

# Hubman Landing Follow-Up Meeting: Wildlife

July 19, 2016, 6:00-8:30 pm  
Coast Canmore Hotel and Conference Centre

## Attendees

Kevin Gregory  
Wendy Gregory  
Dale Bathgate  
Glen Werner  
Jane McClellan  
Andrew Grasmuck  
David Eaket  
Rimma Goodfellow  
Curtis Scherer  
Sally Scherer  
Paul Ysselmuiden  
Greg Heath  
Hans Wolf  
Steve Baylin  
Murray Hunter  
Debbie Baylin  
John Williamson  
Paul Lessard (CAG)

## Support

Lori Van Rooijen- Facilitator  
Martin Jalkotzy- Golder  
Alaric Fish- Town of Canmore  
Jessica Karpat- QPD  
Mitch Braun- QPD  
Jenn Giesbrecht- QPD

## Welcome and Introduction

- This meeting focused on the wildlife mitigations proposed for the Smith Creek ASP and the Resort Centre ASP amendments.
- An overview was provided for those new residents attending the meeting.
- The notes from the previous meeting were finalized and distributed. Facilitator asked the group if they would be comfortable if the Project Team posted the finalized notes on the website.
  - The consensus of the group was to keep the notes private at this point but that they would consider and get back to the Facilitator.
- The Facilitator asked if the group would be comfortable if we shared the notes with a Town councillor as part of a one-on-one conversation.
  - The group indicated that they will think about this and let the Project Team know.
- QPD reiterated that with the submission of the ASP there will be an Engagement Report to Council that will summarize all of the meetings and conversations that we had with small community groups. Consequently, as part of the engagement reports, we will be noting that we met with Hubman Landing residents several times and will be summarizing the discussions at these meetings.

- Because of the corridor connections, the meeting encompassed both projects and focused on wildlife mitigation.
- The Project Team reported that it has been working on the Smith Creek ASP for a year and, therefore, there is a significant amount of information that has been gathered and discussed.

### QPD Update

- Since the last meeting June, QPD has been working on the following:
  - The residents of Hubman Landing's indicated that their preference would be a recreational focus behind their homes. QPD has been exploring this option and engaging in conversations with the Town about the types of recreational amenities they could need.
  - QPD is working to balance the amount of recreational space provided with how the Resort Centre will function within the community. QPD is looking at this and will follow up after the undermining meeting with how we are able to respond.
  - QPD is engaging in community conversations with other small groups such as members of local environmental groups and recreational groups and this is going well.
- The intent going forward is receive input from all of groups involved in the small group conversations, consider the requests and issues and work to respond in a balanced and comprehensive manner after all the meetings have concluded.
  - Follow up meetings will be scheduled at that point in time.

**Resident Comment/Question: At our previous meeting you were going to provide us with a timeline about the development process and where there are opportunities for input. Have you looked into this?**

- QPD did not feel that a timeline detailing Town process could be created without consulting the Town. The Town is working to create a graphic timeline of their planning and development process.
- Generally, the process QPD is going through is in accordance with and exceeds the engagement required within the *Municipal Government Act (MGA)*.
- At this point in time, QPD are not able to provide definitive dates as to when the applications will be submitted. The Project Team is hoping to submit the ASP to the Town in September. Upon submission, the timeline is subject to the Town's progress on processing the application.
- The Project Team will create an engagement timeline specific for the ASP. The dates will be subject to change. It was noted that the opportunities for public input are greater now than after submission. There will be formal opportunities for residents to voice their support or concern at the Public Hearing of Council.

ACTION: Prepare a draft timeline.

### Overview of Projects

The Project Team reviewed the project at a high level for the benefit of those in attendance for the first time. A summary follows:

- In 2015, the Town and the Canmore and TSMV embarked on a collaborative process to develop an ASP for Smith Creek (Sites 7, 8 and 9 as well as Thunderstone Quarry lands). The collaborative

process was proposed as an alternative to previous TSMV submissions which were complicated by long-standing conflict.

- Through the collaborative process, the Town, TSMV and the Community Advisory Group have been working through the ASP and having conversations that have not been held during previous ASP submissions for Three Sisters.
- After a year of discussion the Project Team and the CAG have settled on a concept plan that will be discussed with the general public for more feedback.
  - Generally, the Smith Creek ASP will provide for lower and medium density residential areas, and commercial and light industrial areas near Dead Man Flats interchange.
  - Three Sisters Parkway to be extended through the site.
  - The ASP is proposing a range of between 1,200 – 1,700 units in Smith Creek which when multiplied by current household size trends in Canmore gives us an approximate (rounded) range of 3,000 – 4,000 residents.
  - The Resort Centre Area Structure Plan proposes a range between approximately 1,600 to 3,450 units which, when using a similar Canmore household size multiplier gives a population range of 3,840 -8,280. Note that these ranges are estimates and intended to be flexible.
  - As per the NRCB decision of 1992, an option of no development is not on the table.
- It is worth noting that the ASP ranges provided are meant to allow flexibility and still correspond to the **original total cap of 5,478 units** which resulted from the 1998 Settlement Agreement. The ranges allow each site to ultimately respond to market demand while respecting the overall cap.
- Steep creek hazards have been identified within the Smith Creek Area. Although the land within the hazard can be developed with mitigation in place, a more practical approach would be to re-align the wildlife corridor to sit on top of the hazard area for Stewart Creek.
  - As a result, there is an option to move the wildlife corridor to align with the steep creek area. This is subject to Provincial approval as well as the Federal and Provincial transportation departments approving a new underpass under the TransCanada Highway.
  - If Provincial and Federal Transportation departments do not approve a new underpass, the Across Valley wildlife corridor will stay in its current location and the steep creek hazard will be mitigated.
  - Currently, the Along Valley Corridor (east/west movement) provides a connection between the Nordic Centre and stops 1/3 of the way into Smith Creek.
  - The Stewart Creek and Tipple across Valley Corridors (north/south movement) provides connection to the river and beyond.
  - Within the Resort Centre, there is also 35 m conservation easement between the wildlife corridor and developable land.

## Wildlife Corridor Mitigation Proposal

### Overview:

The Project Biologist provided an overview of the mitigation proposal. Golder Associates are the project biologists hired by the Town.

- With the submission of a new ASP, there is an opportunity to reduce, mitigate or in some cases, eliminate environmental impact associated with future development in Smith Creek.
  - Golder has prepared an Environmental Study (an impact assessment) to identify the types of issues that are seen with wildlife in the Bow Valley.
  - For development in TSMV to be approved, the NRCB has stipulated that there must be a wildlife corridor that is approved by Alberta Environment and Parks.
  - Wildlife corridors have been a large component of the CAG discussions surrounding the Smith Creek Project and the sub group on the Resort Centre Project.
- Wildlife data has shown an increasing amount of human / wildlife interaction.
  - This has been highlighted by the work of the Town through the Human Use Management Review Committee (HUMR) and monitoring data collected in collaboration between the Town, the Province and TSMV. Specifically:
    - There is an increased wildlife interaction in Town (elk in school yards, black bears and grizzly bears coming into town).
    - There are an increasing number of people using the wildlife corridors (not just on designated trails but on pirate trails).
- Given all the data collected on wildlife in the Bow Valley, the project biologists explored the impact on wildlife should the ASP move forward for approval. The Biologist reported that
  - Between animals selecting to be in the Town and humans spending time in the wildlife corridor, current mortality in the Bow Valley around Canmore indicate that the Town and adjacent recreation areas could represent a local scale population sink.
  - Once the ASP goes forward, there will be more people in proximity to wildlife.
  - Without the proper mitigations, humans will continue to use the wildlife corridor for recreation, wildlife will continue to habituate in Town due to attractants and therefore human-wildlife interaction will increase.
- Overall, the wildlife corridors seem to be working well for most species (elk, grizzly bears and cougars) although there are questions about how well the wildlife corridor is working for wolves.
- Wildlife in the Bow Valley and elsewhere are much more adaptable to development than what was previously thought. For example,
  - Elk prefer to be in Town (telemetry data indicates that town and the unfinished golf course are among the most selected part of the Bow Valley for elk).
  - Grizzly bears, black bears and cougars are also adaptable and are spending more time close to the town.
- Humans in the wildlife corridor ultimately affect wildlife corridor functionality and whether wildlife can move through the corridor safely without interaction 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 these slopes for some species in some seasons.
  - While there is still a preference for wildlife using flatter areas, use does not stop after 25 degrees.

- 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.

**Attendee Question: If this type of development goes ahead, what types of strategies can be implemented to maintain a wildlife population in the Bow Valley?**

- There are many strategies that have been successful elsewhere that can reduce and mitigate the effects of development on wildlife.
- Attractant management is an example of this.
  - While great strides have been made in Canmore in terms of minimizing attractants, there is still more work to be done (e.g., there are still fruit bearing trees in town).
- A hard edge wildlife corridor treatment in contrast to a soft edge.
  - At the time of the Resort Centre ASP in 2004, it was thought that a soft edge (allocating a low density use adjacent to the wildlife corridor to extend the corridor and provide a buffer between humans and wildlife) would be an effective way to separate humans and wildlife.
  - Experience has shown that the soft edge provides wildlife with greater access to the attractants in Town and does little to discourage humans from recreating in the wildlife corridor.
  - Consequently, Provincial and the project biologists now advocate for a hard edge alternative.
  - The Project Team explored the option of both a fence and a higher density development as hard edge alternatives.
  - In the spring of 2016, the Project Team hosted a workshop with wildlife interaction and fencing experts from Alberta Environment and Parks, and Parks Canada. At the meeting the experts indicated that fencing, given the nature of the proposed development, would be a better edge treatment than a high density development adjacent to the corridor as this high density development would still be permeable and wildlife is very adaptable.
  - The consensus amongst experts is that a fence could work in Canmore to reduce human wildlife interaction with the understanding that a fence will not be perfect and that there would still be intrusions.
  - Swing gates would be located at intervals along the fence to ensure that there is a method to deal with intrusions; wildlife conflict specialists did not favour jump-outs.

Discussion: Data Collection Methods

**Resident Comment/Question: How is data related to population sink collected? What is the science and statistics behind this? It sounds like it is not really accurate.**

- Data collection is based on the reproductive capacity of black bears as well as monitoring of the extent of wildlife removal occurring in the Bow Valley. This includes road kill as well as wildlife mortality on railways and in developed areas.

- As stated earlier, it is the opinion of the wildlife biologist (Golder and the Provincial biologist) that current mortality in the Bow Valley around Canmore could indicate that the Town and adjacent recreation areas could represent a local scale population sink.
- The data is interpreted by the Project and Provincial biologists who make recommendations based on their expert opinion.

**Resident Comment/Question: Is there any data supporting hard edge vs. soft edge options other than opinion? Are there any examples of a similar type of community where a fence has been shown to be effective?**

- As indicated earlier, the experience in the Bow Valley since 2002 is that the soft edge approach has not been effective. Using radio telemetry data for both ungulates and predators, we have found that predators follow ungulates into town. Ultimately, the ungulate habituation and their incursion in Town resulting from the soft edge have exacerbated the wildlife interaction issue in the town.
- Fencing has been effective elsewhere. For instance, in Jackson Hole Wyoming a fence separates the Town from the wildlife refuge. However, given that the wildlife in Jackson is primarily bison and elk, the situation is not exactly the same.
- More locally, the fence along the TransCanada highway has reduced wildlife – vehicle collisions by 87 percent in places it has been implemented. However, it is recognized that the transportation fencing along the Highway is not perfect.
- While it is not possible to completely demonstrate that the fence will be 100 percent effective, experts are of the opinion that given the current status of wildlife in the Bow Valley, the problem of humans using the wildlife corridor for recreation and experiences with fencing elsewhere, it is a strong option worth exploring.

**Resident Comment/Question: Who is the biologist whose opinion you are working with?**

- We have worked with the project biologists (Golder Associates) but have had input from Provincial biologists, Parks Canada staff and the Bow Valley Wildlife Conflict specialist.
- At the workshop, those around the table felt that the fence could work in Canmore to substantially reduce human-wildlife interaction.
- Provincial biologists (from Alberta Environment and Parks) hold the opinion that the wildlife corridor width meets the criteria to be functional.

**Resident Comment/Question: Are there any statistics pertaining to human-wildlife interaction in Three Sisters?**

- Yes, data collected by Jay Honeyman (the Bow Valley wildlife conflict specialist) indicates that the Peaks of Grassi and Banff Gate are the two worst “hot spots” in TSMV followed by Stewart Creek Golf Course.

**Resident Comment/Question: How do you define human-wildlife “interaction”? What is the scope of current human-wildlife interaction?**

- A map was circulated at the meeting that outlines high, moderate and low conflict areas. An area is considered to be “high” conflict if there are more than four encounters a year.
- Bear-human interactions were defined as incidents where there was a perceived threat to individuals that may have resulted in personal injury such as a charge, property damage, or incidents involving unnatural food attractants.

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

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

**Resident Comment/Question: Can you give an overview of the methodology for collecting wildlife data? I am not sure I understand how this data is collected.**

- GPS is used to track elk, grizzly bears, cougars and wolves.
- Data on Cougar and Bear 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. It was noted that there are biases related to camera placement associated with this type of data collection.

**Resident Comment/Question: What about the human use data that you are collecting?**

- Human use data is primarily collected using cameras. TSMV has been collecting this data for years. Today, this is an initiative shared by TSMV and Environment and Parks in collaboration with the Town.
- 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.
  - 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.
  - Although animals are still using the corridor, human use results in more conflict.
- There are more attractants that motivate elk to come into the 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.

Discussion: Environmental Impact Assessment

- Golder has undertaken an environmental study for the Smith Creek and Resort Centre Projects (this is an environmental impact study or EIS but is referred to as an environmental study).
  - The study examines opportunities to mitigate, reduce or eliminate the negative environmental impacts of development.
  - 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.

- The 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 as the green spaces allow permeability.
    - These green spaces exist in developed areas and many 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. The rationale for a fence is that it will reduce the risk of human-wildlife interaction.
    - In spring 2016, as discussed earlier, 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 by experts 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 incursions will be less often provided that attractant management practices are underway and enforced within the 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.
    - Without a fence, sensory disturbance mitigations would not be effective.
    - Without a fence, animals would not be encouraged to avoid developed areas. However, with a fence, minimizing sensory disturbance in the wildlife corridor would facilitate wildlife movement.

#### Discussion: Fence Location and Logistics

**Resident Comment/Question: How is this going to work? Can you show us the location of the fence? I am not sure this is the right solution. How can you guarantee this?**

- The fence location was shown on a map on the screen. It generally runs along the proposed wildlife corridors in Smith Creek and Resort Centre. In order to mitigate for human wildlife interaction within existing TSMV development, a connecting fence length between Resort Centre and Smith Creek is proposed through the Stewart Creek Golf Course (SCGC).



- The Project Team previously explored an option to fence Smith Creek and Resort Centre separately; however, at the fencing workshop in the spring, experts indicated that a comprehensive fence for all TSMV development would be looked upon more favourably from a human wildlife interaction mitigation perspective.
- In response, the Project Team worked on an option to run the fence through SCGC and worked with the ownership to identify an alignment that would not interfere with golf course operations.
- The fence will clearly delineate the wildlife corridor and gates will provide people with access to trails above the corridor.
  - The ASP provides for a system of multiuse trails to allow people to recreate in other areas beside the corridor.

**Resident Comment/Question: How do you cross Three Sisters Creek with a fence? This is a problem. Animals can swim.**

- The fence would go across the creek. QPD will work with the project biologists and fencing experts to determine specific details on how to treat gates, jump-outs, roads and other natural and man-made features at future planning stages (i.e. land use and subdivision stages). This is an issue that will need to be mitigated.

**Resident Comment/Question: Why would you replace the underpass? Is there something wrong with the existing one? This may not make sense.**

- There is nothing wrong with the current wildlife underpass. The proposal would be to build a new underpass to better align the wildlife corridor with the steep creek area, if the Stewart Creek across Valley Corridor is relocated. This will allow better functioning of the corridor.

**Resident Comment/Question: If there was no fence would you be able to develop up to the development boundary?**

- No. As discussed earlier, soft edge without a fence has been shown to be ineffective and expert opinion is that a hard edge without a fence (i.e. higher density development adjacent to the wildlife corridor) would be less effective than a fence to separate humans and wildlife.
- There have been ongoing discussions about the WLC and wildlife mitigation with the Project Team and the CAG. Ultimately, it is necessary to balance the needs of the Town, the need for a functioning corridor, the necessity for the developer to build something viable and the input from the community.
- The proposal to implement a fence is ultimately an application submitted to the Province by the developer. What we are discussed tonight are the result of months of discussions with experts and the CAG. The community conversations were suggested by the CAG who felt that the Project Team should discuss these ideas with the community.

**Resident Comment/Question: Can you experiment with putting a fence around Smith Creek and determine the costs to maintain and effectiveness prior to implementing the fence everywhere? The Resort Centre fenced area is not complete so I am not convinced it will be effective [referring to the gap in the fence at the Bow River].**

- The fence will be phased in with development. There will be parts of the fence that will be implemented before others. As development progresses, the fence will be phased to fully enclose the developed areas of both Smith Creek and the Resort Centre.
- Gaps in the fence have been identified as problematic. There needs to be a holistic solution. We are open to see if there is a workable solution that balances community, wildlife, town and TSMV requirements.

**Resident Comment/Question: Why doesn't the fence go around the entire golf course? Is there an option to keep Stewart Creek Golf Course outside of the fence? This doesn't make any sense.**

- At the time the WLC was approved, it was thought that the wildlife corridor and golf course could overlap.
- There are portions of the golf course that are wildlife corridor and conservation easement
- The alignment that has been selected is the most effective option of golf course operations and runs along the length of the golf course. There will be minimal gates and cattle guards on this component of the fence.

**Resident Comment/Question: Why didn't you work with Hubman on the fence alignment concept? Is there a concept that you would not fence the Hubman community? Have you gone too far and are we too late?**

- These meetings are intended to get feedback from Hubman residents on the conceptual fence alignment. The Project Team needed to understand from the experts what their recommendations were and how they would solve the problem.
- There are opportunities to make changes and resolve outstanding issues. However, the idea of a fence is supported by many experts in this area as well as those working with the conflicts that arise when people and wildlife meet.
- Canmore has a reputation for being leading edge in terms of wildlife conservation. The fence is the next level of conservation and will only be effective for TSMV if it is comprehensive.
- The fence strategy has been discussed with the Province and they are in support as long as the other strategies (see above: attractant management, education, enforcement, etc.) are also in place.

**Resident Comment/Question: If a fence is such a good option, why is it not going to enclose the rest of the Town of Canmore? If this is a priority, why is Town not being fenced before the new development area?**

- The Town is always working with developers to do the latest and best practices. Consequently, new developments are held to a higher standard than older models which are harder to retrofit with newer technologies and practices (for example, green building).
- If fencing proves to be working, it may be something that is considered for the rest of Town. In the meantime, the Province has approached the Town to explore fencing school yards in Canmore.

**Resident Comment/Question: How many gates are there right now to access up and above the corridor and where are they?**

- The locations of the gates have not been determined with the Province at this time. There will be 2-3 access points to get through the wildlife corridor so people can access designated Provincial trails above the wildlife corridor.
- This is a balance between the recreational needs of the community and the function of the wildlife corridor.
- These types of details will be determined at a later stage in the development process. The principles and high level concepts will appear in the ASP.

**Resident Comment/Question: Eight years ago we were told that the maintenance compound had to be moved because it was in an area that was a pinch point for wildlife. Now we find out that this area will be fenced and the wildlife will be excluded anyway. What changed?**

- Currently, the concern is not simply about the topography of the wildlife corridor and wildlife pinch points. The proposal to implement a fence addresses the issue of humans using the wildlife corridor for recreational purposes.

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

- 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.

**Resident Comment/Question: How could intrusions into the fenced area be dealt with?**

- 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 work for the Province, leading wildlife out of developed areas would be even more work without a fence.
- Within the environmental study without a fence, it is predicted that when Smith Creek and Resort Centre are developed, there will an increasing intensity of human use in the wildlife corridors than currently experienced in the existing developments.
- The fence creates an opportunity to have designated access to the corridors and to provide signage to promote the wildlife corridor and its purpose.
- A key mitigation will be finding positive places for people to take their dogs and to ride their bikes within the developed area, rather than within the wildlife corridor.
  - Development in Smith Creek will provide recreational alternatives to using the wildlife corridor. The ASP provides for designated trails and dog parks.

**Resident Comment/Question: Has the fence been agreed upon by the developer even with the extra cost incurred?**

- 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 delineate the wildlife corridor using a fence both for the new developments (Smith Creek and Resort Centre) and existing TSMV developments.
- As discussed earlier, 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.
  - 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)

**Resident Comment/Question: Who has given their blessing on the fence? (The Facilitator came back to this question that was asked at the beginning of the meeting)**

- Nothing is approved and conversation is ongoing. The Province has seen the corridor and the data behind the corridor and they have provided some feedback that will be incorporated into the application.
- The corridor is ultimately approved through a designation of the Province. The process of designation is a back and forth discussion.
- Note that the concept shown today is not necessarily where the fence will go if it is implemented.

Discussion: Area Structure Plan Concept

**Resident Comment/Question: What is the difference between development in Smith Creek and in Resort Centre?**

- Resort Centre is medium density while Smith Creek will provide for a variety of building forms (predominately middle housing- townhomes, stacked townhomes and multi-family). These are still grade oriented but compact. There will still be single family homes in Smith Creek but we are not currently contemplating an acreage development
- The rationale for having a higher density in Resort Centre is because the terrain is flatter and therefore there is more developable land.
- Some statistics:
  - 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

**Resident Comment/Question: Has the Town mandated that a specific portion of the development be allocated as green space?**

- Under the *Municipal Government Act*, the Town is permitted to ask developers to allocate up to 10% of land as municipal reserve (MR).

- In Smith Creek, TSMV and the Town have worked out a way to use the topography in Smith Creek to build hiking and biking trails in the Plan area. Not only will this provide more than 20% of the land as MR, but it will also provide people with alternatives to recreating in the wildlife corridor.
- In Resort Centre, there will be recreational opportunities as well. There will be a specific emphasis on pedestrian connections as we discussed at our last meeting.

### Process Moving Forward

**Resident Comment/Question: If a stakeholder group would like to prepare an independent report to present to the Town, when would be a good time to do this?**

- At this point in time, the submission process and timelines are more malleable but as the ASP proceeds through the formal submission it will be less flexible.
- If the ASP is submitted to the Town in September, the public hearing could be in November, however, at this stage in the process this is still subject to change.

**Resident Comment/Question: The Smith Creek Project Team is having small community conversations. Is there an opportunity for these groups to come together?**

- The Project Team will be having two larger public events either prior to or at the same time as the ASP submission. The format of these sessions is yet to be determined but is likely to be an open house or world café format.
- There is also an online forum called PlaceSpeak that we will be using to facilitate targeted conversations. This online tool allows everyone to weigh in on the conversation.

**Resident Question/Comment: How do we move forward from here and build trust? This meeting has built some trust as it is very transparent; however, it has also built distrust because it is clear that the wildlife proposals are based on expert opinion rather than real facts – the data is not clear. Trust will come from the Project Team showing the Hubman residents how the plan has evolved and how our feedback is being implemented. Do not do this if you are not going to listen. The residents will feel like there is just talk with no intention of listening.**

### Concluding Remarks

- The Project Team has committed to providing Hubman Residents with information on the data that was used to formulate the proposal.
- The Project Team will be in touch as soon as possible with the dates of the next follow-up meeting focused on undermining.
- The Facilitator committed to providing an approximate timeline for the Hubman residents.
- The Facilitator thanked the residents for coming and having a robust discussion with the Project team on the wildlife strategies.
- The Facilitator acknowledged that these types of conversations are not easy to have and reiterated the appreciation for the feedback.