	
9	Lynnwood	Gentrification fails to address lack of proportional representation.	Out of scope
9	Manchester	Higher number of people impacted.	
9	Ogden	Lack of activity area overlap	
9	Ogden	maintains high variance between high and low	
9	Penbrooke Meadows	Minor changes of some communities being removed. not much of a disadvantage to consider mentioning	
9	Penbrooke Meadows	See question 3. Time to go back to the drawing board for Scenario C.	
9	Penbrooke Meadows	The only disadvantage I can comment on, based upon the statistics you provide, is that scenario A affects more people, which would be better if minimized to produce the same results.	
9	Ramsay	Ramsay is lost to Ward 11, a ward with communities that differ widely from our own. It dilutes the urban perspective into suburban values. It removes the opportunity to vote out our current councilor, thus preserving incumbency advantage.	
9	Ramsay	Very high levels of deviation in population between the wards. The urban core communities are particularly affected, with either far higher than average population per ward, or by being gerrymandered off as parts of suburban communities.	
9	Ramsay	See above	
9	Ramsay	it is the less equitable scenario	
9	Ramsay	cant open it	
9	Ramsay	Cuts the east off from stampede and downtown connections	
9	Renfrew	Does not appear to address the continued growth of ward 12 very well.	
9	Renfrew	I can't see anything wrong	
9	Renfrew	Ward 9 loses a large chunk of inner city.	
9	Renfrew	as above	
9	Renfrew	It is completely unacceptable for the impacted residents of ward 9 (one of the most evenly represented wards in the city) to be moved into ward 7, which will be the second most underrepresented ward in the city. Way more deviations overall.	
9	Renfrew	Goes too far north.	
9	Renfrew	none	
9	Renfrew	Larger population than scenario B	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	4) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
9	Renfrew	I do not like this option as it would make 16th Ave the boundary between wards. Resulting in different priorities/views from wards/councillors on either side of 16th ave	
9	Renfrew	I think the downtown and inner-city communities have greater social challenges that most suburbs, so it may be a lot for one representative. Equal doesn't always mean fair when it comes to the burden each councillor will carry.	
9	Renfrew	Ward 7 takes up most of the inner city north communities. But this makes for a much bigger area and population to deal with.	
9	Renfrew	None	
9	Renfrew	There is a higher variance, presumably that is a bad thing.	
9	Renfrew	Nothing	
9	Southview	Gian-Carra	Out of scope
9	Southview	More citizens impacted	
9	Southview / Dover	No comment	
10	Abbeydale	none	
10	Abbeydale	n/a	
10	Abbeydale	Disparity is greater	
10	Marlborough Park	Helps ward 8 and 12, which is not good.	
10	Monterey Park	Will require another adjustment before scenario b will.	
10	Pineridge	Too high of deviations still.	
10	Temple	None in particular.	
11	Acadia	Bigger variance compared to Scenario B.	
11	Bay View	Ward boundaries should be made by an independent group and not by current council	Out of scope
11	Beltline	Going to run into similar problem in Ward 12 that it experiences today as SE communities continue to grow. Seton currently has very little population but will grow. Downtown area loses representation going from 4 councillors to 3.	
11	Beltline	None.	
11	Beltline	Less impact to the metrics you are trying to change	
11	Beltline	Not as balanced in distribution of population. Residents' vote in Ward 3 has much more weight than Ward 14.	
11	Victoria Park	None	
11	Braeside	14 city councillors is not enough to be effectively represented	Out of scope
11	Elbow Park	Too small of an area	
11	Elbow Park	Less equitable by population	
11	Elbow Park	Doesn't seem to be an issue	
11	Erlton	Too little emphasis on inner-city concerns	
11	Erlton	I would like see my place in Stanley park hill not erlton	
11	Erlton	none	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	4) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
11	Erlton	I don't agree with any of these changes, this is just another waste of taxpayer dollars by city bureaucrats, it should be left as is.	Out of scope
11	Erlton	Again, it doesn't show how many people are in each ward, that's what matters! What a complete waste of taxpayers money!	Out of scope
11	Haysboro	Too much difference in population	
11	Haysboro	More people will be impacted.	
11	Lake view	We would be losing North Glenmore park to a different parks division we finally have things happening in the park. Why do they change regional parks in the scenario when they have experienced staff And management	
11	Lakeview	That I won't have Jeromy Farkas as my councillor anymore.	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	None	
11	Lakeview	None	
11	Lakeview	Lakeview is now in Ward 8.....	
11	Lakeview	I see any change being made by counsel as a conflict of interest and an affront to democracy	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	Not sure	
11	Lakeview	None that I can see	
11	Lakeview	My neighbourhood has more similarity with and connection with to the neighbourhoods south and west of it than the ones north and east of it. And even this scenario leaves new ward 8 with more people per representative which is unfair.	
11	Lakeview	We are well served by our current councillor. This is a conservative riding and our current councillor shares many of the same fiscal values that the majority of our residents do.	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	Makes 11 too small, cuts Lakeview out of 11.	
11	Lakeview	Gerrymandering	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	We will lose OUR councillor Farkas	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	Lakeview is similar to communities South of Glenmore Lake. Communities North of Glenmore Trail are very different in design, density, and character. The impact of changes in Tsuu Tina Nation should be in the scope of one Councillor n Tsuu Tina	
11	Lakeview	It cuts Lakeview out of Ward 11	
11	Lakeview	changes to WARD 11 boundaries	
11	Lakeview	Loss of intelligence from the history of managing this community's challenges!	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	Scenario A undemocratically deprives me of my democratically elected representative	Out of scope
11	Maple Ridge	n/a	
11	Marda Loop	still some "pan handles" which are generally a product of gerrymandering or a secondary agenda.	Out of scope



Ward	Community	4) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
11	Meadowlark Park	Still leads to a situation of over-representation of the North and under-representation of the south.	
11	Meadowlark Park	I would like to see what the INDEPENDENT COMMISSION recommended. This is NOT the job for City Council	Out of scope
11	Mission	Mission and Cliff Bungalow are separated from other city centre neighbourhood and in a ward with other voters whose interests are likely to not align.	
11	Mission / Cliff Bungalow	I can't speak for other wards, I just don't want to live in a community like Mission and be represented by the same person that represents Willow Park.	
11	Oakridge	Do need see ANY NEED FOR CHANGES TO CURRENT WARD BOUNDARIES	
11	Oakridge	None that I can see.	
11	Oakridge	doesn't address tie derivative issue as much as B	
11	Oakridge	None	
11	Palliser	Does not incorporate the district model where southwest ward 11 communities will be joined with Woodpark in ward 13 - would be nice to all be in the same ward	
11	Palliser	Couldn't tell the difference	
11	Rideau Park	same as noted in 3.	
11	Rideau Park	Communities with similar needs that are next to each other are not in the same ward.	
11	Southwood	I think it gives out area fewer votes and our councillor less power	Out of scope
11	Southwood	Nothing	
11	Southwood	Ward 11 covers a weird space - leading to a large diversity in residents and therefore needs	
11	Victoria Centre	Cliff Bungalow a better fit for Ward 8.	
11	Victoria Park	Can't see one right now.	
11	Victoria Park	Too high population in ward 8	
11	Windsor Park	Inequity of population, unequal representation among the communities	
11	Windsor Park	I'd need to see the map, not these nonsensical numbers.	
12	Auburn Bay	I believe we share a lot of amenities with Cranston, and it makes sense to keep them within the Ward 12 boundaries.	
12	Auburn Bay	Same as above	
12	Auburn Bay	None	
12	Auburn Bay	Please refer to the independent commission report on boundaries!	Out of scope
12	Auburn Bay	That these are being proposed by city elected officials and/or employees	Out of scope
12	Auburn Bay	Does not seem to affect me in Auburn Bay.	
12	Copperfield	The geographical are of Ward 12 stays very large, and has a varied amount of industrial/residential	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	4) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
12	Copperfield	is there a known cost benefit?	Out of scope
12	Copperfield	losing Riverbend. I don't think it makes sense to send them back to Ward 9.	
12	Copperfield	Our councillor	Out of scope
12	Copperfield	12 is still too large	
12	Copperfield	Totally biased towards Ward 7 which is generally the downtown core. You are unfairly biasing the ward's influence by this scenario. It is corrupt	Out of scope
12	Copperfield	not much	
12	Cranston	Cranston aligned with wrong communities	
12	Cranston	Large deviations between wards still exists and doesn't prepare for growth in new communities	
12	Cranston	Do not see any	
12	Cranston	Kids have to travel much further across a major bridge and highway to get to school	
12	Cranston	Cranston is cut off from the rest of the new ward by the river	
12	Cranston	Increased Ward 14 considerably and will likely need to be changed again in a few years. Cranston is still growing, Walden and legacy have a large growth. Big mistake	
12	Cranston	We still have less representation in SE as this is high growth area	
12	Cranston	It combines communities that shouldn't be combined. Cranston has more in common with Seton and Auburn Bay than Chapparral.	
12	Cranston	greater deviation between the Wards	
12	Cranston	moving communities that have very different requirements (newer and older areas) together. There is little synergy between Cranston and Sundance / Shawnesey as the areas are focused on different needs and growth pressures	
12	Douglasdale / glen	none	
12	Mahogany	Adding Cranston to Ward 14 - just transfers the over-populated ward from 12 to 14. Geographically, Cranston not connected to rest of Ward 14.	
12	Mahogany	Not enough of a change to create a more equal population in the wards.	
12	Mahogany	Some communities linked appear to be separated, however they likely share issues.	
12	Mahogany	Does not address the problem of distribution	
12	McKenzie Towne	More work for the incumbent Councillor	Out of scope
12	McKenzie Towne	There is still large deviations in several communities.	
12	McKenzie Towne	Doesn't correct enough	
12	New Brighton	Still leaves multiple wards out of balance	
12	New Brighton	Still have Keating as my councillor. He's very ineffective and represents a massive amount of new residential communities. We need more voices.	Out of scope



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	4) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
12	Quarry Park	The standard deviation is still large and likely will require another realignment sooner than scenario B.	
12	Quarry Park	Larger population deviations than Scenario B. Splits Riverbend from Quarry Park/Douglas Glen.	
12	Riverbend	See above	
12	Riverbend	Separated from fellow communities between glenmore and Deerfoot to south, share more similarities with Douglas glen and Quarry Park	
12	Riverbend	Every time there is a boundary change Riverbend changes Wards. Please leave Riverbend in Ward 12	
12	Riverbend	None	
12	Riverbend	1 small portion of Riverbend is in ward 9 the rest in ward 12	
12	Riverbend	Doesn't include Quarry park with Riverbend. Those two communities are very connected.	
12	Riverbend	No disadvantages	
12	Riverbend	dissimilar- no geographic ties, ward split by deerfoog	
12	Riverbend	We have very little in common with the neighbourhoods to the north of us.	
12	Riverbend	Riverbend is similar to communities to south, not north. It's issues would be lost	
12	Riverbend	Separates Riverbend from Quarry Park, Douglas Dale and south communities. We have things going on in the south that we need to be connected to.	
12	Riverbend	Separation of Riverbend and quarry park	
12	Riverbend	Riverbend will be separated from it's closest neighbors in Quarry park and Douglasglen.	
13	Bridlewood	Following policy for the sake of policy, not achieving the desired outcome of equalizing the population.	
13	Bridlewood	the centre gets more power	Out of scope
13	Canyon Meadows	Doesn't fix the strange boundary of Ward 11 and how it follows a narrow path to downtown.	
13	Evergreen	Still have ward variances are too high.	
13	Silverado	Nome	
13	Woodbine	For me, none	
13	WOODBINE	i like it - the only thing we want to be in the Farka's ward he is the only one decent Councillor in this corrupted team	Out of scope
13	Woodbine	disparate number of citizens	
13	Woodlands	It's unequal.	
13	Woodlands / Woodbine	Not taking full advantage of trying to have the best possible deviations that can be reduce to the most minimum amount	
14	Chaparral Valley	Ward 11 becomes a strange ward.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	4) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario A? (Comments unedited)	Notes
14	Lake Chaparral	High variance in deviation	
14	Legacy	River seems like a good boundary so why mess with that?	
14	Legacy	Council involved	Out of scope
14	McKenzie Lake	none	
14	McKenzie Lake	Ward 14 would be taking on the most percentage of residents.	
14	Midnapore	Still not as equal in distribution based on maximum/minimum deviations	
14	Queensland	too much of a variance	
14	Sundance	Not sure	
14	Walden	None	
14	Walden	No impact	
	No ward/community given	We have to stay with our terrible Alderman.	Out of scope

Ward	Community	5) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
1	Bowness	Ward boundaries are more equal and further away from the -15/15 deviation. Redrawn boundaries should last for longer before requiring changes again.	
1	Bowness	I guess that ward 11 becomes more balanced with the size of other wards	
1	Royal Oak Rocky Ridge	Brought every ward more in line or to a degree of equilibrium	
1	Tuscany	Downtown is no longer split between two wards. Population deviations are less extreme. Of the two options presented, B is better but could still be improved greatly.	
1	Tuscany	Wards 12, 13, and 14 are more representative of similar interests.	
1	Valley Ridge	None	
1	Valley Ridge	Deviation is much lower than B, reducing the risk that another correction will be needed in a short timeframe. Fewer citizens are impacted and wards 12-14 have similar northern boundary, which has some logic to it.	
1	Valley Ridge	less deviation from the mean	
1	Valley Ridge	None	
1	Varsity	Clearly defined boundaries	
2	Citadel	Less population variation	
2	Sage bluff	No advantage	
2	Sage Hill	Democracy.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	5) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
2	Sage Hill	The number of residents per ward is closer to being equal, resulting in fairer representation on City Council and a more equitable workload for Councillors.	Out of scope
2	Sage Hill	The variance gap is addressed more fully and seems to leave room for the continued growth happening in Ward 12	
2	Sherwood	More square	
3	Country Hills	I don't know what the advantages to this would be	
3	Country Hills	More likely will not need to adjust ward 3 in a while	
3	Coventry hills	Having all of Beddington together	
3	Coventry hills	The two new ones are separated by Beddington and don't have easy access to the rest	
3	Coventry hills	Wards 7, 8 and 11 get boundaries that are likely keeping similar communities together.	
3	Coventry hills	Beddington is not separated from neighboring communities	
3	Coventry hills	None.	
3	Coventry hills	See above.	
3	Coventry hills	I assume more change reflects longer-term planning	
3	Coventry hills	I believe this is the better representation of population based on population deviations shown above. To include Beddington in ward 3 would have a better scenario than the existing or Scenario A.	
3	Coventry hills	Nothing for ward 3	
3	Coventry hills	There are already many ties with these communities for services used in this area of the city.	
3	Coventry hills	natural boundaries	
3	Coventry hills	Deviations are more closely aligned.	
3	Harvest Hills	See above	
3	Harvest Hills	No advantage	
3	Harvest Hills	Please delay changes	Out of scope
3	Hidden Valley	None.	
3	Hidden Valley	easier for the councillor	Out of scope
3	Hidden Valley	None. This city just seems to like to waste our money.	
3	Hidden Valley	We would get the chance to vote for Sean Chu in Ward 3 and get rid of the useless twit we have for a councillor now.	Out of scope
3	Hidden Valley	zero	
3	Hidden Valley	More closely equals the population numbers between the wards.	
3	Hidden Valley	Bigger impact and inclusion of 3rd district/blue dot seems to be more logical	
3	Livingston	This will give better planning area for transit based development and also grow the amenities in the area.	
3	Panorama Hills	Closer deviations	
3	Panorama Hills	Comes closest to mean population	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	5) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
3	Panorama Hills	None x 2	
3	Panorama Hills	Absolutely none	
3	Panorama Hills	Equalizes population the best	
4	Beddington	None	
4	Beddington	Larger representation.	
4	Beddington	None	
4	Beddington	I am not sure	
4	Brentwood	More sustainable in the long term	
4	Brentwood	Ward 4 would likely have a more diverse demographic, by including more of the SE components.	
4	Cambrian Heights	Nil	
4	Charleswood	Perhaps a more even proportion of residents to councillor.	
4	Charleswood	none	
4	Dalhousie	None. As long as policy criteria are met	
4	highland park	It brings all the ward populations more in line with each other	
4	Highwood	smaller deviations	
4	Huntington Hills	No opinion	
4	Huntington Hills	Better balancing, looks longer for durability	
4	MacEwan	For my community I see no advantage to Scenario A, we would be represented by a councillor who's focus would be on Country Hills and has no interest in Nose Hill Park area.	
4	MacEwan	None for me.	
4	MacEwan	None. The city should be putting resources towards easing tax burden and not changing political lines.	Out of scope
4	MacEwan	No longer being in Sean Chu's ward	Out of scope
4	MacEwan	Allows for future population growth, more even population distribution.	
4	Mount Pleasant	Variances are lower than Scenario A	
4	North Haven	Deviation is less. Communities seem more intact. Boundaries seem to make "more sense".	
4	North Haven	Achieves most even distribution of residents across wards, while moving the fewest number of people.	
4	North Haven	less people are impacted and there is less deviation. it evens out the wards	
4	Sandstone Valley	It includes Beddington with the move into ward 3.	
4	Sandstone Valley	none	
4	Sandstone Valley	None	
4	Sandstone Valley	I really do not find advantages as Beddington and Sandstone Valley will be together with different ward	
4	Sandstone Valley	None	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	5) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
4	Sandstone Valley	You've kept our community association together so that is a good thing.	
4	Winston Heights	None that I can see.	
4	Winston Heights - Mountview	The deviations seem more balanced	
5	Castleridge	none	
5	Martindale	Not Applicable	
5	Red Stone	2 and 3 need to reduce the boundary, so Calgary it is not too big city does not increasing taxes because of population need more money funding.	Out of scope
5	Saddleridge	Acceptable level of deviation across the entire city.	
5	Skyview	None	
5	Taradale	The inner communities are being consolidated together so they can be represented by a councillor that fits their perspective or urbanized community.	
6	Coach Hill	I have no faith in city council to do this. It must be done independent of gerrymandering hacks like Gian-Carlo Carra who admits he wants to rig the system.	Out of scope
6	Coach Hill	None, it's a waste of money in a down economy	Out of scope
6	Cougar Ridge	Population in wards is more equal	
6	Glamorgan	Why would you put all those changes in	
6	Glamorgan	None	
6	Glamorgan	Scenario B meets the requirement to redistribute the voters.	
6	Glamorgan	N/A	
6	Glenbrook	New boundaries for 11 and 9 in particular make good sense. Ward 9 now has the majority of industrial sectors outside of airport, good. 3, 4 & 7 swapping developed communities which makes sense as well, while anticipating growth in the north of 3.	
6	Glendale	Keeping ward 6 the same	
6	Patterson	Deviations in all wards are within 12 points deviation	
6	Patterson	I disagree with moving ward boundaries.	
6	Richmond Hill	An independent commission should oversee this process	Out of scope
6	Richmond Road	Increased population assigned to Ward 11 where we know that representation is strong.	
6	Signal Hill	None!	
6	Springbank Hill	BETTER POPULATION BALANCE BETWEEN WARDS	
6	Springbank Hill	Same as above	
6	Strathcona	Try fewer wards.	
6	West Springs	Less deviation in population of wards. More democratic.	
6	West Springs	Affects fewer people, gets deviation much closer to zero	
6	Westgate	More balance in current population numbers per ward creating a more equal representation.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	5) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
6	Westgate	None	
7	Banff Trail	there is not enough information	
7	Capitol Hill	None for Zone 7	
7	Capitol Hill	?	
7	Crescent Heights	On the surface level most communities of similar property values and household income are grouped together.	
7	Crescent Heights	Lower deviations, natural and man-made barriers (river, highways) are followed more closely. Weird shape of Ward 11 is corrected.	
7	Crescent Heights	Not Affected	
7	Crescent Heights	The proposed population variances are more even for all the Wards versus Scenario A.	
7	Crescent Heights	better geographic and demographic division for ward 9/7	
7	Crescent Heights	Don't think it will.	
7	East Village	Better balance of population deviation	
7	Eau Claire	neither scenario affects Eau Claire	
7	HILLHURST	Each ward has similar population levels	
7	Hillhurst	I do not like Scenario B	
7	Hillhurst	Moves all wards to be closer together (less spread) and no ward is close to being re-evaluated.	
7	Montgomery	More equality between wards in terms of population represented	
7	Mount Pleasant	NONE.	
7	Mount Pleasant	I would be more aligned with the communities north of 16 Ave, which makes sense. Downtown and the area north up to 16 ave have more in common.	
7	Mount Pleasant	lower population deviations. More equal representation.	
7	Mount Pleasant	I don't see any	
7	Mount Pleasant	none	
7	Mount Pleasant	Bridgeland and Renfrew would join other communities on the west side of Deerfoot.	
7	Mount Pleasant	Not aware of any.	
7	Mount Pleasant	None	
7	Mount Pleasant	The northern communities get to be thought of as residential areas and less like downtown. Change of counsellors is a HUGE advantage!	Out of scope
7	Mount Pleasant	None for my area.	
7	Point McKay	Out of scope There is less deviation between the wards Out of scope provides a more central City Centre ward Out of scope Better at creating logical wards	
7	Renfrew	proportionate	
7	Sunnyside	Better distribution of issues between wards 7, 8, 11. Ward 4 becomes more urban.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	5) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
7	Sunnyside	More cohesive river communities	
7	Sunnyside	Minimizes differences in population between Wards. Moving Inglewood, Ramsay, etc. to make boundary Deerfoot makes more sense than east-west connection. Bundles industrial/commercial land uses together in Ward 9. Keeps southeast communities together.	
7	Sunnyside	More condensed area	
7	Tuxedo Park	None.	
7	Tuxedo Park	South alignment looks less strange	
7	Tuxedo Park	The variance is smaller	
7	Tuxedo Park	There are none.	
7	Tuxedo Park	There are none for Tuxedo Park	
7	University Heights	brings numbers into line better, but there is not enough information about future projections, like when U/D is fully populated	
7	University Heights	smaller deviation; impacts fewer people;	
7	West Hillhurst	Also lower population deviation	
7	West Hillhurst	It does shift some of the suburb communities into an inner city ward, which may lead the residents to relate more to the struggles that inner-city dwellers have faced for the last couple of decades.	
7	West Hillhurst	More equitable population distribution	
7	West Hillhurst	Can't think of any except gerrymandering	Out of scope
7	Winston Heights	None	
7	Winston Heights	Ward 9 growth south. I don't see any advantages for ward 7 or 4	
7	Winston Heights	None	
7	Winston Heights	Not seeing any for my neighborhood.	
7	Winston Heights	None	
7	Winston Heights/Mountview	None	
7	Winston Heights / Mountview	none	
7	Winston Heights-Mountview	Currently do not see any	
7	Winston Heights / Mountview	New councilor with more backbone	Out of scope
7		None	
8	Bankview	None	
8	Beltline	Brings deviations for all wards into better balance.	
8	Beltline	It controls better for ward divergence.	
8	Beltline	None, go back to STV.	
8	Beltline	This arrangement allows more councillors to represent inner city as well as more suburban populations.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	5) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
8	Cliff Bungalow	Reduced variation in some wards	
8	Connaught	does not make a difference to me	
8	Currie Barracks	None	
8	Downtown West	Major residential areas in downtown are unified under one ward, riverwalk - better alignment on Center City issues on both sides of the river. Might promote more permeability across CP rail tracks.	
8	Garrison	Does not affect as many people, accounts for new areas without people, less deviation points	
8	Garrison Green	Looks the same as scenario A. I think Garrison residents spend alot of time downtown, in altadore, lakeview, etc - so we have similar interests, and use the city facilities in a similar way.	
8	Garrison Woods	Unsure	
8	Killarney	Nice try councilors.	Out of scope
8	Lower Mount Royal	Inner City Wards (7, 8, and 11) are concentrated.	
8	Marda Loop	Nothing, stop wasting money!	Out of scope
8	Richmond	Better reduces the huge variations in representation.	
8	Rosscarock	See above	
8	Rosscarock	I see no important difference between the two	
8	Scarboro	Overall, the relative populations look fairer.	
8	South Calgary	Ward 9 needs to stay on the east side of Deerfoot. The communities on the east side do not have similarities with that on the west, and for that, the east communities struggle getting the attention of the area councillor.	
8	Sunalta	I like Ward 11 having the bulk of the commercial centre.	
8	Sunalta	The Scenarios above don't really explain whether there is a mix of interests represented. Much of the change seems concentrated in the inner city, where I'm guessing the most concentrated population is.	
8		Brings all the wards closer to 0 with fewer outliers.	
8	Wildwood	Better representation	
8	Wildwood	familiarity with the old boundaries	
8	Wildwood	Provides better, fairer representation of all citizens.	
9	Albert Park / Radisson Heights	NA	
9	Applewood	It makes the most geographical sense. It unites Quarry Park with Ogden and Riverbend, communities with significant overlap	
9	Applewood	Keeps our ward outta down town and makes it solely residential. Perhaps some funding from the alberta government for a sound barrier on Stoney trails.	Out of scope
9	Bridgeland	Bridgeland is lumped with other inner city communities with similar interests.	
9	Bridgeland	Not much.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	5) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
9	Bridgeland	I don't know	
9	Bridgeland	Groups Bridgeland into a more logical geographic community that we have day-to-day interaction with	
9	Bridgeland	Similar to Scenario A	
9	Bridgeland	I don't like this model at all.	
9	Bridgeland	little differences between the scenarios. No matter which ward people end up in they will have incompetent representation	Out of scope
9	Bridgeland	We are grouped with more like communities that make geographic sense. I think the other wards besides my own make more sense in this version	
9	Bridgeland/Riverside	Included in the communities I spend the most time in, with more like-minded people that I have more in common with. With deviation closer to 0 than Scenario A, there is room for growth so as not to have to change boundaries. Much preferred!	
9	Dover	None - should be done be independent body; councillors should not have a say	Out of scope
9	Dover	Smaller variance than A.	
9	Erin Woods	We get rid of the communities west of the Bow river and hopefully the narcissistic councilor that comes with them	Out of scope
9	Fairview	Fairview will then be included with its neighbouring communities (Acadia, etc). this is great	
9	Fairview	none	
9	Fairview	Fairview community moves to a ward that is primarily residential so the councillor can have a clear focus and provide better representation for this community.	
9	Fairview	Downtown inner core is one area	
9	Fairview	None	
9	Fairview	More Balanced deviations	
9	Forest Lawn	None - dislike this scenario.	
9	Forest Lawn	N/A	
9	Inglewood	Puts Inglewood Ramsay in a more appropriate grouping of communities that are more similar to its values. Still think it would be better in Ward 7	
9	Inglewood	Inglewood belongs with inner city area, Deerfoot is a clear boundary marker	
9	Inglewood	We would be part of a ward that are on one side of the Bow River, similar interests, community cohesiveness.	
9	Inglewood	Farkas is fantastic!	Out of scope
9	Inglewood	Inner city and both river sheds become Ward 11 and it feels like they have more in common	
9	Inglewood	It balances out representation across the city. This is better for citizens to have equal representation, and for Councillors to have equal responsibility for constituents	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	5) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
9	Inglewood	Having a different city councillor who will hopefully stop pushing crazy development projects and engage in MEANINGFUL dialogue with residents, rather than paying lip service while pursuing a development agenda.	Out of scope
9	Inglewood	It puts us in a ward that has a good representation of inner-city communities. It puts us in a new ward which would mean a councillor who doesn't treat his constituents with disdain. The deviation is quite low.	Out of scope
9	Inglewood	Inglewood would be incorporated into a more inner city Ward which may have less disparate issues. East Calgary has quite different issues than Inglewood.	
9	Inglewood	Getting better representation	Out of scope
9	Inglewood	More homogeneous communities; largely residential; similar business interests; strong inner-city components.	
9	Inglewood	Fairly includes Inglewood with more appropriate neighboring communities vs in Scenario A which pigeonholes us with larger East Calgary communities that have very different socio-economic needs.	
9	Inglewood.	There are many similarities across the communities whether socioeconomic, heritage or inner city issues. The deviation is quite small.	
9	Lynnwood	None.	
9	Manchester	Population deviation is better	
9	Ogden	Communities within wards seem more related to one another.	
9	Ogden	Impacts least number of citizens and maintains the lowest variance.	
9	Penbrooke Meadows	Removing of Inglewood and Bridgeland makes a lot of sense. Why? Because those two communities were taking away ALL of attention of the Ward the Easter communities are always forgotten about. Carra or any other would focus more on the East side.	
9	Penbrooke Meadows	See question 3. Time to go back to the drawing board for Scenario C.	
9	Penbrooke Meadows	Reducing the impact on the populations that live in these areas strikes me as a good, seeing as this issue is not about quality of life but about population distribution. This scenario affects less people, which could reduce disruptions.	
9	Radisson Heights	Removing Inglewood from Ward 9.	
9	Ramsay	Grouping more similar communities together. Inner city communities	
9	Ramsay	Mission Leaves Ward 11	
9	Ramsay	Lower levels of population deviation between wards. Looking at the boundary maps, it better encapsulates "like" communities (central urban vs. suburban) together.	
9	Ramsay	Again a more detailed description of the reasoning behind this is needed	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	5) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
9	Ramsay	It reduces the differential in representation to the better, smaller amount	
9	Ramsay	cant open it	
9	Ramsay	None	
9	Renfrew	Adjusts ward 12 the most. Pushing of ward 4 south may benefit north central more than current and more than plan A.	
9	Renfrew	I don't like it at all. It changes too much	
9	Renfrew	None	
9	Renfrew	Did I miss something? Wards 6,7,8,11 don't have boundary lines??	
9	Renfrew	Much closer to even distribution.	
9	Renfrew	Again it connects like communities	
9	Renfrew	this expands the ranges of community types that ward 11 would represent, which I think is a healthier balance of community types.	
9	Renfrew	none	
9	Renfrew	Same as scenario A for Renfrew, but more equalizes the population by removing some communities	
9	Renfrew	I like that Option B moves the ward boundary further north (relative to Option A) and groups Winston Heights and Renfrew together.	
9	Renfrew	Same as above: It brings neighbourhood on the east side of the riding under the same Ward, also keeps communities with common interests together.	
9	Renfrew	Ward 7 gets smaller.	
9	Renfrew	It brings me more inline with my neighbouring communities.	
9	Renfrew	Less likely to change boundaries again as East Village and other areas of increase in population density	
9	Renfrew	Fewer actual people will be affected in the way that they need to vote.	
9	Renfrew	Makes Ward 9 smaller	
9	Riverbend	Why is Riverbend being separated from neighboring communities? It doesn't make sense to have us pulled away from quarry park.	
9	Southview	Definitely worst than Scenario A.	
9	Southview	Better distribution, less variance	
9	Southview / Dover	Was only able to see Scenario A. I was not able to see Scenario B.	
10	Abbeydale	none	
10	Abbeydale	n/a	
10	Abbeydale	Population disparity is lower	
10	Marlborough Park	None	
10	Monterey Park	Greater longevity.	
10	Pineridge	Much more balance throughout city as a whole. And ward boundaries make more sense.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	5) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
10	Temple	I can only see advantages for expanding the reach of certain political interests at the expense of minority voices - not really an advantage to most Calgarians.	Out of scope
11	Acadia	Smaller variance. More equitable representation.	
11	Bay View	No advantages. Boundaries should not be made by current council, rather an independent group	Out of scope
11	Beltline	Shrinks the geographic size of Ward 12, but minimal changes in actual population	
11	Beltline	Includes most inner-city neighbourhoods in one ward.	
11	Beltline	Achieves the objectives of what you are trying to change	
11	Beltline	Much more balanced distribution of population in wards. Treats residents votes more fairly.	
11	Victoria Park	Still fixes bringing beltline back to ward 8	
11	Braeside	14 city councillors is not enough to be effectively represented	Out of scope
11	Cedarbrae	to big, our voices are already not heard (this was made VERY clear with the two years of STILL ongoing road work FIASCO.....).. with a bigger ward there will be no point in even trying to have a voice in anything	Out of scope
11	Elbow Park	Larger area in a central part of town	
11	Elbow Park	More equitable geographically and by population	
11	Elbow Park	Doesnt seem to be a good plan at all	
11	Erlton	Better mix of inner-city and suburban interests	
11	Erlton	None	
11	Erlton	None	
11	Erlton	Honestly my biggest concern is proper representation. I think these boundaries make sense for the community boundaries and how I tend to group them. It wouldn't really impact much but I think it makes sense for 11 to change in this way.	
11	Erlton	None	
11	Erlton	I don't agree with any of these changes, this is just another waste of taxpayer dollars by city bureaucrats, it should be left as is.	Out of scope
11	Erlton	This entire project is a complete waste of taxpayers money!!	Out of scope
11	Haysboro	Nearly equal	
11	Haysboro	Fewer people will be impacted	
11	Lakeview	None	
11	Lakeview	reducing the size of ward 11	
11	LAKEVIEW	I AGREE WITH RETURNING LAKEVIEW TO " NORTH OF THE RESERVOIR"	
11	Lakeview	aligns lakeview more with central west	
11	Lakeview	Not everyone in the large SE will be represented by the same councilor anymore which should benefit them	Out of scope

Ward	Community	5) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
11	Lakeview	As per Scenario A - I don't see any advantages and question the motive behind any change being made.	
11	Lakeview	Not sure	
11	Lakeview	Lakeview joins communities to the north of it in ward 8, which is a better geographic fit	
11	Lakeview	None - I want to remain in Ward 11	
11	Lakeview	See Scenario A comments.	
11	Lakeview	Nothing	
11	Lakeview	Gerrymandering	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	None	
11	Lakeview	The same-there are no advantages. This is only a political move from the rest of Council who dislike J.Farkas.	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	none	
11	Lakeview	None	
11	Lakeview	The advantage lies in the incumbent that potentially is awarded the Lakeview neighbourhood and its votes. Primarily senior and mixed young family demographic. Political advantages to be sure.	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	There are no advantages to Scenario A	
11	Maple Ridge	Inner city represented by smaller group of councillors	Out of scope
11	Marda Loop	less gerrymandering. But most arbitrarily, it results in smaller deviation between wards.	Out of scope
11	Meadowlark Park	Is more even from a population deviation standpoint	
11	Meadowlark Park	I would like to see what the INDEPENDENT COMMISSION recommended. This is NOT the job for City Council	Out of scope
11	Mission	As above	
11	Mission / Cliff Bungalow	Again, I'm out of Ward 11 and into ward 8.	
11	North Glenmore Park	Makes the Glenmore Reservoir the obvious boundary between inner city and suburban areas	
11	Oakridge	Do need see ANY NEED FOR CHANGES TO CURRENT WARD BOUNDARIES	
11	Oakridge	None.	
11	Oakridge	appears to best address the deviations found in Wards 8, 9,11 and 12	
11	Oakridge	We keep Councillor Farkas	Out of scope
11	Palliser	Shrinks Ward 11 - mostly residential	
11	Palliser	None	
11	Park Hill	By adding more centrally locates communities to ward 11 could help to ensure the change implemented supports the whole ward, not just those in eagle ridge...	
11	Rideau Park	same as in 3	

Ward	Community	5) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
11	Rideau Park	Communities with similar needs are placed together in the same ward making it easier for their needs to be addressed by the same alderman.	
11	Roxboro	it makes representation more equal per capita	
11	Southwood	It gives our area a larger vote in Council.	
11	Southwood	Alleviating the pressures of growth in ward 12 to go into ward 9	
11	Southwood	More continuous borders for ward 11 (geographically consecutive communities). It's still a diverse ward but this makes more sense to me.	
11	Victoria Centre	Reunites the communities in the Beltline Community Association, currently served by 2 Councillors into 1. Also the Beltline Communities have more commonality of issues then currently reflected in the elongated Ward 11.	
11	Victoria Park	We would still be in Ward 8! (goodbye far south!)	
11	Victoria Park	Reconnecting Vic Park with the rest of the beltline	
11	Victoria Park	I am not group with SW suburbs when I live downtown	
11	Victoria Park	Groups Mission with similar neighbourhoods of Inglewood and Ramsay instead of being a weird appendage attached to the south	
11	Windsor Park	Greater equity of population, resulting in a more equitable and responsive council	
11	Windsor Park	I'd need to see the map, not these nonsensical numbers.	
12	Auburn Bay	Keeps all the FAR southeast communities together. Just seems to make more sense. I believe that I have more issues and concerns in common with Cranston than I do with Quarry Park or River Bend.	
12	Auburn Bay	Ward 12 is smaller and can be better managed	
12	Auburn Bay	Very strong focus on the SE terminus of the city. High suburban density. Move the industrial park into a greater focus of Ward 9	
12	Auburn Bay	Please refer to the independent commission report on boundaries!	Out of scope
12	Auburn Bay	There are none	
12	Auburn Bay	Does not seem to affect me in Auburn Bay.	
12	Copperfield	Focus on residential neighbourhoods and growth neighbourhoods.	
12	Copperfield	we will remain in the same ward - however making it a smaller ward may provide the elected official to better mitigate and represent the constituents	
12	Copperfield	none	
12	Copperfield	None	
12	Copperfield	Smaller 12	
12	Copperfield	You adjust more fairly the ratio in Ward 3 reduce the ration more equitable in ward 12 and 9	
12	Copperfield	nothing	
12	Cranston	Cranston aligned with the proper communities	
12	Cranston	More even populations between wards	
12	Cranston	None. Horrible idea.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	5) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
12	Cranston	Seems to better group communities together that have infrasture in common	
12	Cranston	Main high school less than 5 minutes away, nohighway or bridge	
12	Cranston	Communities in deep southeast all kept together.	
12	Cranston	Keeping all communities east of the Bow River together. Most of the sub division areas are relatively young in age and have similar issues, growth pains and transit issues.	
12	Cranston	Same	
12	Cranston	Best option. Combines communities that have common interests. Makes the River the boundary.	
12	Cranston	it leaves more room for population growth in Wards in the suburban/developing areas	
12	Cranston	focused ward 12 on key growth areas in the south east - shared specific requirements amongst Seton, Auburn Bay, Cranston, and Mahogany	
12	Douglasdale / glen	none	
12	Mahogany	Ward deviations are much smaller city-wide, especially in the south. Ward 12 poised for more growth southward,	
12	Mahogany	Better representation of the population in each of the wards.	
12	Mahogany	Smaller area and the communities in their local area appear to still be in same ward.	
12	Mahogany	Provides more even representation per ward	
12	McKenzie Towne	Fair representation	
12	McKenzie Towne	Small deviations for communities, this scenario offers the most equal representation.	
12	McKenzie Towne	Brings all wards closer to average	
12	New Brighton	Brings all wards closer to balance	
12	New Brighton	Another councilor will represent some newer communities rather than keeping the status quo.	
12	Quarry Park	The standard deviation is smaller, likely meaning will be longer before we require yet another realignment. Seems to share the downtown core among 4 wards which may alleviate some of the core vs suburbs mentality currently.	
12	Quarry Park	Smaller population deviations than Scenario A. Unites Riverbend/Quarry Park/Douglasdale/Glen.	
12	Riverbend	Please clarify scenario B	
12	Riverbend	More aligned with neighbouring communities all in same ward, better boundary lines, more clear than random pockets of plan A	
12	Riverbend	none for Riverbend	
12	Riverbend	None	
12	Riverbend	It puts Riverbend in Ward 9	
12	Riverbend	None	
12	Riverbend	None	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	5) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
12	Riverbend	Riverbend is groups with Quarry Park and Douglasglen	
12	Riverbend	At the very least, it keeps Riverbend connected with Quarry Park, Douglas Dale & south communities. These are the communities I work in, play in & visit regularly. These communities have more similar concerns that can be supported by ward Councillors	
12	Riverbend	Riverbend and quarry park are still in the same ward	
12	Riverbend	Riverbend needs to be kept in the same ward as quarry park and Douglas glen as we share issues and demographics with those neighbourhoods much more than the neighbourhoods north of Glenmore trail.	
13	Bridlewood	Equalized population means each Councillor represents a similar number of Calgarians, so no individual Councillor appears to be more important or more representative than another.	
13	Bridlewood	fairer distribution	
13	Canyon Meadows	Ward 11's boundary makes much more sense in this scenario. The overall distribution of population is also better.	
13	Evergreen	Ward populations are more evenly distributed.	
13	Millrise	There is no change	
13	Silverado	None	
13	Woodbine	For me, none	
13	WOODBINE	totally wrong, do not see any advantages	
13	Woodbine	better rep by pop	
13	Woodlands	More equal.	
13	Woodlands / Woodbine	Helps increase the population in areas in which they have established communities	
14	Chaparral Valley	Gives a different voice and different representation to folks in Ward 9 - however, the items a Cllr. would have to deal with would be so varied given the vulnerable populations in Ward 9 currently.	
14	Douglasdale	None, there are a lot of communities, no idea who they are so no advantage	
14	Lake Bonavista	More even distribution of population.	
14	Lake Chaparral	Lower variance in deviation	
14	Legacy	Nicer than A.	
14	Legacy	None	
14	McKenzie Lake	none	
14	McKenzie Lake	Looks like there is a need for Ward 14 to become bigger, this would be the better scenario.	
14	Midnapore	More even distribution of population by ward, smaller deviations.	
14	Queensland	less variance	
14	Sundance	Not sure	
14	Walden	None	
14	Walden	No impact	

Ward	Community	5) What do you think are the main advantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
	No ward/coomunity given	Putting "like communities" together.	

Ward	Community	6) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
1	Bowness	Many more communities are impacted by the changes.	
1	Bowness	ward 9 gains a lot of size while 7 and 8 become much smaller	
1	Bowness	Ward Boundary changes should be done by an independent panel, not by City Council looking out for their own interests.	Out of scope
1	Royal Oak Rocky Ridge	More communities / people could be affected.	
1	Tuscany	The ward boundaries are a little confusing (using rivers in some areas, roads in others).	
1	Tuscany	Seems to affect more communities overall	
1	Valley Ridge	None	
1	Valley Ridge	More communities impacted and the changes are larger than for option A.	
1	Valley Ridge	Stop waisting our money on this	Out of scope
1	Varsity	Number of electors impacted. It appears there is a desire to reduce the potential of a couple of Councillors being re-elected	Out of scope
2	Citadel	None	
2	Sage bluff	No point	
2	Sage Hill	Taking away from left leaning ridings.	Out of scope
2	Sage Hill	The Ward boundaries are quite different in some cases, possibly resulting in resident confusion. However, I personally am not concerned with what Ward my neighbourhood is assigned to, as long as I can easily figure it out, and who my Councillor is.	
2	Sage Hill	The number of communities impacted is increased, with greater risk when implementing as a result.	
2	Sherwood	Not clear how population is affected	
3	Country Hills	It seems like an unnecessary move for Ward 3 area. Beddington is not particularly accessible to the Country Hills / Coventry hills / Harvest Hills / Panorama area because of the bus trap on Centre Street.	
3	Country Hills	None	
3	Coventry hills	makes the district very large	
3	Coventry hills	There appears to be a new Ward in the SE which is expensive in having surgery city councilor.	Out of scope
3	Coventry hills	Will need to review the boundaries again in near future	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	6) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
3	Coventry hills	Adds 3 additional communities which is a significant number of residents to be represented in the Ward. What happens when the northern most communities in this Ward are fully developed? The boundaries will need to be redrawn yet again.	
3	Coventry hills	See above	
3	Coventry hills	More people will complain about change	
3	Coventry hills	The main disadvantages in Scenario B are the many more communities that will get shifted to have a better representation of population. There would be a significant amount of families affected by this change.	
3	Coventry hills	Panorama Hills is split into 2 wards. See above.	
3	Coventry hills	It affects a lightly smaller population	
3	Harvest Hills	See above	
3	Harvest Hills	Please delay changes	Out of scope
3	Hidden Valley	Ward is too big. Less similar to Beddington.	
3	Hidden Valley	cost. to many councillors	Out of scope
3	Hidden Valley	Wasting money!	Out of scope
3	Hidden Valley	Ward 3 would have a higher than average population and would be facing significant population growth as Livingston and Carrington grow.	
3	Hidden Valley	zero	
3	Hidden Valley	Confusion caused by adding three new communities to the ward.	
3	Hidden Valley	The larger impact to the Sandstone Valley community	
3	Livingston	None	
3	Panorama Hills	Does not leave room for growth in Ward 3. Beddington can stay with Ward 4 as it fits in well there.	
3	Panorama Hills	Growing communities to the north would mean reviewing the map again in a few years	
3	Panorama Hills	Even more...	
3	Panorama Hills	This plan is flawed as it was not designed by an independent non-vested person or committee	Out of scope
3	Panorama Hills	Includes neighborhoods that are 20 years older than the rest of the ward. Different demographic, different priorities.	
4	Beddington	None	
4	Beddington	Again... Beddington should be looking at updating and in building....not focusing on 'expansion outwards'.	
4	Beddington	Trying to remove a popular Councillor that goes against the socialist city hall mentality, by rearranging boundaries in order to keep them from being re-elected	Out of scope

Ward	Community	6) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
4	Beddington Heights	My neighbourhood has more condos/duplex's & a different layout than the more suburban ward 3, if my area became a part of it a disadvantage is residents having different interests they'd like to have represented in council	
4	Brentwood	Greater change	
4	Cambrian Heights	Gerrymandering to disadvantage incumbents in Wards 4 and 11 instead of addressing the issues within Wards 3, 7, 5 and 12 with minor tweaks.	Out of scope
4	Charleswood	With inner wards like 9 and 11 being dramatically increased in size, the perspective of the urban or immigrant population might be less present. There's already enough wards where the wealthy, single family household perspective prevails.	
4	Charleswood	My community should be moved back to Ward 7. We don't have anything in common with the communities North of John Laurie. I work at the University of Calgary. I use the University LRT. All my connections are with Ward 7.	
4	Dalhousie	None. As long as policy criteria are met	
4	Highwood	more areas affected	
4	Huntington Hills	Breaks apart Beddington	
4	Huntington Hills	Weird central boundaries near the city centre	
4	MacEwan	MacEwan is part of Nose Hill park, heck it is ON Nose Hill Park. We have nothing to do with Country Hills and would be left with a Councillor where our concerns are an afterthought compared to the population of Country Hills.	
4	MacEwan	My community is grouped into a larger community that doesnt have the same issues and similar development stages of neighborhoods, demographics are quite different.	
4	MacEwan	None. The city should be putting resources towards easing tax burden and not changing political lines.	Out of scope
4	MacEwan	I don't see any	
4	MacEwan	Several communities will have to change wards.	
4	Mount Pleasant	More communities affected	
4	North Haven	Big change. (but I'm okay with that)	
4	North Haven	More communities move wards	
4	North Haven	drastic change	
4	Sandstone Valley	It moves 3 communities into a ward with a rapidly growing population. I expect at the next review they will have to come back out to rebalance for population.	
4	Sandstone Valley	Ward 3 will grow with new communities so these options appear to have lack of foresight.	
4	Sandstone Valley	Doesn't have future of growing communities in mind??	
4	Sandstone Valley	I do not find disadvantages	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	6) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
4	Sandstone Valley	We are in Ward 3 separated by a major thoroughfare where issues affecting issues the newly added communities will not be addressed	
4	Sandstone Valley	Still losing Sean Chu as he is quite helpful in our community.	Out of scope
4	Winston Heights	Remaining in Ward 4.	
4	Winston Heights - Mountview	More areas/people are impacted by the changes	
5	Castleridge	manipulating populations - no gerrymandering needed	Out of scope
5	Martindale	Not Applicable	
5	Red Stone	2 and 3 need to reduce the boundary, so Calgary it is not too big city does not increasing taxes because of population need more money funding.	
5	Saddleridge	None. There are no perfect solutions, but this ensures an equal voice far more than Scenario A.	
5	Skyview	Skyview needs to become part of ward 3	
5	Taradale	None that I can think of	
6	Coach Hill	I have no faith in city council to do this. It must be done independent of gerrymandering hacks like Gian-Carlo Carra who admits he wants to rig the system.	Out of scope
6	Coach Hill	None, it's a waste of money in a down economy	Out of scope
6	Cougar Ridge	More people affected	
6	Glamorgan	Everything	
6	Glamorgan	Border should be Sarcee not 37st.	
6	Glamorgan	More people are transferred between wards, meaning possible isolation and new relations required.	
6	Glamorgan	N/A	
6	Glenbrook	More communication needed, but really that's only for voting every 4 years. I think this is the best scenario.	
6	Glendale	Ward 11 Splitting up downtown doesn't make sense	
6	Patterson	none, although in deciding boundaries, ensure near future development is considered so that realignment is minimized	
6	Patterson	I disagree with moving ward boundaries.	
6	Richmond Hill	An independent commission should oversee this process	Out of scope
6	Richmond Road	Decreased population to section 4 where we know representation is strong. There is also no need to decrease population in Ward 6 - this ward should be staying as is.	
6	Signal Hill	It arbitrarily changes the boundaries unnecessarily	
6	SPRINGBANK HILL	NONE	
6	Springbank Hill	Same as above	
6	Strathcona	Too many on City Council .	Out of scope
6	West Springs	None	
6	West Springs	?	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	6) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
6	Westgate	Larger change in boundary areas potentially impacting how neighbourhoods will be able to manage future growth.	
6	Westgate	None	
7	Banff Trail	there is not enough information	
7	Capitol Hill	The size and proximity...	
7	Capitol Hill	More communities are affected.	
7	Crescent Heights	Huge concern of large range in community age amongst wards. As a result certain communities will not get as much attention as they deserve. For example Inglewood and Ramsey do not share the same needs as Oakridge and Palliser	
7	Crescent Heights	More extensive modifications. Ward 11 covers an extensive and diverse swath, from Anderson to downtown. Not sure how cohesive this region is.	
7	Crescent Heights	Not Affected	
7	Crescent Heights	Less disadvantage for population size versus Scenario A.	
7	Crescent Heights	not sure	
7	Crescent Heights	Not confirming zones.	
7	East Village	Nothing in particular. I'm in Ward 7 under existing boundaries and both alternative scenarios.	
7	Eau Claire	Eau Claire should not be part of Ward 7 - it's needs are too different from the rest of the ward.	
7	HILLHURST	More residents will have a new ward	
7	Hillhurst	There is too much disruption to the current Scenario.	
7	Montgomery	More change	
7	Mount Pleasant	SEAN CHU.	Out of scope
7	Mount Pleasant	None	
7	Mount Pleasant	much more significant changes across the City.	
7	Mount Pleasant	I believe the Ward 7 communities proposed to be moved to Ward 4 have more in common with Ward 7 than Ward 4. The redevelopment pressures are the same & the community layouts are similar. Mt Pleasant has more in common with Capitol Hill than Rosedale.	
7	Mount Pleasant	cuts Winston Heights off from other similar neighboring communities	
7	Mount Pleasant	My neighbourhood would be forced into a new ward with a councillor that we would never vote for. Our needs are different from those of homes further away from the inner city.	Out of scope
7	Mount Pleasant	Would move to Ward 4 which does not have some of the same inner city issues, and would be linked to communities with which we have little history.	
7	Mount Pleasant	None	
7	Mountview	may not have the same issues	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	6) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
7	Mount Pleasant	Taking on downtown, a totally different mindset than the residential, but if B is implemented, I won't care because I'll be out of 7.	
7	Mount Pleasant	Mount Pleasant is an inner-city community, connected by 14th and Centre Streets. Moving it into a the suburban Ward 4 is an awful blow to effective representation.	Out of scope
7	Sunnyside	Ward 9 becomes very suburban. Bigger change overall.	
7	Sunnyside	Zero	
7	Sunnyside	I think it misses the Deerfoot-Stoney barrier between Ward 12 + 14.	
7	Sunnyside	Makes Area 4 really big	
7	Tuxedo Park	I do not participate in any of the communities of Scenario B. I feel disinterested in this change and feel it would be alienating.	
7	Tuxedo Park	futher out NW communities that I do not identify with	
7	Tuxedo Park	Mount Pleasant, Tuxedo Park, Winston Heights are inner city, issues align more with Ward 7 than neighborhoods in Ward 4. Also requires more neighborhoods to be moved	
7	Tuxedo Park	Makes Tuxedo Park move into ward 4 away from our immediate neighbors	
7	Tuxedo Park	I don't believe that my views align with those of many of the voters in ward 4. I likely would be represented by a candidate who I did not vote for.	
7	Tuxedo Park	Inner city communities would not have a voice if they belonged to Ward 4.	
7	Tuxedo Park	It pushes Tuxedo Park out of the inner-city conversation.	
7	University Heights	political gerrymandering is obvious and disturbing	Out of scope
7	University Heights	makes less geographic sense re: Bow River, 16th Ave, Memorial Dr., Splits North Hill Plan communities;	
7	West Hillhurst	The changes to Ward 9 make no sense. They have nothing in common with the people in Ward 11, and would not be well served with Farkas as their councillor. Similarly, Ward 12 doesn't deserve Carra! He's too good for them!	Out of scope
7	West Hillhurst	Lack of inclusion with issues and concerns WEST HILLHURST has in common with the northern inner city communities	
7	Winston Heights	Ward 11 adds way too many "inner city" communities. My community would join ward 4 where very few of those communities share my communities needs and wants	
7	Winston Heights	The communities in ward 7 that would become Ward 4 are not part of that community, Ward 7 is inner city.	
7	Winston Heights	Cutting off Winston Heights from their current relationship with Tuxedo Park	
7	Winston Heights	Splitting up communities along 16 Ave that share similar characteristics does not make sense	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	6) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
7	Winston Heights	Placing what are essentially inner city neighborhoods with higher density mixed with more suburban single family neighborhoods further from downtown. Different needs from transport to development.	
7	Winston Heights	WH, Tuxedo Park, and Mount Pleasant are placed in a ward with few similarities to them.	
7	Winston Heights/Mountview	Same thing	
7	Winston Heights / Mountview	It puts us too much in the NW and competing with other communities	
7	Winston Heights-Mountview	We change wards to one where the needs of the inner city are not met nor understood!	
7	Winston Heights /Mountview	None	
7	Winston Heights /Mountview	Makes no sense geographically or from the perspective of age/issues of communities involved, still cuts Inglewood in half for no apparent reason	
8	Bankview	Gerrymandering	Out of scope
8	Beltline	That it's not STV. Split the city into 4 quadrants (balancing the populations) and give us 4 councilors per quadrant elected under STV using the Droop quota.	Out of scope
8	Beltline	We should have all councillors responsible for some portion of the inner city.	
8	Cliff Bungalow	Continued variation in representation	
8	Connaught	does not make a difference to me	
8	Currie Barracks	That you are deliberately screwing up ward 11 because Jeromy is outspoken against the current Council.	Out of scope
8	Downtown West	West Village is in a different ward - resurrecting previous discussions about that site might be more difficult with this alignment.	
8	Garrison	Since there are 15 areas without residents, it is hard to say how many will be affected in the future.	
8	Garrison Green	Nothing	
8	Garrison Woods	Unsure	
8	Killarney	Redraws the line to expand support for councilors that should be on their way out of city governance.	Out of scope
8	Lower Mount Royal	There are significant changes to Wards 9, 11, and 12	
8	Marda Loop	Nothing, stop wasting money!	Out of scope
8	Rosscarock	See above	
8	Rosscarock	I see no important difference between the two	
8	Scarboro	For the numeric-consistency OCD/autistic types, wards 8 & 9 would no longer directly border each other. This did mildly upset one person I know.	Out of scope



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	6) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
8	Sunalta	Ward 9 becomes very large	
8	Sunalta	The main disadvantage of scenario B seems to concentration of urban interests into fewer wards.	
8		Can't see any.	
8	Wildwood	I do not like how the beltline and downtown get all the attention, further out communities are lumped in with high density issues. R1 is being pushed aside because its in the same Ward and R1 residential issues are not respected due to the imbalance	
8	Wildwood	I have no concerns re: scenario B.	
9	Albert Park / Radisson Heights	NA	
9	Applewood	It divides East Calgary, specifically International Avenue and Inglewood. It doesn't consider the deep connections that East Calgary communities have. It also divides Inglewood from Riverbend, Ogden, and Quarry Park (302 BRT communities).	
9	Applewood	Includes east hills and perhaps we will not see some more improvement to 17 and 16 ave interchanges	
9	Bridgeland	None	
9	Bridgeland	It pushes out ward 9 from inner city to completely suburb.	
9	Bridgeland	I don't know	
9	Bridgeland	Same as Scenario A.	
9	Bridgeland	Very unhappy with the changes made to Ward 11 last change. The demographics of the south end of that ward and the north end which includes most shelters & low-income downtown is too varied - tough to represent fairly. B makes this worse.	
9	Bridgeland	little differences between the scenarios. No matter which ward people end up in they will have incompetent representation	Out of scope
9	Bridgeland/Riverside	None.	
9	Dover	Gerrymandering	Out of scope
9	Dover	Alters the urban/suburban balance.	
9	Erin Woods	none	
9	Fairview	don't see any	
9	Fairview	Our neighbourhood gets grouped with neighbourhoods that are more affluent and have different priorities. There are a lot of voices in what is currently ward 11 that are against transit that wouldn't align with our needs.	
9	Fairview	Mixing/adding a large industrial area to a primarily residential riding could cause the councillor to have to split focus by having to represent two potentially conflicting perspectives.	
9	Fairview	More disjointed geography, impacts more constituents.	
9	Fairview	Too many electors impacted and Too dissimilar communities together.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	6) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
9	Forest Lawn	Changes the entire make-up of our community as a Ward in Ward 9 - our voice could be white washed, and Ward 11 becomes an even more "entitled" Ward. Socio-economic distribution seems skewed.	
9	Forest Lawn	Ghettoized.	Out of scope
9	Inglewood	Still feel that values of Inglewood and Ramsay are best represented as a group with ward 7. Someone voted in by those communities would be acting on behalf of the entire ward and not just some communities.	Out of scope
9	Inglewood	None	
9	Inglewood	There are several communities impacted by the change, but that isn't a negative, just change.	
9	Inglewood	Taking people out of ward 9 they need as many people to vote out The current counsellor as possible	Out of scope
9	Inglewood	long standing political relationships and quid pro quo are lost	Out of scope
9	Inglewood	There are now only 3 wards that represent inner city neighbourhoods. I think that weakens the voice of the inner city - right now there are 4 wards representing inner city.	
9	Inglewood	Ward 11 becomes an odd grouping of random people with minimal connection throughout rather than the old ward 9 including inner city neighbourhoods.	
9	Inglewood	I can't see any.	
9	Inglewood	None leap out!	
9	Inglewood	Innercity communities like Inglewood and Ramsay are pushed into larger suburban neighborhoods that have very different needs that tax dollars can go towards	
9	Inglewood.	None discernable	
9	Lynnwood	It's obviously part of a larger vision to nerf Ward 9.	
9	Manchester	Inflicts a major geographical change to more electors.	
9	Ogden	None	
9	Ogden	Further amplifies the east-west division seen in Calgary. Wards are either east or west of Deerfoot. Further alienating East Calgarians.	
9	Ogden	Impacts more communities	
9	Penbrooke Meadows	The south communities might be too far out with industrial in between. Not as cohesive. But you need to consider eliminating 10. and divid it between 9 & 5. Jones is retiring anyone. So need to carve it for him.	Out of scope
9	Penbrooke Meadows	See question 3. Time to go back to the drawing board for Scenario C.	
9	Penbrooke Meadows	Again, being blind, I can't really comment on the map itself	
9	Ramsay	Change from ward 9 to 11	
9	Ramsay	Ramsay is lost to Ward 11. Same disadvantages to me as with scenario A.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	6) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
9	Ramsay	None, really. Scenario B better represents the cultural boundaries that exist within Calgary, while at the same time rectifies the population deviations between wards.	
9	Ramsay	What are the advantages/disadvantages with regards to taxes, etc is needed.	
9	Ramsay	cant open it	
9	Ramsay	Cuts the east off from downtown and north of the river connections.	
9	Renfrew	All of east Calgary lumped into ward 9 seems quite expansive (accounting for growth?). Ward 11 becomes very heterogenous with DT and inner city residential.	
9	Renfrew	Too much change	
9	Renfrew	Ward 9 loses all inner city.	
9	Renfrew	see #5. I moved out of Tuxedo Park to get away from Druh Farrell. both scenario A and B put Renfrew in her ward. :(Out of scope
9	Renfrew	None	
9	Renfrew	Tuxedo Park and Winston are vital to ward 7 the inner suburbs perhaps less important	
9	Renfrew	it's a fairly major change for several wards. the portfolio of Ward 9 changes significantly in community types	
9	Renfrew	Tacks Renfrew onto the suburbs	
9	Renfrew	Removes Mount Pleasant and Tuxedo Park which are very closely related to Renfrew. Plus a lot of students that go to King George School are Renfrew residents and we should have the same ward	
9	Renfrew	No major concerns	
9	Renfrew	Adding more downtown residents increases the burden, and downtown residents may not share same challenges and opportunities as inner-city.	
9	Renfrew	Ward 4 gets bigger and some of the concerns may be different in the more northern communities then the more inner city communities.	
9	Renfrew	Some of the closest communities (Winston Heights for example) would not be in the same ward so it would not be as effective. We share things like stores, pools schools etc.	
9	Renfrew	Less similar to other political boundaries. Residents north of 16 Ave NE have less connection with neighbourhoods north of them.	
9	Renfrew	I would be in a different ward.	
9	Renfrew	Nothing	
9	Riverbend	Why is Riverbend being separated from neighboring communities? It doesn't make sense to have us pulled away from quarry park.	
9	Southview	I cannot express myself in a meager 250 character limit! So, in one word, I say - atrocious!	
9	Southview / Dover	No comment	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	6) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
10	Abbeydale	needs work	
10	Abbeydale	n/a	
10	Abbeydale	More electors affected	
10	Marlborough Park	Helps ward 8 and 12, which is not good.	
10	Pineridge	None.	
10	Temple	Way too many communities impacted, seems like gerrymandering.	Out of scope
11	Bay View	It totally messes up who people in current ward feel is their council rep.	Out of scope
11	Beltline	Shrinks downtown representation to just 2 Cllrs. with Ward 11 having some fringe downtown representation. W12 will continue growing and likely still run into population differences in short time.	
11	Beltline	None.	
11	Beltline	More changes	
11	Beltline	More communities change wards.	
11	Victoria Park	Puts inner-city communities of Ramsey and Inglewood into ward 11	
11	Braeside	14 city councillors is not enough to be effectively represented	Out of scope
11	Elbow Park	None	
11	Elbow Park	None	
11	Elbow Park	Ward 11 now covers far to wide a swath of voters, with different needs and viewpoints, and will weaken the ability of our Councillor to advocate for our best interests.	
11	Erlton	none	
11	Erlton	I'm no longer in ward 9	
11	Erlton	Still leaves the ward with an above average of residents.	
11	Erlton	I don't agree with any of these changes, this is just another waste of taxpayer dollars by city bureaucrats, it should be left as is.	Out of scope
11	Erlton	This entire project is a complete waste of taxpayers money!!	Out of scope
11	Haysboro	Haysboro aligns more with west side of ward as opposed to east.	
11	Haysboro	More electors and more community districts will be impacted.	
11	Lakeview	We would be losing North Glenmore park to a different parks division we finally have things happening in the park. Why do they change regional parks in the scenario when they have experienced staff	
11	Lakeview	That I won't have my current councillor.	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	not an equitable split among wards, will have to be addressed again soon	
11	Lakeview	WARD 11 LOOKS VERY DIFFICULT - SPANNING AREAS WITHOUT MUCH IN COMMON	
11	Lakeview	none	

Ward	Community	6) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
11	Lakeview	Ward 11 now encompasses a large industrial area that does not match the neighbourhoods that make up the rest of the Ward	
11	Lakeview	As per Scenario B - I see any change being made by counsel as a conflict of interest and an affront to democracy	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	Puts Inglewood and Ramsey in ward 11, which doesn't make sense	
11	Lakeview	Overall it looks like a lot more communities will be changing wards on scenario B	
11	Lakeview	My neighbourhood has more similarity with and connection with to the neighbourhoods south and west of it than the ones north and east of it. And even this scenario leaves new ward 8 with more people per representative which is unfair.	
11	Lakeview	See scenario A comments	
11	Lakeview	Cuts Lakeview out of 11.	
11	Lakeview	Gerrymandering	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	We will lose our councillor Farkas	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	The disadvantage is now Council is once again ignoring the input of duly appointed panels who were to do the study, just as it ignored a panel about salaries, pensions etc.	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	See 4) above, same disadvantages	
11	Lakeview	It cuts Lakeview out of Ward 11	
11	Lakeview	changes to WARD 11 boundaries	
11	Lakeview	Lack of history and connection with us residents, our concerns and challenges living side by side to Stoney Trail and Glenmore Tr.	
11	Lakeview	Scenario A undemocratically deprives me of my democratically elected representative	Out of scope
11	Maple Ridge	Inner city represented by smaller group of councillors, more diversification needed	
11	Marda Loop	fewer "pan handles", particularly Ward 8, which for some reason, include Stampede Park.	
11	Meadowlark Park	Huge number of changes to communities is disruptive.	
11	Meadowlark Park	I would like to see what the INDEPENDENT COMMISSION recommended. This is NOT the job for City Council	Out of scope
11	Mission	As above	
11	Mission / Cliff Bungalow	See answer to question 4	
11	Oakridge	Do need see ANY NEED FOR CHANGES TO CURRENT WARD BOUNDARIES	Out of scope
11	Oakridge	Lakeview and oakridge have a vested interest in the reservoir so I feel both communities should be in the same ward.	
11	Oakridge	South Glenmore Park no longer part of ward 11. this affects Oakridge directly.	
11	Oakridge	None	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	6) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
11	Palliser	Does not incorporate the district model where southwest ward 11 communities will be joined with Woodpark in ward 13 - would be nice to all be in the same ward	
11	Palliser	None	
11	Park Hill	Adding more voices to ward 11 will only frustrate those who already don't feel heard.	
11	Rideau Park	same as in 3	
11	Rideau Park	I don't see any	
11	Southwood	Our councillor will be run ragged keeping up with the demands of the constituents in our area.	
11	Southwood	Ward 11 taking on Inglewood is a no-no. This community should not be linked in with a ward where the boundary goes as far south as Anderson. There are varying visions that come by bringing in highly urban communities.	
11	Southwood	None	
11	Victoria Centre	The Cliff Bungalow communities are a better fit in Ward 8.	
11	Victoria Park	11 "gobbles up" too much to the east.	
11	Victoria Park	Too high population in ward 8	
11	Windsor Park	More communities changing wards, leading to some confusion among voters	
11	Windsor Park	I'd need to see the map, not these nonsensical numbers.	
12	Auburn Bay	Less intuitive for the uneducated to figure out which ward they live in.	
12	Auburn Bay	None	
12	Auburn Bay	Riverbend and Douglasdale get the shaft. They are stuck in a largely industrial ward.	
12	Auburn Bay	Please refer to the independent commission report on boundaries!	Out of scope
12	Auburn Bay	That these are being proposed by city elected officials and/or employees	Out of scope
12	Auburn Bay	Does not seem to affect me in Auburn Bay.	
12	Copperfield	None.	
12	Copperfield	What would the cost impact on taxes be if there was additional elected officials?	Out of scope
12	Copperfield	Large section of non populated area (for now) in Ward 12. Also, again the loss of Riverbend & Shepard.	
12	Copperfield	Our councillor	Out of scope
12	Copperfield	Better common issues for smaller region	
12	Copperfield	Ward 4 and 14 are being manipulated to accomadate a political agenda focused on empowering the minority residents of the high density downtown core. This is corrupt	Out of scope



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	6) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
12	Copperfield	many changes	
12	Cranston	No disadvantages	
12	Cranston	Some wards that will expect a lot of growth in upcoming years (e.g. 5, 12) would already have higher populations when created	
12	Cranston	Cranston would now be with with communities across the River, which makes it geographically challenging and older communities that face different issues. It would alienate us from the SE corner, from the Seton area facilities that we moved here for.	
12	Cranston	None	
12	Cranston	None	
12	Cranston	no obvious issues	
12	Cranston	Same	
12	Cranston	Could be due for a split soon with the amount of construction going on, especially multi family and condos.	
12	Cranston	a lot of inner city communities are impacted. However, if done well, those new boundaries would stay intact for years and people would get used to it over time.	
12	Cranston	none	
12	Douglasdale / glen	More change. More industrial areas are included in my zone. Not sure if the representation is even between industrial and residential.	
12	Mahogany	putting Douglasdale in Ward 9 and McKenzie Lake in Ward 14, while the southward communities they are most connected to (geographically, transportation, regional use and socioeconomic) are in Ward 12 does not make any sense	
12	Mahogany	Those that are affected will need to get used to the changes.	
12	Mahogany	Possible affects to current budgets or plans	
12	McKenzie Towne	Still Councillors are meddling in all areas	Out of scope
12	McKenzie Towne	Several people impacted by changes.	
12	McKenzie Towne	Doesn't plan for growth in Seton	
12	New Brighton	Impacts far more citizens	
12	Quarry Park	Slightly more residential communities impacted, several more non residential communities impacted.	
12	Quarry Park	Larger number of communities affected	
12	Riverbend	See above	
12	Riverbend	None noticed at time	
12	Riverbend	Every time there is a boundary change Riverbend changes Wards. Please leave Riverbend in Ward 12	
12	Riverbend	We move into a different ward	
12	Riverbend	Makes the ward very large	
12	Riverbend	It seperates Riverbend from close and similar communities	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	6) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
12	Riverbend	Ward broken up	
12	Riverbend	Riverbend gets cut off from the communities that surround us and that we engage with. We share common facilities and infrastructure with Quarry Park and Douglasdale, not Ogden and Inglewood.	
12	Riverbend	Still doesn't seem ideal. Would prefer an arrangement that kept Riverbend, Quarry Park, Douglas Dale connected to south communities	
13	Bridlewood	May have to amend the policy.	
13	Bridlewood	none	
13	Canyon Meadows	None.	
13	Evergreen	None	
13	Silverado	None	
13	Woodbine	For me, none	
13	Woodbine	1. more Councillors on taxpayers shoulders , 2. more political divisions trying to create wards with certain support group concentration 3. unfair representation	Out of scope
13	Woodbine	none	
13	Woodlands	None.	
13	Woodlands / Woodbine	Doesn't take into account of possible trends especially in new neighbours that will be developed	
14	Chaparral Valley	The potential lost voices of what may become the underrepresented population in the greater forest lawn areas when paired with the more southern Calgarians.	
14	Douglasdale	You have lumped all these communities together with no names, no boundaries no nothing and that is the disadvantage, no thought process	
14	Lake Chaparral	Specifically to Ward 14 is a growth ward with newer communities and increasing future population -7.37 will catch up in future to more balanced versus inner city wards with a 'fixed' population	
14	Legacy	I like my fancy, quiet, new area. It would suck if developed areas affected access to resources especially for people that rely on things like accessible transit. Older areas dont represent these issues at all	
14	Legacy	Council involved	Out of scope
14	McKenzie Lake	large number of people affected	
14	McKenzie Lake	None	
14	Midnapore	Ward 9 will be a nightmare logistically. More communities will be displaced	
14	Sundance	Not sure	
14	Walden	Communities may not identify which each other as some of the residents are more centrally located and could have different concerns then those of new growth areas.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	6) What do you think are the main disadvantages of Scenario B? (Comments unedited)	Notes
14	Walden	No impact	
	No ward/community given	Not all the boundary changes make sense, like downtown into Ward 7.	

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
1	Bowness	It would be much more helpful to present approximate changes to population numbers contained within wards now vs in these proposed changes	
1	Bowness	This should be done by an independent panel, not the City Administration or Bureaucrats. The last Election fiasco is a prime reason.	Out of scope
1	Bowness	the Supreme Court of Canada and Alberta Court of Appeal have handed down rulings stating that population differences should not exceed certain limits relative to each other.	Out of scope
1	Royal Oak Rocky Ridge	This was not needed. Previous Councils have dealt with this exact issue at least 10 times previously- the parameters are known and clear cut so why this Engagement exercise. Is this Council so fractured and ineffectual it can't make decision	Out of scope
1	Scenic Acres	None of these affect me, and I am not sure why there is change, as the news report doesn't say...	
1	Scenic Acres	Council has ZERO BUSINESS drawing up the ward boundaries!!! It is meant to be done by a disinterested THIRD PARTY!!!	Out of scope
1	Scenic Acres	An independent commission, not politicians and bureaucrats, should decide the boundaries of our Wards for the 2021 election.	Out of scope
1	Scenic Acres	I read an article in the SUN and I contacted Ward Sutherland who assured me this was being done in a totally professional manor and not influenced by council. So it's just an amazing coincidence that what Carra said comes to fruition in these 2 maps?	Out of scope
1	Tuscany	Why are the boundaries so oddly shaped? Wards 1, 2, 8, and 11 all have weird extensions that look like they're being gerrymandered (current or proposed). Why not have some sort of coherent and consistent grouping like the Provincial constituencies?	
1	Tuscany	I think the boundary changes should be done 3D party and no one in council or mayor should have any say in it.	Out of scope
1	Tuscany	Reduce the number of Councillors and Wards significantly.	Out of scope
1	Valley Ridge	Don't waste more tax payers money!!!	Out of scope
1	Valley Ridge	City Council should have no say in the changes to the boundaries.	Out of scope
1	Valley Ridge	should not be determined by the sitting councillors	Out of scope



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
1	Varsity	Why are Councillors involved with boundaries being redrawn? Gives the impression of gerrymandering, lacks transparency and accountability. with reference to Community Association boundaries not being impacted, that's irrelevant.	Out of scope
2	Citadel	Make Joe Magliocca's residence an enclave and remove it from the city.	Out of scope
2	Evanston	This process should be scrapped and handled by an independent group. Councillors having any input on the boundaries or their own wards infringes on tampering with democracy.	Out of scope
2	Evanston	Councillors should have ZERO input on ward boundaries. It should be an independent commission. This amounts to voter tampering.	Out of scope
2	Nolanhill	Don't do it right now	Out of scope
2	Sage bluff	Why not weight votes based off of property tax paid? The more a household posts property tax, higher the weight of the vote.	Out of scope
2	Sage Hill	Term limits.	Out of scope
2	Sage Hill	No.	
2	Sherwood	This visualization is useless if we don't know how many people are represented in each ward.	
3	Coventry hills	Would prefer the cut off to be Beddington trail	
3	Coventry hills	There are a number of northern communities in Ward 3 that are not fully developed yet. Ward 3 may currently appear to have a smaller number of residents than is "ideal" but this is temporary.	
3	Coventry hills	Neither changes my life dramatically so go with which one best reflects the needs of the working class.	
3	Coventry hills	Whichever scenario is chosen, it should be clearly communicated to all households who do not have internet access or cable. A flyer should be sent so that all households know of the incoming changes once decided.	
3	Coventry hills	Please put all the Northern Hills Communities in the same ward. They have similar needs and concerns. Splitting a community into 2 different wards seems silly.	
3	Coventry hills	Why wasn't this addressed as Wards like ward 1 expanded in size?	
3	Hanson Ranch	You are taking away from those councillors that oppose Nenshi, thereby making them work harder to convert voters. The plan is very transparent.	Out of scope
3	Harvest Hills	Please provide meaningful information about the rationale, reasoning, features, advantages, benefits, costs and/or revenues associated with these changes. I am unimpressed because of the lack of rigour in evidence here.	
3	Harvest Hills	Please delay changes	Out of scope
3	Hidden Valley	No	
3	Hidden Valley	do more with less	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
3	Hidden Valley	This city council is disgusting. Everyone wants to be the center of attention. Only Farkas listens to his constituents, and you all seem to think that money grows on trees!	Out of scope
3	Hidden Valley	No	
3	Hidden Valley	It is important to equalize the population numbers in each ward. Make sure to properly notify the affected communities of the change in ward boundaries ahead of the next election.	
3	Hidden Valley	Have an independant body do the changes not city bureaucrats	Out of scope
3	Hidden Valley	I think this should be left to an independent review process. It's a conflict of interest for councillors to meddle in this process.	Out of scope
3	Panorama Hills	I suspect some will be up in arms, but if wards were half the size, each councilor could get bot a (more) inner city ward plus a (more) suburban one. They would be required to think beyond special interests.	
3	Panorama Hills	I'd rather not see any changes at all. I used to live in MacEwan and I don't see the same issues or concerns by adding them to the north side of Beddington Trail.	
3	Panorama Hills	This is another example of how far off of reality our city council is. This process is flawed. NO city Councillor should be involved in this process, in any way.	Out of scope
3	Panorama Hills	Elect only 6 councilors city wide and mayor. That way you remove the ward kingdoms . The six councilors deal with issues on a city wide bases, not what is best for their ward	Out of scope
3	Panorama Hills	I believe only residents that would have a change of wards should be allowed to vote. They are the ones effected.	
4	Beddington	The boundaries should be studied & proposed by an independent body, not city council. I do not think it needs changing. The mayor need changing!.	Out of scope
4	Beddington	Don't do it.	Out of scope
4	Brentwood	I think it's important to take a longer term view of the problem and develop a solution that will likely be able to be in place for several elections	
4	Cambrian Heights	Hire an independent consultant to make non political decisions	Out of scope
4	Cambrian Heights	An attempt by council to subvert democracy and favour select incumbents. Same story as 4 years ago when the consultant recommendations were rejected. I am not in favour of either of these scenarios. I've raise a complaint with Provincial Minister.	Out of scope
4	Charleswood	My community should be moved back to Ward 7. We don't have anything in common with the communities North of John Laurie. I work at the University of Calgary. I use the University LRT. All my connections are with Ward 7.	
4	Dalhousie	Both scenarios have little to no impact on my household	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
4	Dalhousie	Council should not be involved in any way in setting ward boundaries, nor should they tinker with any recommendation put forward.	Out of scope
4	Huntington Hills	This doesn't seem like a very holistic approach. All wards should be considered.	
4	Huntington Hills	Would be nice to not have the little tiny peninsulas in the centre of the city.	
4	MacEwan	I pick neither. These are terrible scenarios for MacEwan.	
4	MacEwan	Don't change my community boundaries please.	
4	MACEWAN	None. The city should be putting resources towards easing tax burden and not changing political lines.	Out of scope
4	MacEwan	Ensure that all communities that have a community association with one another are in the same ward.	
4	North Haven	I definitely like B better. Make a bigger change now and it should last longer than if making a smaller change.	
4	Sandstone Valley	Doesn't make sense	
4	Sandstone Valley	I would prefer to keep the same boundaries	
4	Sandstone Valley	Why is there no option to not move into a new ward?	
4	Thornclyffe Greenview	Leave boundary as is	
4	Winston Heights	I don't agree with the boundaries you've drawn for Ward 11 and think it captures too much. Either focus inner city or in the suburbs.	
5	Castleridge	don't gerrymander. Not necessary - we don't need your manipulation	Out of scope
5	Martindale	The population census is flawed. It relies on the fact that the residents of household input correct data. This may be true for residents without renters in the basement. I doubt the people with illegals basement renters provide correct information.	Out of scope
5	Red Stone	I think to raise more tax if the city too big like Toronto. 2 and 3 need to reduce the boundary, so Calgary it is not too big city does not increasing taxes because of population need more money funding. 2 and 3 need to reduce the boundary.	Out of scope
5	Saddleridge	Councillor Carra's comments are an affront to democracy and show why Council should have no input on this decision.	Out of scope
5	Skyview	Communities north of Country Hills should become part of ward 3.	
5	Taradale	Double the size of them and cut the number of councillors in half, end their pensions immediately to save money.	Out of scope
5	Vista Heights	As somebody in a ward that keeps changing every election. Make a decision & stick with it! I can't even tell you what ward I'm in anymore :(
6	Coach Hill	I have no faith in city council to do this. It must be done independent of gerrymandering hacks like Gian-Carlo Carra who admits he wants to rig the system.	Out of scope



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
6	Coach Hill	Stop wasting tax payer money	Out of scope
6	Glamorgan	Why is this not being done by an independent committee like it is supposed to be done ? This city council better get it together before next election or you will not be here	Out of scope
6	Glamorgan	Communities east of Sarcee have nothing in common with communities north of Sarcee. Realign to represent intercity issues.	
6	Glamorgan	Leave the boundaries of Wards as they currently are!!!! Also City Councillors should have " NO SAY" in how the Wards boundaries change it stay. Councillors should NEVER have any input and whoever suggested so should be FIRED ASAP	Out of scope
6	Glenbrook	I think that this is just an exercise in gerrymandering for certain ridings, most notable Ward 8. A ward boundary study was completed a few years ago and it should be good enough for at least 2 election cycles. Leave it alone until for 2025 election	Out of scope
6	Patterson	I believe the current ward boundaries work, and strongly urge council to not mess with them.	
6	Richmond Hill	An independent commission should oversee this process	Out of scope
6	Richmond Road	There is no reason why there should be 7 or 8 points taken from one community and given to another. If there is a need to do this then it is clear that these boundaries were never fair to begin with. Redraw boundaries using proper laws, not this way!	Out of scope
6	Signal Hill	There is no reason to change the boundaries at all	
6	Springbank Hill	MAYBE THERE SHOULD BE NO WARDS. ELECT 15 PEOPLE THAT OVERSEE CITY OPERATIONS. THESE PEOPLE THEN WORK FOR THE WHOLE CITY; STOP PET PROJECTS. START FIXING PROBLEMS. FOCUS ON CUTTING SPENDING. DROP USELESS DEPARTMENTS.	Out of scope
6	Springbank Hill	I don't prefer either scenario because this is a terrible survey. The maps don't work properly and there is no information on how these changes will ACTUALLY affect people. Go back to the drawing board and try again.	
6	Strathcona	Council salary should not exceed average city staff.	Out of scope
6	West Springs	No	
6	Westgate	I don't care about boundaries per day. We should make less wards. The less councillors the better.	Out of scope
6	Westgate	Enough with the BS Ward changed	Out of scope
7	Banff Trail	This should absolutely not be done and decided by City Council. As a resident this feels like Councillors picking their wards based on perceived support. None of this makes any sense at all.	Out of scope
7	Briar Hill	Honestly, what difference does it make. Even out the populations. Carry on. The city has way bigger issues than lines adjusted for ward boundaries.	

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
7	Crescent Heights	I'm sure this has been considered, I was wondering if Ward 8 could be expanded west to encompass Elbow Park and Mission, Erlton etc... This allows the expansion of ward 11 to include Woodbine and canyon meadows. Then shifting Wards 13 and 14 East	
7	Crescent Heights	Suggest the Beltline be joined to Ward 7 under Scenario B. That may reduce the absolute deviations for both Words 7 & 8. Also, consider the impacts of an east-west orientation for Ward 8 & 11, rather than north-south (e.g. 58 ave could be divider).	
7	Crescent Heights	Read Amber Ruddy's SUN article. I see what she is talking about. Calgarians will see thru this. Why stir up election trouble AGAIN and be accused of rigging the maps? Make it fair and add suburbia like Brentwood to ward 7 like before 2017.	Out of scope
7	Crescent Heights	The changes do not affect me.	
7	Crescent Heights	None	
7	Crescent Heights	No all good.	
7	East Village	Entirely tangential, but I'd like to see a combination of ward-based councillors and "at-large" councillors on city council.	
7	Eau Claire	Eau Claire should not be part of Ward 7 - it's needs are too different from the rest of the ward. Eau Claire should be part of Ward 8 which represents other residential areas of downtown.	
7	Eau Claire Community	We live on 3rd SW on the south side and are active in Eau Claire Community. Last election we were moved to Ward 8. Councillor Ward 7 have been championing our causes. We would like to have boundary changed to be aligned back with Ward 7. Please!	Out of scope
7	Eau Claire Community	We live on 3rd Ave SW on the south side and are active in Eau Claire Community. Last election we were moved to Ward 8. Councillor Ward 7 have been championing our causes. We would like to have boundary changed to be aligned back with Ward 7. Please!	Out of scope
7	Hillhurst	In a representative democracy the population levels in each ward should be as even as possible	
7	Hillhurst	Notwithstanding my comments about Ward 7 above, I think more reliance should be placed on the Bow River and the Deerfoot and Crowchild Trails as boundaries.	
7	Hounsfeld Heights	These changes to the ward boundaries need to be postponed until after the COVID 19 crisis is over. This is not the time to be time to be changing ward boundaries as many of us are trying to sort out greater problems in life.	
7	Mount Pleasant	Please keep Mount Pleasant, Capitol Hill & Banff Trail in the same Ward	
7	Mount Pleasant	Let's make this happen as soon as possible.	
7	Mount Pleasant	Yes. We need to have more councillors wards extend into representing a piece of the downtown. The tax shift issue is massive and far too many do not understand or care enough about it.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
7	Mount Pleasant	I think my values align more closely with inner city residents, rather than people living in Edgemont, etc	
7	Mount Pleasant	Leave the boundaries alone. For the small difference, it is a waste of time and money.	Out of scope
7	Mount Pleasant	The boundary should be the Bow River. It's a different mentality and desire of needs on either side.	
7	Mount Pleasant	Development of the Green Line is liable to have huge impacts on communities, and ward boundaries that follow the proposed path might be helpful to minimize civic infighting.	
7	Parkdale	I wish a pie shape was considered. It would be nice if all councillors had to address inner city and suburban issues.	
7	Tuxedo Park	Please keep Tuxedo Park in ward 7. I feel well represented in this ward and do not wish to change that.	
7	Tuxedo Park	I am good with where I am now	
7	Tuxedo Park	I hope Sean Chu doesn't win regardless of outcome	Out of scope
7	University Heights	All but two councillors & the mayor don't listen to or represent their constituents, so why bother with Wards? Let all Calgarians vote for 10 councillors and get rid of the fat.	Out of scope
7	University Heights	Not enough detail here for such complex issues; online info is not sufficient; many side issues raised at October 21/19 council meeting not addressed; the last boundary change didn't last very long! No provision if you don't like either scenario.	
7	West Hillhurst	We need more inner city Wards,&fewer wards in the far suburbs.The people who are paying the most in property taxes while getting the least in services deserve more than 3 inner city councillors.	
7	Winston Heights	No.	
7	Winston Heights	I'm not clear on why we're being asked for this input. I would expect ward boundaries to be set on the technical merits of equitable representation. This feels like we're wading into gerrymandering territory.	
7	Winston Heights	No	
7	Winston Heights/ Mountview	Why are we wasting our tax paying dollars on this? We did this last time, do we have to do this each election? People are moving out of Calgary and empty communities mean nothing. It should be based on similarities and not population.	Out of scope
7	Winston Heights- Mountview	Please make sure to not break this community into 2 again. I know it was an oversight/clerical error but it really makes a community feel insignificant when you don't even know its boundaries!	
8	Bankview	Boundaries should not keep changing. You do it for political purposes only. The only changes should be in Ward 3 where new communities were proposed but will not be happening	Out of scope



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
8	Beltline	Changes should be implemented sooner rather than later to accommodate forthcoming election.	
8	Beltline	I would like to see the average household income for each ward balanced out, to avoid income-level based politics in the city.	
8	Beltline	Presenting two option that are barely different without giving real electoral reform a position on the ballot is dishonest.	Out of scope
8	Beltline	We need to density and improve our cities sustainability. The ward Boundaries affect decisions regarding climate concerns, and fewer cars and roads must be our future.	Out of scope
8	Currie Barracks	Council should NOT be allowed to make their own changes to ward boundaries because they are politically motivated!	Out of scope
8	Downtown Commercial Core	No option to stay in my current ward...both options look identical. This feels like fake outreach. I like the councillor I have now.	
8	Garrison	I think both are good options, it really depends on what the vision is? Affect people now with less in the future, or take a risk of the unknown and possibly have more ward changes in the future?	
8	Garrison Green	As long as the city doesn't add more councillors, it's fine. The 14 people we have now can barely get anything done.	Out of scope
8	Garrison Woods	Prosecute magliocca for fraud	Out of scope
8	Killarney	Boundaries should remain the same or be adjusted by bodies outside of city council influence.	Out of scope
8	Marda Loop	The way the City of Calgary mismanages tax payers money is ridiculous. Stop wasting money!	Out of scope
8	Richmond	Why is one of the criteria to make it look neat on a map? Equal representation is far more important, it's ridiculous someone's vote in Ward 3 is effectively worth 43% more than a person's in Ward 12. Pick a year and equalize them to the population.	
8	Rosscarock	Scrap the whole process, fire the corrupt election commission, put it into the hands of a provincial appointment!	Out of scope
8	Rosscarock	no	
8	Rosscarock	Don't change the boundaries. This is just Gerrymandering to try to retain political control.	Out of scope
8	Scarboro	Named, rather than number wards could be a cool/fun/engaging change. Something to honour history & culture, maybe. I understand this would be out-of-scope of this consult/change set, but for future consideration, could be interesting.	Out of scope
8	South Calgary	With the 2017 changes, an east-side ward was removed. Since then, the communities east of Deerfoot have struggled with getting the attention of their councillor at the expense of communities on the west side. Plan B will fix this.	
8	South Calgary	All Wards should be as close to been equal as possible. The one person - one vote.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
8	Sunalta	I don't really know if ward boundaries are a factor in representation of interests in Calgary or of how our city grows but I would hate to see more decisions in favour of suburban growth we cannot afford.	Out of scope
8		Why are you presenting 2 vastly different scenarios? Seems to me Scenario B is the best solution.	
8	West Sunalta/Scarboro	Why do you say there are no residents at 8th Avenue and 11th street when Westmount Place is there? This goes for a number of other 0 resident areas.	
8	Wildwood	R1 neighbourhoods should be clustered together in a ward to have a voice against incresed densification.	Out of scope
8	Wildwood	My preference is equality of representttion.	Out of scope
9	Albert Park / Radisson Heights	There's talk about gerrymandering. Moving this responsibility to the provincial government would eliminate this concern, and increase trust with the city council over all. Any reason to distrust causes distrust in everything.	Out of scope
9	Applewood	I want a Ward 9 councillor who maintains the Max Purple/Route 1 corridor. If Scenario B is chosen, I would have to consult 2 councillors for better transit in East Calgary.	Out of scope
9	Applewood	City council should NOT be involved in any way with this process. It smacks of political opportunism and corruption.	Out of scope
9	Applewood	Ward 9 should not include the core. It should be kept residential and SE industry. Moving towards upgrades and repairs to the existing ward.	
9	Bridgeland	Will that improve the safety in Bridgeland?There are a lot of crimes going on in Bridgeland and seems that City or Police doesn't care.Police is picking up a perp and releasing him after that.When City will alocate a police station in Bridgeland?	Out of scope
9	Bridgeland	This is what happened prior to the last election, letting the incumbent councillors get voted in on name recognition only, since a number of their new constituents were unaware of how pathetically useless they actually were.	Out of scope
9	Bridgeland	doyou worry that since you put A first people will choose it over b or does it change for each person providing feedback?	
9	Bridgeland/ Riverside	Scenario B is much preferred.	
9	Dover	should be done be independent body; councillors should not have a say	Out of scope
9	Dover	Keep Inglewood in Ward 9 and extend Ward 14's boundary to Deerfoot Trail all the way. I think that will decrease the variance even more.	
9	Fairview	The wards were changed quite recently, and I think fewer changes are best.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
9	Fairview	By moving Fairview community into a ward that is more demographically similar will allow for better and more focused representation from their councillor.	
9	Fairview	YES, we get Farkas!!	Out of scope
9	Fairview	I believe it's important to keep similar communities grouped together so a common voice is heard and ultimately various Wards will have differing needs that can more easily be met or at least expressed thereby creating efficient use of funds & assets	
9	Fonda	Both suck as we are crammed into ward 9 and have an [language removed] to represent us.	Out of scope
9	Forest Lawn	Both scenarios seem to do a disservice to Ward 8 - but those folks can have their input.	
9	Forest Lawn	No	
9	Inglewood	no	
9	Inglewood	Please consider continuing to have 4 wards that represent inner city neighbourhoods but still balance out the representation.	
9	Inglewood	How convenient? Scenario B looks like it is protecting Carra from all the angry small business owners in Inglewood. This is wrong. Drawn so he can't be held accountable.	Out of scope
9	Inglewood	Consider creating smaller boundary for innercity communities	
9	Inglewood.	There should not be any last minute changes allowed by individual councilors.	Out of scope
9	Lynnwood	Calgarians construe this as gerrymandering. Ward adjustments - even minor ones should be done by a non-partisan body.	Out of scope
9	Manchester	Being an affected community in scenario B, I don't know that it's the right fit for Manchester compared to what currently exists in terms of mix for understanding inner-city, industrial, and affordability of living.	
9	Ogden	Boundaries need to incorporate more than just population in ensuring adequate representation. Needs to also reflect socio-economic patterns. Issues faced in an inner-city neighbourhood are different than a suburban community.	
9	Ogden	how have these proposed changes been structured to account for future growth and shrinkage in the city? Future proofing changes where possible with info we have now.	
9	Penbrooke Meadows	Remove 10. Divid it between 5 & 9, You are aware that you will continue to contribute to the East of Deerfoot syndrome by only following B. Consider using the actual quadrant lines for your pillars of carving ward boundaries.	
9	Penbrooke Meadows	Please consider the mindful presentation from Councillor Gian-Carlo Carra. He has done his due diligence and consulted with his constituents. Let COVID-19 bring sober thought on how Calgary can continue to maintain/service increasing urban sprawl.	Out of scope



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
9	Penbrooke Meadows	I really appreciate Counsellor Carra's discussion of these changes.	Out of scope
9	Ramsay	I prefer neither.	
9	Ramsay	Scenario B is superior to both the current situation, and Scenario A. The current boundaries look very gerrymandered to ensure the longevity of certain councilors careers, rather than representing a logical divisions.	
9	Ramsay	I have a lot of neighbors who are seniors and are not tech savy. How do they get to voice their opinion? As well the explanation of this change is not very specific and doesn't address the day to day living that happens in a Ward. More transparency.	Out of scope
9	Ramsay	It's always a challenge to redraw boundaries and educate people about which ward they are now in. But as equal as possible representation is the guiding principle here.	
9	Ramsay	you guys crack me up-why waste time and money on an email that can't be viewed. after clicking on the "open with any of these" I gave up after 10 page downs of adds and other BS. why dont you just place 3 seaparate maps on the page? to easy efficient	Out of scope
9	Ramsay	East Calgary (ward 9) will no long be a tru representation of all Calgary, it will be relegated to mostly wast of Deerfoot and industrial areas and miss out on opportunities to mesh with inner city as well.	
9	Renfrew	There should be more wards created.	
9	Renfrew	Maximize wards which can represent inner city & suberbs. Council will be more balanced to ensure equal representation of both types of constituents. Hopefully less bickering in #yyccc	
9	Renfrew	I want to remain in Ward 9 and neither scenario allows that. It would have helped to know why you moved the lines in each scenario - what were the drivers? I understand it is a population balancing but why east vs west or north vs south?	
9	Renfrew	This should not be decided by the city of Calgary. The city knows which polling stations voted for which Councillor, and which stations a Councillor wants to include or exclude. The potential for corruption is too high.	Out of scope
9	Renfrew	It's important that like minded communities are together. The current ward 9 is a joke. When I think Bridgeland Renfrew I certainly do not think Dover or Acadia . We identify with Inglewood Crescent Heights sunny side downtown etc.	
9	Renfrew	i appreciate when wards have a balance of a variety of community types, as this increases the perspective the councillors must have when thinking of their constituents.	
9	Renfrew	no	
9	Renfrew	I really like that Renfrew is being removed from Ward 9.	
9	Renfrew	I like being in ward 9, but understand the changes and why the change is needed.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
9	Renfrew	No	
9	Riverbend	Riverbend has seen many many changes. Keep us stable and united with our neighboring communities!!!	
9	Southview	Council is gearing up to decide new ward boundaries themselves. This is a clear conflict of interest and affront to democracy! I insist that the standard practice of an independent, arms-length citizen committee be adhered to	Out of scope
9	Southview/Dover	No comment	
10	Abbeydale	calgary yes Abbeydale and Applewood should be together in ward 9 so they can share the same community hall	
10	Marlborough park	Changing of boundaries should be done by and independent body with no interference or changes from council.	Out of scope
10	Marlborough Park	Question 7 should also have "current".	
10	Marlborough Park	These decisions should be left to an independent commission to avoid rigging the election!	Out of scope
11	Bay View	This process should not be a council decision that will change voting results on next election.	Out of scope
11	Beltline	Downtown representation should somehow remain at 4 Councillors while rapid population growth on fringe wards should be considered, notably Ward 12.	
11	Beltline	The main objective of this change should be to ensure that there is as balance of population as possible. Also the jog between Ward 4/7 around the old Rocky View office makes no sense as there no residents there.	
11	Beltline	Both scenarios are the same for my community, I do not identify with Ward 8 (only with a minimal portion from 14 Street SW to Beltline). Ward 11 makes more sense. Cut off W11 in south and add W8's portion from 14St to Beltline.	
11	Victoria Park	Thank you for bringing beltline communities back into ward 8 where they belong.	
11	Braeside	14 city councillors is not enough to be effectively represented. It is time for us to increase our representation by at least two members. This is not providing our councilors with a health work environment.	Out of scope
11	Cedarbrae	I don't think anything is wrong with how they are now	
11	Elbow Park	This must be in place sooner rather than later. The closer to the next election the less validity this will have.	
11	Erlton	This is tough to get right, but during the last civic election I felt shut-out as the eventual winner of the council seat largely ignore forums and the interests of our community.	
11	Erlton	I do not care for either Scenario A or B. Inner city communities have different needs and priorities than other areas. It does not make sense that my community is lumped in with areas all the way to Anderson Drive. It's a big nope from me.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
11	Erlton	I'm a GIS Analyst so proportional representation especially with the changing of density, growth that has gone on in this city is highest priority, no gerrymandering. Population size and natural community boundaries, nothing else should matter.	
11	Erlton	I would like to see better, more sustainable development in the city - more bike and pedestrian options, less spent on roads and cars	Out of scope
11	Erlton	I don't agree with any of these changes, this is just another waste of taxpayer dollars by city bureaucrats, it should be left as is.	Out of scope
11	Erlton	This entire project is a complete waste of taxpayers money!! I do not pick any scenario. This just shows the public what ridiculous projects the city bureaucrats are wasting taxpayers money on!	Out of scope
11	Haysboro	Should not be up to council to select areas.	Out of scope
11	Haysboro	Impossible to understand, and I live in the most discombobulated ward there is, where there are no changes proposed.	
11	Haysboro	I support the need to refine boundaries and have no difficulty with Council making the final decision as long as Council chooses one of the two recommended options.	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	We would be losing North Glenmore park to a different parks division we finally have things happening in the park. Why do they change regional parks in the scenario when they have experienced staff and management	
11	Lakeview	Why is there not a choice to say I don't like either of the scenarios-useless survey!!	
11	Lakeview	None	
11	Lakeview	WARD 8 SHOULD INCLUDE NORTH OF GLENMORE TO MACLEOD TRAIL	
11	Lakeview	Very disappointed in the engagement format and questions. It's built to assume a change is going to be made and that we have to go along with one of them. I strongly disagree with the process behind the change.	
11	Lakeview	I don't like either scenarios as they both change our Ward and want to keep our current Councilor.	
11	Lakeview	I look forward to my community joining ward 8!	
11	Lakeview	I'm very disappointed in Council. Both your scenarios do the same thing to Lakeview present it as a fait accompli. This is NOT consultation.	
11	Lakeview	I do not prefer any scenario as presented. There should be a third category for Q7: Neither,	
11	Lakeview	Please offer alternative options - these can't possibly be the only choices! Leave Lakeview in Ward 11 please. Get an objective body like an independent citizen group to make these decisions - having council involved is a conflict of interest!	Out of scope



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
11	Lakeview	To be clear, I do NOT like either option. I want Jeromy Farkas to stay as our elected City Council Representative. He has done more for this community than any other city councilor. Going behind closed doors between elections is disgusting!!!	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	The scenarios are the same for Lakeview. It appears in both scenarios Lakeview moves to Ward 8. I will let people who actually have a say in where their neighborhood goes provide feedback.	
11	Lakeview	I voted for Jaromy Farkas. He is one of the very few Councillors with any kind of fiscal responsibility. I	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	I don't like either option. We voted for Jeromy Farkas and he has represented us well. Jeromy Farkas is very responsive and listens to his constituents. We want Jeromy Farkas as our councillor so please keep Lakeview in Ward 11.	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	Do NOT make changes that will remove Farkas!!	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	I refuse to answer #7 as it assumes I agree with one of them and i do not.	
11	Lakeview	Keep similar communities in same division were possible. Ward 11 SHOULD be left alone.e	
11	Lakeview	The City of Calgary should adhere to proper process in assessing the ward boundary changes by taking and implementing recommendations of the Independent Citizen's Panel.The process MUST be done publicly,not behind closed doors.Listen to us tax payers	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	Prefer no changes. This was not presented during last election cycle	
11	Lakeview	Gerrymandering is unacceptable. This councillor worked hard in 2016-17 for our votes. We want him to retain our neighbourhood.	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	I would prefer to remain in Ward 11 as I believe our issues are more related than Ward 8 Communities. I also feel this process of having the City develop Ward Boundary changes unilaterally I would prefer an independent civiccommittee propose changes	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	This is a undemocratic gerrymandering effort. To provide this feedback form with two undesireable options and ask us to respond in the affirmative only which one we like is manipulative and creates DISHONEST data results.	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	My wife and I don't want either of the boundary Scenarios. Why is our city council not listening to the Independent Citizen's Panel to have the panel make the decision on ward boundaries.	Out of scope
11	Lakeview	I expect to be represented by the person who was elected. This should be determined by a citizen council, not city council. Perception of gerrymandering.	Out of scope



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
11	Marda Loop	Neither City Councilors NOR City Administration should be redrawing ward boundaries.	Out of scope
11	Marda Loop	my comments are more general. The fact that this has to be done again, so soon, clearly demonstrates a failure by City Hall. The politicians are still likely too involved in the process are seeking solutions that best suits their situations.	Out of scope
11	Meadowlark Park	I still see a bias towards north/central representation vs. south.	
11	Meadowlark Park	I would like to see what the INDEPENDENT COMMISSION recommended. This is NOT the job for City Council	Out of scope
11	Mission	The needs and interests of citizens who choose to live in the city centre vary widely from those in more suburban communities. Taking a piece of the city centre and attaching it to a ward with more suburban interests leaves me un represented.	
11	Mission / Cliff Bungalow	I would be in Ward 8 right now actually if I lived a few blocks over. Its dumb that I'm not represented with my neighbours	
11	North Glenmore Park	Both scenarios, and the existing boundary, for Ward 11 are in violation of council policy CC017 because the boundary is "pie-shaped". That Cedarbrae and Mission are in the same ward is asinine. Neither scenario is acceptable; fix the underlying issue	
11	Oakridge	Do need see ANY NEED FOR CHANGES TO CURRENT WARD BOUNDARIES.	
11	Oakridge	Why should ward 11 give up the reservoir itself? That doesn't address population	
11	Oakridge	no	
11	Oakridge	Populations per ward should be even	
11	Oakridge	Realistically we need to be aware that economic factors especially populations with financial resources have the power to impact political change. Numbers alone do not tell the whole story. Citizens with higher income and education = more influence.	
11	Palliser	This is the worst depiction or explanation of ward boundary changes that someone could have come up with. Why not make it clear and show each ward separately with the changes? Would be helpful to show the number of residents in each ward! Poor job	
11	Rideau Park	Leave the boundaries as is and don't spend a dime of our already limited resources doing this. You already did an independent study if need to make changes then follow this.	Out of scope
11	Southwood	Stop wasting money on this. Your job is to represent the people and you have failed us. You are being evaluated by the populous and the vote is not in.	Out of scope
11	Southwood	Please go with A.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
11	Southwood	Changes to Ward boundaries should not be done by City Hall. As with the Federal and Provincial governments, this process should be done by an independent commission.	Out of scope
11	Victoria Centre	Ward 11 to Ward 8. A more natural fit. 4ST SW along the Elbow 26 Ave, 18 Ave South to River, West 1 St SW. Include in Ward 8. Otherwise this area will be orphaned to the suburban communities to the South.	
11	Victoria Park	Our community is going to a different ward AGAIN....it's like we move every election!	
11	Victoria Park	Don't break out downtown wards. Group suburbs together and inner city tohety. If there is no park plus on your street then your suburban	
11	Victoria Park	Very happy that Victoria Park will be in the same ward as the rest of Beltline. It has totally different needs concerns than the rest of the current ward 11, such a the more suburban communities of Braeside, Acadia, Willow Park, etc...	
11	Windsor Park	Goal should be the same as Federal riding reviews: equal representation. Disrupting communities by moving wards can be a headache, but it's a necessary one for a functioning democracy.	
11	Windsor Park	I don't want the boundaries to change as I like my representative. Most of City Hall is a mess except him.	Out of scope
12	Auburn Bay	Please refer to the independent commission report on boundaries!	Out of scope
12	Auburn Bay	I feel very strongly that this process should be managed through an independent consultant and not involve any city employees or elected officials, most of all NOT by City Council members.	Out of scope
12	Auburn Bay	Councillor votes should be weighted by ward population, not all equivalent.	Out of scope
12	Copperfield	All councillors should be under investigation	Out of scope
12	Copperfield	Wards 7 and 9 should be split into two additional wards that draw hard boundaries around residential and commercial property densities above 75% then the issues of the ward can be prioritized based on residential needs or commercial	
12	Cranston	Make wards with growing communities have lower initial population compared with wards with more established communities	
12	Cranston	As Calgarian we should have the right to vote on this proposal.	
12	Cranston	none	
12	Cranston	Our ward councillor does not represent us and does not seem to understand that he is supposed to represent the views of his ward (representative democracy) which begs the question if there should even be wards.	Out of scope
12	Cranston	This citizen engagement site is very well prepared. One suggestion to the slides: a portion of the data tables is hidden behind the pop-up window that can't be closed or moved so not all of the data is visible.	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
12	Douglasdale/glen	none	
12	Mahogany	Consider Scenario B, but with changes: Move Douglasdale/Mckenzie Lake to Ward 12 & balance that by moving Cranston to Ward 14. Deviations will remain low, but geographically, Cranston loses out as it is more connected to Ward 12 communities.	
12	Mahogany	No	
12	Mahogany	Additional wards should be created (new wards added) to accommodate population increases & urban sprawl.	
12	Mahogany	Thanks, Councillor Carra, for letting the cat out of bag. How can trust? Incumbents are shaping who else is elected to council. This needs to be done by an independent committee that's work is protected by the province.	Out of scope
12	McKenzie Towne	I believe the priority should be equal representation.	
12	McKenzie Towne	Use predictive planning to establish ward boundaries ahead of establishing these so that they do not have to be changed	
12	Quarry Park	Select from one of these two options and do not change it based on Councilor input after the fact like the last realignment.	Out of scope
12	Riverbend	Make the options clearer to have valid feedback.	
12	Riverbend	I agree strongly that the community of Riverbend should be part of Ward 9	
12	Riverbend	Riverbend should remain in ward 12	
12	Riverbend	What are you smoking>	Out of scope
12	Riverbend	City council should not be moving the ward boundaries. They should be commissioning an independent review and accepting recommendations of that review.	Out of scope
12	Riverbend	Riverbend deserves a councillor that actually cares about our issues. Shane Keating is often focused on issues that don't involve this ward, but he has at least been a big green line advocate. Cllr Carra is so focused on Inglewood he wouldn't be good	Out of scope
12	Riverbend	Totally disagree with the proposed carving out of Riverbend to be in a ward that has such different issues and concerns. Riverbend needs would be neglected in scenario A	
12	Riverbend	Don't keep switching riverbend Tom one ward to another - it confuses people and makes relationship building with our representatives impossible.	
13	Canyon Meadows	Thank you for offering the chance to provide comments on this.	
13	Evergreen	Ward populations need to be kept as equal as possible. Re-balancing to favor one demographic is just wrong.	
13	Woodbine	I think the time line should be fish creek park as opposed to Anderson Road. Neither of these benefit me as most residents in the award live South of fish creek park, different issues and demographics. Therefore I am not being adequately represented.	

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
13	Woodbine	i like less Councillor with the territorial equality vs political interest groups	Out of scope
13	Woodbine	CANT WAIT TO READ THE RICK BELL ARTICLE ABOUT THIS. CARRA WANTS TO GET MORE DIVERSE VOICES LIKE HIM ON COUNCIL AND THESE RIGGED MAPS ARE DRAWN TO DO THAT. SHAME!	Out of scope
13	Woodlands / Woodbine	Better ideas around population change based on statistics and how the potential growth of the population in urban density or outward communities having a larger then project population	Out of scope
14	Chaparral	I think the council should go with an independent commission to determine the wards and not deviate from the outcome of their findings. The councillor should not be able to tweak anything.	Out of scope
14	Chaparral Valley	Scenario A feels like a better fit for Calgary Neighbourhood staff that are currently organized by Ward boundaries.	
14	Deer Run	I just thought it wld make more sense if it was the people of the wards affected that made the recommendations. In a ward not affected, I feel my say isn't as important or critical as those in affected wards.	
14	Douglasdale	Give the names of the districts affected on the map	
14	Douglasdale	You would not care to hear. Cancel the green line down south, by the time the majority of riders would catch a. Us to get down to 114 th you may as well just ride the bus. 30 to 40 by ears later to make it to the hospital if ever, just forget it,	Out of scope
14	Legacy	More education needed on this.	
14	Legacy	City Council should not be involved in this process. This should remain an independent process.	Out of scope
14	McKenzie Lake	no	
14	Midnapore	Not sure what population/councillor is in Calgary relative to other similarly sized municipalities or even federal/provincial constituencies and MLA/MP representation per pop. Would be worth considering what a reasonable limit for representation is.	
14	Midnapore	Ward boundaries s/be established by an non-elected group with no political interference	Out of scope
14	Parkland	Stop messing with it! If any changes are to be made it should be made by an impartial organization, not city staff. Councillors should have nk part in deciding who gets to vote within their ward.	Out of scope
14	Sundance	To be honest, I don't like either. Not sure why the downtown is always split up amongst 2 or three wards. Couldn't ward 1 be the downtown and beltline, put all the urbanists in one riding? Then move out to the suburbs. Must be a historical reason	
14	Walden	No impact for me so don't care	
	No ward/community given	Boundaries should not be decided by city council but by an independent firm.	Out of scope



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

Ward	Community	8) Do you have any additional comments related to the proposed changes to City of Calgary Ward Boundaries? (Comments Unedited)	Notes
	No ward/community given	I am not in agreement with either scenario. Why the significant changes for wards 4 & 11? This looks more like political sabotage to REMOVE diverse voices on council. Don't overhaul wards that don't require it otherwise it looks like gerrymandering.	Out of scope
	No ward/community given	The public requires a fully independent commission for all future boundary changes.	Out of scope
	No ward/community given	There have been reports in the media that Councillor Carra is purposely manipulating the ward representation to favour his personal (and inner-city) agenda. This is manipulative, dishonest, and undermines democratic process. Ask him to stop.	Out of scope

Email Comments

EMAIL FEEDBACK (Comments Unedited)	Notes
Farkas and Chu. Why is council not agreeable to the idea of having input on these changes from an independent group?	Out of scope
<p>We have just learned of the city's plans to adjust the boundaries of our ward which would deny us representation by our elected representative.</p> <p>We would like to know what we can do to register our opposition to this undemocratic change and to support any effort to retain representation by the individual that we elected.</p> <p>Further – we have visited the feedback survey provided quietly by the City and deem it to be an entirely dishonest form of engagement. It presents two gerrymandering scenarios as the only possible options – with no null option – and requires the participant to respond in the affirmative only as to which scenario they like. This is an overtly manipulative, non-scientific process that will produce dishonest data that will be used to produce dishonest outcomes – either knowingly or unknowingly.</p> <p>We are entirely opposed to this undemocratic initiative [personal identifying information removed]</p>	Out of scope
<p>I've just read Mr. Carra's well-thought-out email about ward boundaries. I think this is of very little concern to most Calgarians, especially at this time. Mr. Carra believes in urbanization and more densely populated communities. I disagree. Especially during this pandemic, I'm so thankful for a yard and space. I realize that single family residences cost the city more, but I'm glad I live in one</p> <p>To conclude, I would like to recommend that no time, energy or money be spent on worrying about ward boundaries.</p> <p>Thank you. [personal identifying information removed]</p>	Out of scope
Hi there. I live in Ward 9 currently with Gian-Carlo Carra as my alderman. I was against the ward boundary changes right from the beginning, because of the unique characteristics of my area and needing effective representation for our needs. When Andre Chabot was my councillor, he got things done, you could contact him if 311 wasn't responding to complaints and BOOM – done right	Out of scope



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

EMAIL FEEDBACK (Comments Unedited)	Notes
<p>away. Our current councilor (Carra) lives too much in the “downtown” of Calgary, where walking/biking are cool and easy to do to get to work, shop, etc, not so in Applewood. Since the boundary changes, I have noticed that anything damaged/need repair, etc in East Calgary doesn't get done. It now can take up to a month or even more to get a single simple lightbulb changed in the streetlights. The road barrier/retention wall that borders 68 St NE and SE has multiple areas of damage where the cinderblocks are destroyed, bare rebar is mangled and a safety hazard with its protrusion , and one area in particular on 68th Street has been damaged since 2018 June and despite multiple complaints to 311 and councilors office, nothing has been done. That is one big reason I voted against the Olympics in Calgary, I am embarrassed by how my city is looking, or shall I say my area at least? I noticed that a retention wall along Southland Dr and Willow Dr area that was damaged was repaired within 2 months, coincidently where a ward official resides. Should be interesting to see if the damaged areas make it to 2 years now, especially with the COVID situation. I do not feel that Gian Carlo Carra is effective for the area he is representing, and seems to be more interested in installing bike lanes, wasting money lowering residential speed limits than effectively interacting and getting things done for us in East Calgary. I am not surprised by this, actually expected it when the wards were redrawn, but none the less, I am still very disappointed by losing our effective counsel for this area of East Calgary (Applewood Park) since it was re-drawn away from Andre Chabot. I think the ward boundaries should be restored, so we can get effective representation from someone in East Calgary who will serve the needs of East Calgary since he knows about the uniqueness of the area. Thank you. [personal identifying information removed]</p>	
<p>I have read the information provided in regard to ward changes. I live in Ward 9 and do not want to see it divided up and no one to look after the very diverse population we have. [personal identifying information removed]</p>	
<p>I vote for Option A not B Please reply if this is a sufficient reply to the city clerks survey? Thank you.</p>	Out of scope
<p>Important to keep the boundary adjustment that took effect in 2017 for Ward 9 as per statement made in Councillor Carra's report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> for the first time in our City's history, the neighbourhoods and working and natural landscapes that have historically been referred to as East Calgary were united into a single, meaningful place. Ward 9 is a model ward as it constitutes a rich mix of demographics, tax bases, and urban, suburban, rural and industrial landscapes; it is block-shaped and bounded by major roads as per the technical requirements; and it is recognizably a place in its own right. 	



Ward Boundary Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard
2020 May 28

EMAIL FEEDBACK (Comments Unedited)	Notes
<p>Re : Ward Boundary Review.</p> <p>I would like to add my voice to this important topic.</p> <p>I believe it is very important that the Climate Crisis, and our cities ability to achieve it's climate targets, is front and center when making ward boundary decisions.</p> <p>Suburban sprawl is a very serious threat to Calgary's ability to achieve its climate targets. Calgary's car-centric suburban communities, especially wards that are 100% suburban, are increasing rapidly. These wards have proven to be conflicted when it comes to making hard decisions around cutting our carbon footprint. Councilors need to be able to balance the needs of their constituents with climate action - but this is proving difficult in suburban wards. So it's imperative that, where possible, wards are a mix of inner city and suburban.</p> <p>Calgary is at a cross roads in regards to climate action and changing ward boundaries in favor of positive climate change decisions will impact the direction our city takes in the future. [personal identifying information removed]</p>	<p>Out of scope</p>
<p>I don't agree with changing any ward boundaries. This is not an effort worth spending any time or money on since the boundaries were reviewed and revised not that long ago.</p>	<p>Out of scope</p>
<p>I want the independent commission to make decisions on ward boundaries</p>	<p>Out of scope</p>