

**Community Conversation:**  
**Wildlife Mitigation Proposed for Smith Creek Area Structure Plan and Resort Centre ASP Amendments**  
Coast Canmore Hotel and Conference Centre  
July 14, 2016 from 1:00-4:00 pm

## Attendees

Hilary Young- Y2Y  
Adam Linnard- Y2Y  
Pat Kamenka- Canmore Resident, CAG Member  
Megan Dunn- Town of Canmore  
Esme Comfort- Councillor  
Colleen Campbell- Canmore Resident  
Bruce Gleig- Biosphere Institute  
Lori Rissling Wynn- Town of Canmore  
Serge Metikosh- EARC  
Natalie Cooper- EARC  
Tyler McClure- WildSmart

## Support

Lori Van Rooijen- Facilitator  
Tracy Woitenko- Town of Canmore  
Alaric Fish- Town of Canmore  
Jessica Karpat- QPD  
Kent McDougall- QPD  
Mitch Braun- QPD  
Jenn Giesbrecht- QPD  
Kyle Knopff- Golder Associates

## Agenda

1. **Examination of Information and Materials**
2. **Welcome and Introduction**
3. **Overview of Projects**
4. **Corridor Overview and Proposal**
5. **Existing Wildlife Corridors Conditions**
6. **Menu of Wildlife Mitigations and Approach**
7. **Discussion**
8. **Conclusion and Next Steps**

### Agenda Item #1: Examination of Information and Materials

- Meeting attendees had the opportunity to examine maps on display (wildlife corridor and Smith Creek and Resort Centre Area Structure Plan (ASP) concept plans) as well as Vertisee data (projected) and ask preliminary questions to the Project Team and the Project Biologist

### Agenda Item #2: Welcome and Introduction-- Tracy Woitenko (Town) and Jessica Karpat (QPD)

- The Smith Creek Project Team thanked everyone for coming out to the meeting and QPD commented that this meeting is particularly exciting for Three Sisters as previous ASP submissions did not involve small-group community engagement initiatives.
- QPD reiterated that although we may not always share the same views, the goal of the ASP engagement process is to identify concerns and opportunities, respect each other's views and to work to find a balance. In addition, through the engagement process, the ASP project team seeks to address questions and concerns where possible.
- The Town highlighted that the development of the ASP and ASP amendments has been a process of balancing opportunities and constraints of the land. Specifically, the Project Team has been balancing the following:
  - o Wildlife corridors and wildlife mitigation strategies and how it relates to human use
  - o The Town objectives associated with development (i.e. infrastructure, roads, parks etc.)
  - o What the developer hopes to achieve with development
- QPD highlighted that the concept plans (displayed at the meeting) reflect a year of conversations, in particular for Smith Creek and the learnings that have been applied to Resort Centre, that have worked to balance these considerations.

Purpose of the Meeting: Members of the Project Team highlighted the following points:

- We have used the original members of the HUMR committee to inform the invitation list to this meeting
- We are looking for feedback on two ASP proposals: the Smith Creek ASP and the Resort Centre ASP amendments
  - o While Smith Creek is a collaborative process between Three Sisters Mountain Village Ltd. (TSMV; represented by QuantumPlace Developments Ltd.), the Town and the wider community, Resort Centre is a TSMV application and is not part of the collaborative process.
- This meeting will encompass both projects and will focus on wildlife mitigation.
- The Project Team has been working on the Smith Creek ASP for a year and therefore there is a huge amount of information. The Facilitator asked attendees to listen to background information prior to the discussion component of the meeting.
- The Facilitator also asked attendees to notify her if they had a question to ensure that the question was addressed following the informational component of the meeting.

The Facilitator reviewed how the notes and input will be used:

- The intention of the meeting is to have a discussion, talk through concerns and identify opportunities and ways we may be able to mitigate issues and concerns that are being raised.
- The group was asked to bring both issues and solutions to the table.
- Notes will be sent to meeting attendees who will have an opportunity to make revisions to ensure that the notes are representative of the discussion. Following the revisions, the notes will be finalized and distributed back to the meeting attendees and with everyone's permission shared with the public on the project website (smithcreekcanmore.ca).
- It is important for all to note that attendance at the meeting and approval of the notes that follow do not suggest agreement with or approval of the contents of the proposals put forward or the matters under discussion in the notes themselves. This is a discussion and the notes will

reflect that discussion. The meetings and notes associated are only one conversation and are part of a larger engagement process.

### Agenda Item #3: Overview of Projects –Smith Creek Project Team & QPD

#### Smith Creek Collaborative Process- Tracy Woitenko (Town of Canmore)

- The development of the Smith Creek ASP is a collaborative process that began in 2014. Council approved the Working Together Guidelines to guide the process of the Town and TSMV coming together and create the Smith Creek ASP in a manner that addresses both TSMV and Town needs.
- The Collaborative Process was a way to adjust previous attempts by TSMV to submit applications to the Town which were controversial and marred with conflict and did not address the needs of TSMV, the Town of Canmore or the wider community.
- The Community Advisory Group (CAG) is a group of community members representing the diverse interests of the wider Canmore community (such as business, social, recreation or environment). The CAG was formed in June 2015. In addition to ongoing input from the CAG and CAG sub-groups there have been many other public engagement opportunities including two open houses and a workshop in fall 2015. Meeting notes from all CAG and sub-group meetings are posted on [smithcreekcanmore.ca](http://smithcreekcanmore.ca) under “Resources.”
- The meeting today is another form of engaging with smaller stakeholder groups. This meeting provides the Project Team with the opportunity to go out to the wider public with input from experts.

#### Smith Creek Overview—Kent McDougall (QPD)

- The Smith Creek Plan Area is located at the eastern edge within the Town of Canmore, adjacent to Stewart Creek Golf Course.
- The Smith Creek ASP Area includes the lands referred to as Sites 7,8, and 9 in the Town of Canmore Land Use Bylaw DC 1-98, the lands currently occupied by Thunderstone Quarries, and two Provincial parcels of land along the TransCanada Highway.
- The total Plan Area comprises approximately 329 ha of land.
  - o 173 ha (53%) is dedicated to wildlife corridors
  - o Smith Creek lands outside of the wildlife corridor constitute a Plan Area of 156 ha. 105 ha (67%) is proposed for development
  - o 40 ha (26%) of developable Plan Area is dedicated to open space and natural areas
  - o 11 ha (7%) of developable area is occupied by transportation and other utility infrastructure.
- The Smith Creek ASP proposes the following land use concepts:
  - o Residential uses including single family homes, townhouses, stacked townhouses and apartments. The ASP provides for a unit range of between 1200-1700 residential units (3000-4000 people assuming 2.4 persons per household).
  - o Commercial, Office and light industrial uses proposed for Thunderstone.

- Recreational and open space is located between the “developable pods.” This is intended to provide a recreational amenity while blending the natural environment within the Plan Area.
- The concept plan has not been put forward publically as the Project Team is still in the feedback stage.
- The Project Team has been working with Town departments and consultants looking at a number of technical details including transportation, grading, riparian areas, stands of old growth of Old Douglas Fir, gathering data for infracycle assessments. The Plan evolved as information became available to the Project Team. These technical details have informed the plan displayed at this meeting.
- With regards to the wildlife corridor alignment, the Project Team is exploring the option of realigning the wildlife corridor with an area that has been identified as having higher risks of hazards related to steep creeks from Stewart Creek.
- Recognizing that avoiding development in this area is a less costly mitigation strategy, TSMV has proposed moving the wildlife corridor (and wildlife underpass) to the Stewart Creek Steep Creek Hazard Area and creating a culvert beneath the Parkway to accommodate the creek. This would separate wildlife from human activity;

**Question from Attendee: What is the population of existing TSMV lands?**

**Response from the Town**

- Canmore:
  - 13,000 permanent residents
  - 3890 semi-permanent residents
  - Approximately 17,000 total residents in Canmore
- Three Sisters Creek:
  - 1300 permanent residents
  - 800 semi-permanent
  - Total population 2050
- Peaks and Homesteads: similar to Three Sisters Creek

**Question from Attendee: How does the scale of this development compare to what is existing in TSMV?**

**Response from QPD and the Town**

- As discussed previously, the ASP provides for a unit range of between 1200-1700 residential units (3000-4000 people assuming 2.4 persons per household).
- The Town and developers overestimate the population in the ASP (or practice conservatism on the high end) to provide a buffer with regards to infrastructure allocation. This is typical of most ASPs.

**Resort Centre Overview—Mitch Braun (QPD)**

- An existing ASP for the Resort Centre was approved in 2004.
- The ASP envisioned a resort golf course within the ASP area.

- In 2008, 15 of 18 holes had been completed however the (then) ownership group went bankrupt and operations on the golf course were halted immediately.
- TSMV purchased the land in 2015.
- Through initial engagement for the Smith Creek ASP, TSMV began to hear from the community and the CAG that they were interested in hearing what would be done with the unfinished golf course. The CAG were concerned that they were not able to see the big picture of where TSMV is going without being able to visualize the connectivity between Smith Creek and Resort Centre (in terms of wildlife, cycling, pathways, infrastructure etc.). People wanted a comprehensive view of the remaining TSMV lands.
- TSMV explored the option of either resurrecting the golf course however, it was determined to be unfeasible due to a decline in the popularity of golf, market saturation in the Bow Valley for golf courses and because in addition to the three holes that were not complete, the existing fifteen holes required restoration.
- TSMV decided to explore other options for the golf course lands. The Resort Centre amendments focus on this area and the conceptual policy within that area.
  - o The amendments would not significantly alter the vision of the ASP that was approved in 2004. Overall, the vision for Resort Centre is a health and wellness themed area within the context of a nature based authentic Canmore experience.
  - o There are also amendments proposed with regards to wildlife mitigation strategies to reflect updates wildlife science and learnings from local experience.
- Difference between the Resort Centre ASP amendment process and the Smith Creek Collaborative Process:
  - o The Resort Centre ASP amendments are an applicant led process
  - o Lessons from the Smith Creek collaborative process have been applied to the Resort Centre amendment process. For instance, a Resort Centre CAG sub-group was formed to provide input into the amendments. Wildlife conflict has been a topic of discussion for the Resort Centre sub-group.

#### Agenda Item #4: Corridor Overview and Proposal—Jessica Karpal (QPD)

- The Project Team looked at the Plan Area and sought to find a balance between dedicating wildlife corridor and maintaining developable area?
  - o This was a dominant topic of conversation with the Project Team as well as the CAG for the last 6 to 8 months. Initially, the proforma's and the expectations for the wildlife corridor were not aligning.
  - o In the fall of 2015, the Project Team and the environmental representatives of the CAG walked the 2002 unapproved corridor to examine the area comprehensively with the objective of gaining additional perspective of the overall landscape.
  - o During that walk, solutions to provide more lands to the corridor in areas that were deemed critical were examined and the Project Team worked with the Town on interpreting the Mountain Terrain Guidelines.

- The objective was to identify additional development area to make the proforma's work while finding a balance that worked for wildlife and development. This approach informed additional discussions with the CAG and the environmental CAG sub-group.
- The goal was to find a solution that balanced the wildlife corridor and developable area that works for wildlife and for the development.

#### Agenda Item #5: Existing Wildlife Corridors Conditions—Kyle Knopff (Golder)

- Wildlife corridors have been a large component of the discussions surrounding the Smith Creek and Resort Centre Projects.
- **Golder** suggested that overall, the wildlife corridors seem to be working well for most species (elk, grizzly bears and cougars). There are questions about how well the wildlife corridor is working for wolves however Golder noted that recently packs have been observed using the corridor on the south side of the highway. Wildlife in the Bow Valley and elsewhere are much more adaptable to development than what was previously thought.
  - Elk prefer to be in Town (telemetry data indicates that town and the unfished golf course are among the most selected part of the Bow Valley for elk).
  - Grizzly bears and cougars are also adaptable and are spending more time close to town
- Between animals selecting to be in Town and humans spending time in the wildlife corridor, we are seeing more wildlife mortality- probably enough mortality to create localized population sinks for some species, like grizzly bear.
- Humans in the wildlife corridor ultimately affect wildlife corridor function primarily in terms of whether wildlife can move through the corridor safely without conflict from humans. Potential for movement may also change as a result of human use, but this appears to be much less important than potential for conflict.
- BCEAG previously identified slopes over 25 degrees as being less ideal for wildlife use. However, based on wildlife research in the Bow Valley, it has been found that wildlife will use slopes greater than 25 degrees, selecting them for some species in some seasons. While there is still a preference for wildlife using flatter areas, use does not stop after 25 degrees.

**An Attendee** pointed out that in 1990 when the BCEAG identified the 25 degree slope as a barrier to wildlife use; it was never intended as a scientific cut off even though it is often talked about as if wildlife do not use any landscape with more than a 25 degree slope.

**Question from Attendee: Are there are more areas in the Bow Valley that are being used by wildlife than just the wildlife corridor?**

**Response from Golder**

- Wildlife select areas outside of the wildlife corridor on both the north and south sides of the corridor.

**Question from Attendee: Can you give an overview of the methodology for collecting wildlife data?**

**Response from Golder**

- GPS is used to track elk, grizzly bears, cougars and wolves

- Cougar and bear data in the Bow Valley were collected between 2000-2004
- Elk data was collected up to 2009
- Wolf data in the valley include Very High Frequency (VHF) tracking collars
- TSMV has also been using cameras and tracking data from 2008 however, it must be recognized that there are biases related to camera placement associated with these types of data collection.

**Question from Attendee: Are you aware of Ben Edward's thesis on elk data collected in 2013? There may be additional data available.**

**Response from Golder**

- The data is likely comparable to what has been used by Golder. However, Golder will look into this study.

**Question from Attendee: Can you speak to the human use data that you are collecting?**

**Response from Golder.**

- Human use data is primarily collected using cameras and is an initiative shared by TSMV and Parks in collaboration with the Town.
  - o Camera data shows that people are the most common animal in the corridor.
    - Specifically, within the corridor camera data has shown that people hike, ride their bikes and run their dogs off leash.
  - o Human use in the wildlife corridor increases the risk of human-wildlife encounters and conflict. Ultimately, human use in the wildlife corridor has a more significant effect on wildlife avoiding the wildlife corridor than development adjacent to the corridor would.
  - o Although wildlife are still using the corridor, human use results in more conflict.

**An Attendee** pointed out that historical hunting practices deterred elk from selecting town. However, now there are more attractants that motivate elk to come to town resulting in predators selecting Town as well. Consequently, attractant management is a significant component of making the plan work for both wildlife and for humans.

**Agenda Item #6: Menu of Wildlife Mitigations and Approach—Kyle Knopff (Golder)**

- Golder Associates has undertaken an environmental study for the Smith Creek and Resort Centre Projects (this is an environmental assessment but is referred to as an environmental study).
  - o The study examines opportunities to mitigate, reduce or eliminate the negative environmental impacts of development.
  - o The study calls for mitigations surrounding wildlife and the wildlife corridor, as well as mitigations related to construction practices (i.e. avoiding clearing during seasonal time periods—such as breeding periods-- for wildlife) and avoiding development in wetlands and riparian areas.
- Golder presented the following information on wildlife mitigations proposed in the environmental study:

- **Attractant Management:** as previously outlined, wildlife (cougars, grizzly bears, cougars) do not always avoid developments like those proposed for the Smith Creek and the Resort Centre. Green spaces exist in developed areas and are adjacent to the wildlife corridor. Managing attractants within the developed area reduces the risk of a wildlife entering a developed area and resulting in conflict. Attractant management is a fundamental component of the mitigations.
- **Fencing:** the use of a hard edge is an important way to further reduce the chance of wildlife entering developed areas and hopefully reduce the risk of human-wildlife conflict.
  - In spring 2016, the Town hosted a stakeholder meeting with wildlife and fencing experts to discuss wildlife mitigations and the effectiveness of a fence. At the meeting there was strong agreement that the fence would be an effective mitigation.
  - A hard edge alternative to a fence is locating higher density development in closer proximity to the wildlife corridor. However, this type of hard edge was deemed as less effective than a fence given that wildlife in the Bow Valley are very adaptive.
  - A key component of the fence is to ensure that the fence is phased in with development and maintains a closed loop throughout the entire buildout. Leaving open ends will create a larger problem for Provincial wildlife enforcement.
  - While incursion is expected, it is anticipated that it will be rare provided that attractant management practices are underway in town.
- **Construction Mitigations:** for instance, conducting site clearing outside of critical seasonal time periods for wildlife and conducting a pre-construction survey to identify the location of any sensitive wildlife features.
- **Sensory Disturbance Mitigations:** Mitigations to reduce lighting, noise and disturbance in and adjacent to the wildlife corridor.
  - Sensory disturbance mitigations are effective for increasing the potential for movement and use of the wildlife corridor adjacent to development.
  - If sensory disturbance mitigations were applied without a fence, the result would be an increase in potential for wildlife entering developed areas which in turn increases the potential for human-wildlife conflict.
  - Decreasing the potential for human-wildlife conflict using fencing is an important component of wildlife mitigation in combination with mitigations used to reduce sensory disturbance.

**Question from Attendee: Has there been other examples of fencing working effectively in North America?**

**Response from Golder**

- Yes, in Jackson Hole Wyoming.
- There is also fencing along the TransCanada Highway in response to the increasing rates of animal mortality along the highway.
- Technical diagrams of the fence shown- the proposed fence is similar to what Parks uses along the highway. There is a buried apron to prevent wildlife from digging under the fence and a high



tensile top wire to prevent trees from damaging the fence (if a tree falls it does not go through the fence, it breaks over the wire).

**Question from Attendee: What is the goal for animals that are excluded from the development using the fence?**

**Response from Golder**

- Primarily ungulates. Given that many carnivores are able to climb, reducing ungulates in Town (through the use of the fence and attractant management) will reduce the likelihood of carnivores entering the enclosed area.

**Question from Attendee: How would you deal with intrusions into the fenced area?**

**Response from Golder**

- Swing gates would be located along the fence. Jay Honeyman (local wildlife conflict specialist) prefers swing gates to jump outs.
- While dealing with intrusions would be more work for the Province, leading wildlife out of developed areas would be even more work without a fence.
- Within the environmental study, it is predicted that when Smith Creek and Resort Centre are developed we will see the same types of uses in the wildlife corridors that we see in existing developments.
- The fence creates an opportunity to have designated access to the corridors and to provide signage to promote the wildlife corridor and what it is used for.
- A key mitigation will be finding places for people to take their dogs and to ride their bikes within the enclosed area.
  - o Development in Smith Creek will provide alternatives to using the wildlife corridor. The ASP provides for designated trails and dog parks.

**Question from Attendee: Has the fence been agreed upon by the developer even with the extra cost incurred?**

**Response from QPD**

- The developer has agreed to build the fence.
- The question of maintaining the fence is being explored by the Town. Fences have a 20-30 year lifespan however maintenance is required due to trees falling through the fence and damaging it or people cutting through the fence to access the wildlife corridor.
- The intent is to clearly designate the wildlife corridor using a fence both for the new developments (Smith Creek and Resort Centre) and existing TSMV developments. TSMV worked with the ownership team at Stewart Creek Golf Course to run the fence through their land to facilitate a continuous fence around all of TSMV lands.
  - o TSMV and Stewart Creek Golf Course negotiated a solution to run a fence through an operating golf course. The alignment meets the functional requirements of the golf course (for instance the fence has minimal swing gates and cattle guards which would disrupt golf course operations)

**Question from Attendee: Can you give us an overview of resource selection function?**

**Response from Golder**

- A model that compares the areas of landscape used by wildlife (used locations from telemetry data) to the general landscape composition (random locations) based on variables that would affect where wildlife select to spend time (slope, food sources, vegetated cover type etc.). The model is used to predict where wildlife would select to spend time.

**Agenda Item #7: Discussion—All**

**Question from Attendee: What is the role of the developer and the Town to ensure that neighboring jurisdictions do what is required to ensure the wildlife mitigations (i.e., the fence) are effective?**

**QPD provided a response.**

- The developers create an application for wildlife corridor alignment and submit it to the Province. The Province then assesses the proposal to determine if it is consistent with the NRCB decision.
- Just as the applicant asks for comments and feedback from stakeholders, the Province provides the applicant with comments and feedback as well.

**An attendee (Y2Y)** suggested that when considering wildlife connectivity in the Bow Valley it is necessary to consider the cumulative landscape to ensure connectivity. The Bow Valley is one of many valleys in the area and therefore it is important to consider what is happening at larger scales.

**Y2Y's reiterated its concerns re: corridor connectivity.**

- Concerns about increase in traffic in the area near the existing wildlife underpass (the eastern end of the Smith Creek ASP area).
- Concerned about the proposed industrial development in Deadman's Flats and the impact that it could have on the wildlife making a passage between Wind Valley and the Bow River. The decision of the MGB hearing is currently unknown. These two issues are illustrations as to why the Smith Creek ASP and the Resort Centre ASP amendment must be considered in the context of the Bow Valley as a whole, where other matters with significant ramifications for the functionality of the corridor proposed by the developer remain undecided.
- Further, development in the Bow Valley itself must be approached in consideration of continental-scale wildlife connectivity. The Bow Valley has always been a vital movement corridor for wildlife, and is a key connector for wide-ranging populations in the Yellowstone to Yukon region; what happens in Canmore has ramifications well beyond our community.

**The Town** noted that Canmore's neighbors are Banff (the Town and the National Park) and the Municipal District of Bighorn.

- The NRCB decision has articulated the necessity for the different governmental/regulatory bodies in the region to collaborate and resolve issues however MD Bighorn has stepped away from the discussions as a result of conflict surrounding Deadman's Flats. The Town is optimistic that they will return to the discussions.

**Question from Attendee: Will there be a connection between the unfenced area after the fence ends adjacent to the Bow River and along the TransCanada highway (currently, the conceptual plan for the fence shows a gap here).**

**Response from Golder**

- The ideal situation would be to have the entire area fully enclosed as it would prevent animals from swimming to access the enclosure.
- Currently, the fence ends at the river due to difficulty with terrain and issues related to ownership.

**The Facilitator** asked the group if they have any solutions:

**One attendee** suggested fencing the TSMV footprint. With regards to extending the fence along the highway: recent study showed that the area along the TransCanada priority for fencing but currently, there are no plans to extend the fence along the highway. **Another attendee** suggested that the end solution should be looked at in a separate sub-group.

**Question from Attendee: Have there been any talks about planting lists and identifying requirements for landscaping? I have been seeing fruit bearing trees in landscaping.**

**Response from the Town**

- The Town has a set of guidelines that outline acceptable plants for landscaping. Edible species are not identified as acceptable for landscaping within the guidelines.
- In Canmore the guidelines are not legally binding and there is no permitting required to change plantings after a landowner has purchased their property.
- While the Town is able to control attractants in parcels of municipally owned parks and open space (MR), the Town has a greater challenge enforcing the guidelines on private land. Ultimately it is the responsibility of the public to ensure that landscaping on their land does not contain attractants for wildlife. Education is a key component of ensuring effective attractant management.

**Response from QPD**

- TSMV has a planting guidelines document. However, this is really only effective for the first home buyer.
- TSMV is working together with the Town and other partners to implement planting guidelines and other similar types of initiatives.
- The Town is working on implementing an animal attractants bylaw in addition to creating a set of guidelines that help manage landscaping with attractant management in mind. The intent is to bring this to Council in September.

In addition to the bylaw component of attractant management, it is necessary to be able to enforce this bylaw. Currently there is limited enforcement capacity due to limited staff. Consequently, education will be a significant component of ensuring the bylaw is effective.

**An attendee** suggested discussing attractant management in schools and cited recycling as a similar initiative that benefited from educating youth.

**An attendee** noted that it is important to ensure that the guidelines are consistent. For example, mountain ash are identified within the permitted plants in the guidelines and yet WildSmart has seen conflict around mountain ash. They also noted that it is more effective to communicate to the public what they can plant versus what they cannot.

**Question from Attendee: Are there any thoughts on habitat enhancement of the corridor?**

**Response from Golder**

- The project biologist felt that this is a great idea. There are jurisdictional issues that pose a challenge to facilitate this.
- Initiatives related to habitat enhancement can also tie into to FireSmart practices.

**Response from the Town**

- Historically the Town participated in controlled burns as a method to reduce the risk of hazard related to wildfire. However, since the 1940s and 1950s there has been a lot of fire suppression in the Bow Valley.
- Controlled burns away from Town can not only facilitate habitat enhancement but also can create fire breaks.
- There have been initiatives near Canmore to create firebreaks including areas near Peaks of Grassi, Eagle Terrace, and downtown.

**An Attendee** noted that in order for a fire buffer to be effective for the most severe fires, it needs to be at least 5 km wide. This is not a feasible undertaking for the Town or for wildlife. However, Canmore has an evacuation strategy in the event of a large scale fire hazard. The smaller fire breaks and habitat enhancements mitigate the risk of small-scale, local fires.

**Question from Attendee: I am not convinced that swing gates are the best option to deal with fence intrusions given the upcoming Y2Y research. Is there an alternative to swing gates?**

**Response from Golder**

- The Project Team has proposed the swing gates because experts at the fencing workshop indicated that their experience has been that wildlife would not enter a jump out willingly and would prefer not to use one.

**An Attendee** pointed out that provided a jump out is well designed (i.e. does not require a six foot jump), wildlife will use a jump out but on their own time.

**An Attendee** asked if there is potential to have both jump outs and swing gates to provide more flexibility to wildlife and humans. The fence along Highway 93 (enroute to Invermere) has recently implemented a new method to deal with intrusions: overlapping the fence to a unidirectional point: wildlife are unable to enter the enclosure but are able to exit. Has this been proven to be effective?

**Response from Golder**

- Yes, there is potential if it proves to be effective.

An Attendee suggested that both the audience and the developer should remain open to the possibility that the fence may not be the best outcome for wildlife as more information emerges.

**Question from Attendee: What are the plans around human use management? Will they dovetail around existing practices of the Town or will TSMV be developing new proposals?**

**Response from the Town**

- There are three key pieces to human use management:
  - o Education
  - o Providing strong alternatives for people to recreate within the development area
  - o Enforcement
- The Smith Creek ASP provides for trails and off leash dog parks. In existing areas there is a lot more pressure on the landscape making it difficult to retrofit these types of amenities into existing areas, however new development areas offers the opportunity to integrate trails, open space and dog parks up front.

**Attendee Comment: I feel more comfortable with the idea of a fence in new developments than in existing neighborhoods as the wildlife corridor in new areas will be well designated and well-marked whereas in existing areas it is more confusing.**

**Response from the Town**

- The Town recognizes that the fence is going to be a difficult conversation with the community. When you move to a community that already has a fence, you have already accepted the idea of a fence where as in existing areas this is not the case as they have not bought into this idea from the get go.

**Question from Attendee: How do we coexist with wildlife? How do we have the conversation about the fence with the community?**

**One Attendee** noted that the community may recognize that currently we are not living well with wildlife and so the fence may be a good step towards living with wildlife and coexisting.

**Another Attendee** noted that humans, like wildlife are able to adapt. The fence will be more of an emotional issue than a practical one.

**Response from QPD**

- The community will require education related to the benefits of a fence:

- The fence will facilitate safety for both wildlife and humans.
- The fence will make it easier for bylaw enforcement to prevent people from entering the wildlife corridor.
- Hopefully people will be supportive of the idea and consider it to be a good solution.

**Another Attendee** noted that the fence gets around having to have a frank conversation with the public about individual action.

**Question from Attendee: Have we settled on the idea that the fence is the best option? This is a new idea with limited precedent. We should be open to the fact that the fence may not be the best outcome for wildlife as more information emerges.**

**Response from Golder**

- The fence is one scenario and we are discussing the implications of this particular scenario.

**One Attendee** noted that the fence appears to be the best mitigation proposed for this type of development. It is possible that new science may bring to light new alternatives to the fence and ultimately it is important to keep our desired outcomes for wildlife mitigation in mind.

**Response from Golder**

- Without humans being 100% compliant to keeping on designated paths only within the wildlife corridor and attractant management within the town development area being perfectly compliant, we believe that the only solution available to us at this time is a fence.

**Agenda Item #8: Conclusion and Next Steps—Facilitator**

- Thank you for taking the time for coming to the session.
- Notes will be distributed for review shortly after the meeting.
  - Send any revisions to the facilitator who will adjust the notes.
  - The notes will then be finalized and if everyone is comfortable with it, will be posted on the Smith Creek project website.
- Please do not circulate the notes until everyone has reviewed them to ensure that the notes are reflective of the conversation we had here today.

**Question from Attendee: Are we allowed to communicate with Golder independently?**

**Response from QPD and the Town**

- Yes, this is an open and transparent process and we would like as many people as possible to be involved in the conversation.
- If you are comfortable sharing, the Project Team wants to hear about the types of questions that are being asked and what the learnings have been. This will help the Project Team with the learning process as well.