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Overview

On April 4, 2018, the Provincial Cabinet approved both the Calgary City Charter, 2018 Regulation and the Edmonton City Charter, 2018 Regulation. These Regulations represent the culmination of a years-long process by Alberta’s two major cities to secure greater control from the Province. Or so we thought ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2012</td>
<td>Alberta, Edmonton, and Calgary enter into an MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2014</td>
<td>Alberta, Edmonton, and Calgary enter into a Framework Agreement for Charters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
<td>Bill 20 - MGAA was passed which introduced the City Charters enabling provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2017</td>
<td>Draft City of Edmonton and Calgary Charter Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2018</td>
<td>City of Calgary Charter, 2018 Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Edmonton Charter, 2018 Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2018</td>
<td>City of Calgary Charter, 2018 Regulation Amendment Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Edmonton Charter, 2018 Regulation Amendment Regulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview

Is a Charter Necessary?

Is it a bit late to be asking this question?

An often heard justification for a big city charter is that the MGA is “one size fits all” legislation for a summer village of 20 residents to a city of 1.2M

But the MGA, which has just gone through a cover-to-cover amendment, is a complex and comprehensive act – 740 sections, over 220 regulations under it

Perhaps the summer villages should have been lobbying for simpler legislation rather than the big cities lobbying for more
Overview

Why a Charter?

Several major Canadian cities have city charters. These cities include:

- St. John’s
- Halifax
- Montreal
- Hamilton
- Toronto
- Winnipeg
- Vancouver
Overview

Why a Charter?

• “In order to ensure cities like Edmonton and Calgary are able to become centres of excellence on the international stage, the legislation applicable to them must recognize their unique status and needs” – Former Municipal Affairs Minister Larivee

• The charters are a tripartite effort to provide additional authorities and flexibility to the cities with the aim of building strong, vibrant cities that attract trade and investment.
An Improper Delegation of Powers?
What do these two rulers have in common?
City charters in other provinces are enabled by provincial statute not regulation
### Vancouver Charter

#### Amendments

- Enacted by provincial statute.
- The Vancouver Charter was enacted in 1952.
- Since enactment, it has been amended over 300 times, all under the scrutiny of the BC Legislature.

#### Regulations

- There are 10 regulations currently in force under the Vancouver Charter, addressing mostly procedural matters.
## The City of Toronto Act – the Toronto Charter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendments</th>
<th>Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Enacted by provincial statute.</td>
<td>• The City of Toronto Act, SO 2006 has 24 regulations currently in force, mostly procedural or further defining (rather than expanding) authorities granted under the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The City of Toronto Act, SO 2006 been amended 41 times since enactment in 2006, all under the scrutiny of the Ontario Legislature.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An Improper Delegation of Powers?

But what about Alberta’s Charters?
The “Henry VIII Clause”

• A Government sometimes adds a provision, known as a Henry VIII clause, to a Bill to enable the Government to repeal or amend it after it has become an Act of Parliament

• The provision enables primary legislation to be amended or repealed by subordinate legislation without further parliamentary scrutiny

• Such provisions became known as Henry VIII clauses after the Statute of Proclamations 1539 gave King Henry VIII power to legislate by proclamation
Are Henry VIII Clauses Unlawful?

• No, but the Courts and parliamentary committees in Canada have cautioned against their use in all but the most exceptional circumstances.

• For example, the federal *War Measures Act* delegates broad powers to Cabinet to conduct war and to amend its enabling legislation.

• This delegation of legislative authority was challenged unsuccessfully (in *Grey, Re*), the SCC holding that the authority to levy war was one of those exceptional circumstances.
Can Henry VIII Clauses be Used in Unexceptional Circumstances?

• Arguably, no. The prevailing judicial view of Henry VIII clauses is that they are repugnant to principles of democracy and parliamentary sovereignty.

• “It is one thing to confer this extraordinary power if it is actually needed for some urgent and immediate action to protect an explicitly identified public interest. It is quite another thing to hand it out with daily rations of government power, unlimited as to any explicit legal purpose for which it may be exercised.” (Ontario Public Schools Boards’ Assn v Ontario (AG), 1997)
An Improper Delegation of Powers?

- MGA is amended by the Legislature to enable charter cities to pass bylaws that amend the MGA and other provincial acts
- A charter bylaw may be able to amend or replace the MGA or any other provincial enactment
- A charter bylaw may supersede the MGA or any other provincial enactment in the event of a conflict or inconsistency
- What urgent public interest is being protected by this extraordinary delegation of provincial power?
Charters – Development Perspective

MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT ACT

CITY OF CALGARY CHARTER, 2018
REGULATION

CITY OF EDMONTON CHARTER, 2018
REGULATION
Overview

Alberta Charters focus on five main categories:

1. Administrative efficiency
2. Supporting community and wellbeing
3. Smarter community planning
4. Empowering local government stewardship
5. Collaboration
Charters – Creating Uncertainty for Development

1. Lack of transparency and involvement
2. Climate change / environmental stewardship impacts
3. Fiscal/tax/levies/cost impacts
4. Inter-municipal opportunities & challenges
5. Implementation, policy and regulatory uncertainty
Four Broad Categories of 37+ Authorities

1. Improving Administrative Efficiency (18)
   • City Charters modernize processes, remove obstacles to innovation and efficiency, provide greater autonomy for administrative decision-making, and ensure appropriate accountability is in place.

2. Supporting Community and Wellbeing (2)
   • City Charters work to improve the wellbeing of citizens by supporting the development and maintenance of affordable housing stock to meet the needs of low and medium income households.
Four Broad Categories of Authorities

3. Smarter Community Planning (10)
   • City Charters enable smarter community planning within the cities by supporting diversified transportation networks, enabling thoughtful revitalization of existing neighborhoods, and encouraging growth that meets local needs.

4. Empowering Environmental Stewardship (7)
   • City Charters enable the City to respond to environmental pressures with local solutions, including measures that provide greater community energy security, climate change mitigation and adaptation planning, and protection of the local physical environment.
Improving Administrative Efficiency

• Authority to perform supplementary assessments on farm land recently redesignated for development

• Authority to define additional types of statutory plans

• Authority to assess Environmental Reserve at the time of subdivision

• Authority to manage its own debt

• Authority to create the parameters for its off-site levies

• Authority to pass bylaws for even broader purposes than those described in secs. 7 & 8 of the MGA

1. Improving administrative efficiency

2. Supporting Community Wellbeing

3. Smarter Community Planning

4. Environmental Stewardship
Improving Administrative Efficiency

**Issue:** The MGA permits supplementary assessments for improved property, not when property changes from one assessment class to another.

**Regulatory Change:** The City may impose supplementary assessments on property that has changed from farm land to another use.

**Industry Concern:** Given long development timeframes for new residential subdivisions especially, supplementary assessments could add significant costs.
Improving Administrative Efficiency

**Issue:** The City lacks the ability to create more specific statutory plans to regulate specific types and areas of development.

**Regulatory Change:** The City will be authorized to pass additional statutory plans that fit into the hierarchy of the MDP, CTP, ASP, and ARP.

**Industry Concern:** ASPs and ARPs have already become overly prescriptive. Adding another layer of regulation will add time and cost to development with no clear benefit. A statutorily defined hierarchy of plans could upset the current interpretive regime (defined by case law) of plans, policies and the land use bylaw.
Improving Administrative Efficiency

**Issue:** Environmental Reserves are determined during the land use redesignation/subdivision approval processes and have been assessed as such as of the date of the LUD decision by Council.

**Regulatory Change:** The City will be authorized to assess ER lands under its prior assessment class until subdivision.

**Industry Concern:** This change stems, we believe from a 2004 ABCA decision involving Carma and The City of Calgary over the assessment of ER in the community of Tuscany. Carma successfully argued that those parcels designated as ER at LUD should be assessed as such from that time. If this were to change so that ER wouldn’t apply for assessment purposes until subdivision plan registration, this would add significant costs.
Improving Administrative Efficiency

**Issue:** The City’s debt capacity is currently limited by provincial regulation.

**Regulatory Change:** The City will be authorized to create its own debt limit and debt servicing policies.

**Industry Concern:** This change could be useful for expanding the City’s capacity to finance development infrastructure. However, without the backing of the Province’s credit rating, City debt could be more expensive.
Improving Administrative Efficiency

**Issue:** Off-site levies are currently prescribed by the MGA and Regulation.

**Regulatory Change:** The City will be authorized to add new types of infrastructure that qualify for levies, define the process of stakeholder consultation, and establish the benefitting area and degree of benefit.

**Industry Concern:** The MGA was recently amended to authorize the community and recreational levy, which the City had collected for years on questionable authority. This new Charter Authority would allow the City to include additional types of development-related infrastructure to its off-site levies bylaw, further limit consultation with developers, and establish a methodology that veers from the current off-site levy regulation in determining benefit.
Improving Administrative Efficiency

**Issue:** The MGA sets out general and specific powers by which Council may pass bylaws. Broader powers to pass bylaws would allow the City to better accomplish its goals.

**Regulatory Change:** The Charter (sec. 4(4)) provides the City with the broad authority to pass bylaws, provided they fit within the municipal purposes described in sec. 3 of the MGA:

- to provide good government;
- to foster the well-being of the environment;
- to provide services, facilities or other things that, in the opinion of council, are necessary or desirable for all or part of the municipality;
- to develop and maintain safe communities;
- to work collaboratively with neighbouring municipalities to plan, deliver and fund intermunicipal services.
Improving Administrative Efficiency

**Industry Concerns:** The expanded powers conferred on a charter city under sec. 4(4) of the Charter Regulation to pass bylaws are so broad as to be potentially limitless. Furthermore, bylaws passed under this authority do not require a public hearing (sec. 9(2) of the Charter). What is the purpose of such an unfettered delegation of power? How do the charter cities intend to use it?
Supporting Community Well-Being

- Authority to offer loans to support affordable housing projects
- Ability to ensure that affordable housing agreements follow title for the life of the agreement
- Ability to create a city-specific inclusionary housing by amending its land use bylaw

1. Improving administrative efficiency
2. Supporting Community Wellbeing
3. Smarter Community Planning
4. Environmental Stewardship
Supporting Community Wellbeing

**Issue:** Despite City policies supporting complete communities, few tools are available at the municipal level to effectively deliver and maintain affordable housing.

**Regulatory Change:** Through the Charter, the City can offer loans to individuals and to developers specifically for affordable housing projects, and design a comprehensive inclusionary program. The ultimate objective is to spur (or require) the development of affordable housing.

**Industry Concern:** How will these loans be funded? What incentives or offsets will the City offer to a developer as compensation for the requirement to develop affordable housing? Will the cost be borne broadly enough?
Smarter Community Planning

- Authority to further define subdivision approval conditions
- Ability to use current or surplus school sites for other uses that confer a public benefit
**Smarter Community Planning**

**Issue:** A municipality is in the best position to determine what factors it needs to examine to make a sound decision on a subdivision application.

**Regulatory Change:** Existing subdivision application requirements would continue to apply as a baseline. The City would, in its land use bylaw, be enabled to vary or add to subdivision application requirements set out in the Subdivision and Development Regulation.

**Industry Concern:** The MGA Subdivision and Development Regulation contains a comprehensive list of “Relevant considerations” for an authority to determine a subdivision application. The Charter Cities have not yet consulted with industry about what further considerations they think may be necessary.
Environmental Stewardship

• Requirement to adopt a climate change adaptation and mitigation plan

• Addition of the environment as it relates to land-use as a matter for bylaws

• Inclusion of the environment in planning and development provisions of MGA
Environmental Stewardship

The Environmental Stewardship authorities in the Charter Regulations enable, among other things, the amendment of the MGA’s general jurisdiction to pass bylaws (sec. 7) to include:

(h.1) the well-being of the environment, including bylaws providing for the creation, implementation and management of programs respecting any or all of the following:
   (i) contaminated, vacant, derelict or under-utilized sites;
   (ii) climate change adaptation and greenhouse gas emission reduction;
   (iii) environmental conservation and stewardship;
   (iv) the protection of biodiversity and habitat;
   (v) the conservation and efficient use of energy;
   (vi) waste reduction, diversion, recycling and management.
Environmental Stewardship

**Issue:** The City would like to encourage innovative construction technologies to improve energy use and waste efficiencies in new construction and renovations.

**Regulatory Change:** The Charter authorizes the City to establish requirements in addition to current building code standards to meet environmental and energy conservation objective.

**Industry Concern:** These amendments should only be implemented after extensive consultation with the development and building industries. The creation of separate building codes for the Edmonton and Calgary is inefficient.
Environmental Stewardship

**Issue:** The City would like to pass bylaws that protect areas of environmental significance within urban boundaries.

**Regulatory Change:** The Charter authorizes the City to pass bylaws that would address environmental protection and restrict land use to protect environmentally sensitive areas.

**Industry Concern:** These amendments should only be implemented after extensive consultation with the development industry. There is potential to sterilize developable lands. The MGA currently provides for MR, ER, and CR.
Charter Authorities – Calgary Implementation

• Prior to the Nov 2018 Amendment Regulation, Calgary had identified which of the 37 authorities require a bylaw, a bylaw and a public hearing, and which require no further action by the City. The City is in the process of adding to this list of authorities resulting from the Amendment Regulation.

• Calgary is delegating to its various business units the responsibility to come up with their own plans for implementing those authorities under their respective jurisdictions.
Charter Authorities - Challenges

- Changes to approval process (requirements, process, considerations)
- Changes to code (separate building codes?)
- Changes on assessment classes and timing of assessment
- Changes related to environmental impacts
- Additional Levies
- Inclusionary Housing
- Risk of “Henry VIII” challenges to bylaws
Charter Authorities – Potential Opportunities

- Funding mechanisms
- City assessment of debt and budgets
- Administrative efficiencies
- Environmental initiatives
- Innovation
- However, all of these potential opportunities need stakeholder engagement and transparency
City Charter – MGA Broad Changes

The combined impact of uncertainty and policy burdens from the MGA amendments and City Charter Authorities add time and cost to development in Edmonton and Calgary. This results in a higher level of perceived risk for our industry,

which could lead to a flight of capital investment and business from Alberta.
Established Areas Growth and Change Strategy
Stormwater Working Group Update

Chris Ollenberger, P. Eng.

THANK YOU TO THE CITY OF CALGARY FOR ALLOWING USE OF THEIR SLIDES!
To enable community growth and change in the Established Area, what level and location of investment is required, and how and when should it be funded?
MDP/CTP and Plan It Calgary Process

100-year vision (2006)

Planning and Engagement (2006 – 2009)

Municipal Development Plan Calgary Transportation Plan (2009)
Complementing the New Community Growth Strategy, three factors form the foundation for this work:

- **MDP/CTP Alignment**
- **Market Demand**
- **Financial Capacity**

Within or in addition to these factors, Redevelopment Readiness will be important to define and consider with stakeholders.
Strategic Recommendations, Through Lens of “Where, What and How”

EAGCS Advisory Group
Prepares recommendations for City of Calgary Administration

Markets Characterization

Where should we invest to support Growth and Change?

What should we Invest in?
Utilities Information and Implementation Working Group
Public Environment Working Group

How do we activate that investment and support?
Financial Planning and Investment Working Group
Planning and Policy Tools Working Group

Connections to Broader Stakeholders:
Updates to existing stakeholder committees/meetings, seek combined engagement with other projects, provide communications and presentations as required
EAGCS Advisory Group Membership

Annie MacInnis
Leslie Evans, Roy Wright

Communities
FCC, BIAs

Admin Support
(non-members)

Advisory Group

Development
Industry
NAIOP, BILD

Chris Ollenberger,
Dave White,
Grace Lui,
Joel Tiedemann

Lesley Kalmakoff,
Matthew Sheldrake,
Kathy Davies Murphy

Administration
DIGC, IC

Debra Hamilton,
Kyle Ripley,
Chris Arthurs,
Francois Bouchart
Key Strategic Outcomes of the EAGCS

- Supporting current residents and businesses
- Spur investor confidence in Calgary
- Support housing demand, affordability and market interest
- Create certainty for investment (public and private)
- Barriers and limiting factors reduced
- Capacity to define and manage risk
- Optimized funding sources
Why Redevelopment? Why Now?

Resilience Strategy Alignment
- Resilient tax base
- Infrastructure resilience
- Socially inclusive communities
- Climate resilience strategy

Policy Alignment
- Imagine Calgary
- MDP/CTP
- One Calgary citizen priorities
- City Planning & Policy service priorities

Building Critical Mass
- Population intensification
- Responsive to market interest
- Economies of scale
- Leverage network effects

Places and Services
- Vibrant communities
- Public amenities
- Neighbourhood Activity Centres
- Efficient service delivery

DRAFT - For Feedback
Redevelopment Market Analysis &
Further Information for Consideration in EAGCS

- Data-based Market Indicators
- Land Use Capacity
- Active or Recent Investment
- Subset of Communities for Investment
- Community Readiness
- Utility Information
- Housing Supply/Need
- Resiliency
- Community Lifecycle

DRAFT - For Feedback
Municipal Development Plan
Goals and Priorities

Managing growth and change
Shaping a more compact urban form
Connecting the city
Creating great communities
Urban design
Prosperous economy
Greening the city

Core Indicators
- Urban Expansion
- Density
- Accessibility to Daily Needs
- Land Use Mix
- Road & Street Infrastructure
- Transit Service Transportation
- Mode Split Accessibility to
- Primary Transit Residential
- Land Use Mix Population and
- Job Balance Goods Access
- Watershed Health
- District Energy
- Urban Forest
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Nov 2018</td>
<td>1. To set the context (define area, data analysis, influencing factors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Complete best practice research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Define project governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Feb 2019</td>
<td>3. To explore/build a better array of financial tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. To identify new and upgrade-focused infrastructure and amenity investments that are critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Referral report to PFC March 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By May 2019</td>
<td>- Update report to Committee May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Identify opportunities to leverage and collaborate on investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Develop data-based decision model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Nov 2019</td>
<td>7. Outline a strategic approach to recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Mar 2020</td>
<td>8. Package of recommendations at mid-cycle budget adjustments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Use of the Market Indicators Analysis

**Redevelopment Readiness**: An evaluation that reflects the readiness of an area to accept change, and includes:

- Land use capacity of existing land use districts,
- High occurrence of under density developments,
- Existing Council approved policy,
- Market attractiveness, community lifecycle,
- Community readiness, and
- Knowledge of infrastructure context.

Information that is more subjective or based on analysis

Note: Components with green text have been reflected in the data-based Market Indicators
Stormwater Working Group Update

Chris Ollenberger
Stormwater Catchments

In many catchments, we do not have a full understanding of the existing stormwater catchments.
How do we bridge the gap between how stormwater is managed at a lot level and the regulatory, river health and safety requirements for stormwater management...
First Major Stormwater Redevelopment Challenge

1. Optimizing The City’s existing stormwater programs

**Question:** What improvements can be made to our existing programs to optimize the City’s investment in stormwater management?
Community Drainage Improvements

Focus = Improve flood safety and reduce property damage

Considers existing system
Integrated Stormwater Management

Previous/Existing Programs

1.  
   ![Image 1](https://example.com/image1)

2.  
   ![Image 2](https://example.com/image2)

3.  
   ![Image 3](https://example.com/image3)

4.  
   ![Image 4](https://example.com/image4)

(drivers and objectives)

Integrated Stormwater Management

Gaps
Integrated Stormwater Management

- Public and Private Options
- Green versus Pipe Infrastructure Options
- Triple Bottom Line
- Framework for Future Studies
Second Major Stormwater Redevelopment Challenge

2. Balancing stormwater management between public and private land.

**Question:** How can we share the responsibility for stormwater management between private and public land in established communities, while ensuring stormwater management is not a financial impediment to redevelopment?
Considerations when determining what’s possible at a project level

• There are both technical and financial (proforma) considerations for feasibility at project level.
• Storm water decisions on private land affect public infrastructure and the public realm

Drivers (risks)
• water quality
• flood control
• volume control
• river health
• climate change

Factors that affect feasibility
• Land Use
• Slope
• Soils
• Existing drainage concerns
• Catchment
• Community
• Others…
Stormwater

Finding our place amongst . . .

Weekly BILD + NAIOP + Water Resources Meetings

The Stormwater Strategy
Recent Collaboration between WR and BILD and NAIOP

Interim Requirements for Redevelopment
(Industry Bulletin October 2018)

- All previously issued approvals will continue to be honoured

- Interim UARR of 50 L/s/ha, unless a higher critical UARR has been provided at the DP stage

- Allowance for some free flow areas on redevelopment sites
Recent Collaboration between WR and BILD and NAIOP

Interim Runoff Volume Control
(Upcoming Bulletin  April 2019)

- With attempts to implement runoff volume control measures over the past few years, it is now evident that the development of the methods and tools have not progressed as originally envisioned. While progress has been made to advance stormwater management practices to minimize the impact of growth on our watersheds, The City has seen examples where current limitations with policies and tools are delaying or stalling development applications because runoff volume control targets cannot be meaningfully achieved.

- An average annual runoff volume of 150 (e.g., multi-family residential development)–250 mm (e.g., commercial and industrial development). A range is being provided to account for the varying land uses, imperviousness, and soil conditions/infiltration rates across the city (greenfield)
Property Tax Shift
Richard Morden
Tax Comparison

Source: City of Calgary

Note: Ratio of 2018 non-residential to residential mill rate equals 3.93 : 1
Downtown Share of Total Calgary Non-Residential Assessment Value

$250 million drop on taxes collected downtown in 2019 vs. 2018

Source: City of Calgary
Impact on City Wide Commercial Assessment Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact On Taxes Outside of Downtown</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in all industrial tax rates</td>
<td>Increased competitive gap - Rocky View County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in suburban office tax rates</td>
<td>Reduced competitive edge - downtown office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in suburban retail tax rates</td>
<td>$5 million incremental bill for CF at Chinook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Industrial Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxes - $/sf</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% increase</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposals under consideration

- Mayor’s proposal - increase Portion of City budget required from residential base from 45% ($865m) to 48% ($942m)
  - Results in ratio shift in 2019 from 4.46:1 to 4.22:1
  - Relies on $27m in tax room from Provincial tax share (no provincial budget in place)
  - Businesses would be able to apply for one-time grants from City-administered fund (May 2019)
  - Calls for an analysis for potential of adding a small-business assessment sub-class

- Alternative proposal – faster shift from commercial accounts (51%) to residential accounts (49%)
  - Results in ratio shift in 2019 from 4.46:1 to 3.93:1
  - Couple with residential rebates - City to directly apply PTP to homeowners’ accounts
  - Aim to get to 50%/50% share in 2020 - 2022
NAIOP’s position

• Solution needs to focus on entire 4 year budget cycle 2019 – 2022

• Small-business assessment subclass suboptimal – administrative cost & issue of “who is small?”

• Make further savings in City annual budget ($1.95 billion of budget required from property tax)

• Selective divestiture of non-core City-owned assets
  • Industrial lands
  • Parking business
  • Non-core corporate owned properties

• Transfer benefits of Phased-in Tax Plan (PTP) from commercial accounts to residential accounts
  • Benefit: City can directly apply savings achieved to homeowners’ accounts > transparent

• Working with BOMA Calgary with input from NAIOP and Calgary Economic Development
  • Letters written to Mayor and all Councilors
  • Active participation in City organized workshops on assessment methodology & tax policy
Next steps

• Council meeting April 8, 2019 to consider 2 remaining proposals – 2019 tax bills to be issued subsequent

• City to report May 2019 on potential for small business sustainability grant fund (up to $70m)

• Reports in June (PFC) on Financial Task Force progress – savings and recommendation on future shift

• Report in November (Council) on impact of 2020 assessment values on indicative 2020 taxes

• If approved April 8, 2018, report to Priorities Finance Committee June 2019 on small-business subclass
  • Mayor’s plan would be to, if approved, implement sub-class in 2021
  • Allowed for by current provincial government’s changes to Municipal Government Act