# Off-site Levies Bylaw Update Review – Water Infrastructure Lists – Linear & Stormwater: Industry Consultation Meeting Notes

**Date/Time:** Monday, February 2, 2026 / 8:30am – 10:00am

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

**Attendees:**

| Internal | External |
|---|---|
| Krista Campbell | Jackie Stewart |
| Erin Felker | Brett Freisen |
| Helen Hu | Brian Hahn |
| Brian Arthur | Nadia Friesen |
| Maggie Choi | Guy Huntingford |
| Quinn Eastlick* | Grace Lui |
| Liz (Elizabeth) Tan | Mohamad Mohamad |
| Laura Urbain | Joe Case |
| | Bob Faktor |
| **Regrets** | |
| Sara Alinaghi pour | Shameer Gaidhar |
| Patrick Doran | Greg Bodnarchuk |
| Pamela Ajoku | |
| Natalia Ivanova | |

*Note taker

## Agenda

1. **Introduction and rationale**
2. **Preview of infrastructure list**
3. **Group discussion and follow up**

## Discussion

- Can you explain the 4 year budget cycle and how it works relative to the approved projects and the inputs to the financial models?
    - Thought the newly approved lands were approved in part because they did not have any new project requirements.
    - How do you ensure that the new projects added to the numerator are aligned with the denominator, and how do you calculate that, including the backup data?
    - Is it possible to share which of the slide 7 applications were no capital applications?
    - Could we get slide 7 restated to reflect which were no capital? How they tie to the infrastructure list.
    - South water servicing option. Talked about there being a benefit to growth. One of the things we were hoping for was the details of the benefit allocation.

    - Didn't realize there was infrastructure required to service approved applications that were no capital required, and now we're going to add a project in the next budget cycle. Our argument has always been the bigger the numerator, the bigger the denominator, the greater the level of stability. It seems like we are now looking at projects at a 4-year budget window, which increases volatility. In addition, not including projects up front opens up the process to error.
    - Hard to go through the project list without knowing the benefit allocation. Will need this information to better understand.
- Can you tell us more about the Prairie Economic Gateway projects added to the list and how the benefit allocation will be calculated for growth?
    - Why is a component of this being allocated to growth? Given the demand for industrial land in Calgary in the past, putting infrastructure that will increase the levy to supply more industrial land on the way to an industrial land hub that will be more attractive than industrial land in Calgary, how does that make sense?
    - Why are we adding industrial capacity in Calgary when industrial lands in Calgary are not competitive with surrounding municipalities?
- If capacity is being directed to Rockyview County, the benefit will be allocated to them. Is there capacity added to industrial lands in Calgary without making them more competitive, that is not money well spent. Our hope is that at end of 2025 with DAs approved, we will be close to balanced. Adding this industrial land puts this balancing at risk.
- Heard that Bearspaw South Feeder Main has pushed a lot of things back, and implementation plan from feeder main report is coming up as well. Think that some of these implementation projects will add to the levy. We should be looking to include and consider this as part of this process. We should perhaps make an ask to management to change this scope.
- Are projects and costs approved as of today or will this be approved in November as part of the new 4 year cycle and how does that timing impact the inputs to the financial models?
- Industry's desire is to ensure that the numerator matches the denominator the best it can and that benefit allocation is accurate
- The more time has passed, the more that we learn about only the past 4-year cycle was included in the levy. Would it be worthwhile for The City to provide rationale for the denominator that's been selected? In 2024, we felt we were provided with a levy that included the ASP denominator, and we took the position that the denominator should be approved areas only. The more time that goes on, it feels like something that industry would like to be explored. We hear that this is out of scope, but why is it out of scope? Would like to discuss the rationale for this.
- When will the water infrastructure fund balances be available as they are also input updates? I previously sent a spreadsheet going back in time and would like that confirmed - historical, current and forecast of future water fund balances is important to understand - thank you. Want to make sure data is accurate. Also, at some point, some of the balances were written off, but I don't see that reflected anywhere.
- In terms of the four year budget cycle, the budget has not yet been approved. How does that align to putting numbers in the model if the budget has not yet been approved by council?

## Summary of Action Items

- **Administration**

- Send updated slide deck.
- Provide benefit allocation information (South water servicing, Prairie Economic Gateway).
- Confirm historical, current, and forecast water infrastructure fund balances.