

Canmore Community Monitoring Program 2016 Final Report



September 25, 2017

Photo Credits: Canada 150 celebration courtesy of Noel Rogers

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
2016 Executive Summary	3
Preface.....	9
People.....	15
Population: Permanent and Non-Permanent Residents.....	16
Population: Age Structure	23
Mother Tongue, Immigration and Cultural Diversity	29
Citizen Satisfaction	33
Place	35
Sense of Community.....	36
Community Facilities	38
Arts & Events	40
Land Use, Development and Planning Standards	42
Service	47
Volunteer Organizations.....	48
Library Facilities and Use	51
Recreational Program and Facility Use.....	53
Responses to Food Need and Food Sustainability	56
Education of Children and Youth.....	60
Health Services	63
Safety.....	67
Community Safety	69
Domestic Abuse.....	75
Sexual Violence.....	78
Wildland/Urban Interface – FireSmart.....	81
Flood and Mountain Creek Hazard Mitigation	84
Economy	88
Employment Status of Adults.....	90
Employment by Industry	98

Municipal Taxation: Assessment and Tax Share	101
Business Licenses.....	104
Building Permits and Housing Starts	106
Commercial Vacancy and Lease Rates	109
Tourism Industry and Visitation	111
Tourist Accommodations and Occupancy Rates	117
Affordability.....	120
Income and Wages	122
Living Wage	133
Social Assistance – Income Support Programs.....	136
Rental Housing: Cost, Availability and Affordability.....	139
Ownership Housing – Resale Prices and Affordability	146
Price of Goods and Services	151
Environment	154
Air Quality.....	157
Water Consumption	159
Drinking Water Quality.....	164
Wastewater	166
Resource Conservation and Waste Management.....	171
Energy Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	178
Transportation.....	181
Aquatic Health and Fisheries.....	184
Wildlife Movement Corridors and Habitat Patches	189
Human/Wildlife Conflict.....	198
Forest Health – Mountain Pine Beetle	211
References.....	214
Appendix A: Archived/Inactive Indicators.....	229
Appendix B: Human-Wildlife Conflict Level Descriptions.....	230
Appendix C: 2014 Census Update	233
Appendix D: Previous (2014) Recommendations.....	237

2016 Executive Summary

People

Over the past 20 years Canmore's permanent population has grown by over 5,600 people, from 8,400 in 1996 to nearly 14,000 in 2016. As of the last municipal census in 2014, there were approximately 4,000 non-permanent residents with homes in Canmore (estimated total population of approximately 18,000 people). During the mid-2000s decade Canmore experienced an exceptionally rapid rise in housing prices, increasing the affordability challenge for many residents. This slowed the growth rate of the permanent population, and there was even a measurable reduction in the number of children in the community (and in the schools) as many families found themselves struggling with affordability and shelter costs. From 2011 to 2016 Canmore experienced moderate growth in the permanent population, with a total increase of 14% during that 5 year period (an average of 2.8% per year). During these past 20 years there has been a significant shift in the demographic makeup of the community, with a sustained population shift to older age brackets and an increasing proportion of residents age 55 and over. In part, this demographic shift to older age brackets mirrors some general aging trends across Canada, but the changing demographics of Canmore are most clearly illustrated by looking at the younger age groups. The number of children was in gradual decline during the 2000s decade but has begun to reverse that trend with a slight increase over the past five years. While this shows a small, but positive trend for families, overall children and youth are an increasingly smaller proportion of Canmore's overall population. The number of children and youth (14 or younger) has not increased substantially during the past 20 years, and as of 2016 there are only about 130 more children in the community than there were in 1996.

The cost of living and affordability of housing are longstanding issues in Canmore, but have grown more acute in recent years. Housing and affordability issues were at the top of residents' minds in the 2012, 2014 and the 2017 Citizen Satisfaction Surveys. While most residents rank the quality of life in Canmore quite highly (98% 'good' to 'very good' in the 2017 Survey), an increasing number of people (26%) felt that their quality of life had worsened in recent years, primarily due to the cost of living and affordability issues. The need for appropriate and affordable housing remains a key community issue and is one of Council's key strategic priorities for 2016-18.

Place

Canmore continues to grow and evolve into one of Canada's premier mountain communities. Once a coal mining and railroad town, Canmore is now well known as a recreation and vacation destination with stunning mountain views. Only an hour from the City of Calgary and an international airport, Canmore has an extensive network of trails in and around the town, the summer and winter facilities of Canmore Nordic Centre Provincial Park, and easy access to tens of thousands of square kilometers of mountainous backcountry.

Over the past several years, the community has made a significant commitment to recreational and cultural facilities. Elevation Place, constructed in 2013, is a hub for swimming, recreation, fitness, arts & culture, and the community library. The old swimming pool at the Recreation Centre was redeveloped as

an expanded gymnastics facility, and the rest of the building is undergoing a significant upgrade over the coming years (as part of lifecycle maintenance). The old Canmore Public Library was renovated into artsPlace, a community arts centre that opened in 2015.

In 2016 the Town of Canmore completed a rewrite of the Municipal Development Plan (MDP), the core statutory planning document for the community. Within the framework of the community Vision and Foundational Values, the MDP sets out a number of key land use and planning concepts which guide future community development. Work is now underway on updating the Land Use Bylaw (LUB) to reflect the direction given by the MDP.

Recent plans to rezone and develop municipal reserve lands in the Peaks of Grassi and at the Old Daycare Lands have resulted in considerable community debate on how to best balance community green space, development, and the need for affordable housing.

Three Sisters Mountain Village (TSMV), the last major tract of undeveloped land in Canmore, was placed in receivership in 2009. In 2013 the property was purchased by a new ownership group, who renewed efforts to gain final development approvals for those lands. In the spring of 2017, an Area Structure Plan (ASP) for Smith Creek and an ASP amendment for the Resort Centre were submitted to the Town of Canmore for consideration. A motion for first reading of the Resort Centre ASP amendment was defeated by Council. The Smith Creek ASP process is delayed pending a decision about the alignment of the wildlife corridor (currently under review by the Government of Alberta). A final decision on the corridor is expected, possibly in the fall of 2017. This planning process, when complete, will finalize the wildlife corridor layout in TSMV and thereby complete the network of corridors in this portion of the Bow Valley.

Service

A wide array of government, private sector, and non-profit and volunteer sector services and helping agencies are active in Canmore. Community organizations and programs cover a wide spectrum of cultural, social, environmental, youth, senior, and other community needs. The volunteer and charitable sector in Canmore remains strong. Canmore's social, cultural, and recreational programs remain popular with growing levels of participation. The library continues to be an important community hub with high levels of use. Elevation Place and artsPlace provide a wealth of recreational opportunities, new library space, and arts and cultural programming and events. Canmore's Public Art program continues to expand with the Fortis Utility Box program and Canada 150 street mural and temporary art installations.

For a relatively small community, Canmore enjoys enviable access to a large number of physicians and a local hospital with relatively short wait times. As of 2013, Banff Mineral Springs Hospital ceased to handle deliveries and that service is now centralized at the Canmore Hospital.

Demand at the Food Bank and Christmas Spirit Campaign has increased over the past several years, highlighting the affordability challenges faced by some residents. The Canmore Food Recovery Barn started operations in 2017 offering residents an opportunity to 'recover' extra food from local grocery stores that might otherwise go to waste.

Overall enrolment in Canmore's three schools systems is up slightly over the past five years, halting the slow decline in the population of children and youth that was ongoing through the 2000s decade.

Safety

Overall, Canmore remains a safe community, crime rates remain low and the crime severity index has trended lower over the past 5 years. For 2016 Canmore had the lowest Violent Crime Severity Index of all the RCMP detachments in Alberta. The Sense of Community survey reveals that most residents tend to feel safe in Canmore. However, it is important to remember that there are still issues and vulnerable populations, as agencies such as Bow Valley Victims Services and the YWCA respond to situations involving domestic abuse and sexual violence.

The summer of 2017 saw many large forest fires across western North America, including large fires nearby in Verdant Creek and Waterton. These fires, and the 2016 Fort McMurray wildfire, highlight the potential threat faced by the communities of the Bow Valley. Fuel modification and FireSmart efforts continue with an annual program to reduce the hazard in the wildland/urban interface.

The 2013 flood caused a significant amount of damage in Canmore to residences, businesses, and infrastructure. Since 2013, flood recovery and planning mitigations for future events have been a key focus for the Town of Canmore. The Town initiated an extensive Mountain Creek Hazard Mitigation program, including a Steep Creek Hazard and Risk Policy. A proposed flood and debris retention structure on Cougar Creek is currently undergoing the approvals process.

Economy

The 2014 oil price crash sent shockwaves through Alberta's economy and labour markets. The regional labour market (Banff-Jasper-Rocky Mountain House) has seen higher unemployment rates and a reduction in the total labour force size. These effects have been somewhat moderated in the Bow Valley as Canmore and Banff's labour markets were not as heavily impacted as the rest of Alberta by the crash in oil prices (tourism visitation to the region remains high). However local effects have been felt: food bank demand is up, Employment Insurance (EI) claims are up, while job orders from local employers at the Job Resource Centre are down slightly.

Overall, local business registrations in Canmore are up, particularly for Home Occupations, highlighting the growth in the entrepreneurial and self-employment sectors. This year the Bow Valley Chamber of Commerce began operations, creating a support and advocacy organization for local businesses and entrepreneurs.

After an unprecedented peak of high prices and high volumes in 2006 and 2007, the development and real estate industries were hit hard by the financial crisis in 2008. Building permits and housing starts plummeted and the real estate market slowed considerably. After some difficult years the local economy started to regain strength in 2011, with increased building permits and housing starts through to 2016 (but remaining well below pre-2008 levels). The price of residential properties began to recover in 2013,

and even though Alberta's economy was hit hard by the oil price crash, sales volumes and prices in Canmore have increased through 2016.

Annual visitation to Banff National Park increased by nearly 24% over the previous 5-year period. Final numbers for the Canada 150 celebrations in the Park (with free Discovery Pass access) are not yet available, but visitation is expected to have been very high. Average traffic volumes on the Trans-Canada highway through Canmore increased by 30.1% from 2011 to 2016. The increased number of visitors to the region has been noticeable in Canmore, with high occupancy rates in hotels on the weekends and all throughout the summer season.

Affordability

A long standing issue, the availability and affordability of housing has emerged as one of the key community issues. With an effective vacancy rate close to 0%, and upward price pressures, finding rental housing has become a challenge for many residents and a limiting factor for the labour market, with many workers having trouble finding housing and some employers having trouble finding workers. Residential house prices remain very high, and home ownership remains beyond the financial means of many low to average income people (particularly single individuals and lone parent families).

For 2016, Canmore had the highest Spatial Price Index ranking in Alberta. The index is based on the overall price of goods and services, of which, shelter costs were a major component of Canmore's high ranking.

In 2015 the Town of Canmore explored the issue of the 'Living Wage' in the community. The living wage is the hourly rate at which a household can meet its basic needs. The estimated living wage is \$23.40 (each) for a couple with 2 children, \$24.25 for a lone parent with 1 child, and \$20.03 for a single adult.

Average total incomes for Canmore residents increased by 33% from 2010 to 2015, but average employment income only rose by 20% during the same period. This highlights the growing gap between income from employment vs income from other sources. Per capita reported investment income in Canmore is more than triple the Canadian average. Therefore 'averages' of total income for the community should be treated with caution as there is an unequal distribution of wealth and income: not all residents have sufficient wealth to realize significant income gains from investments.

Environment

The mountain environment is central to Canmore community identity and its appeal as a tourist destination. As such, sustainability and conservation of wildlife are important issues in the community. Late in 2012, a permanent air quality monitoring station was installed east of Canmore. The results have indicated levels of sulphur dioxide and nitrogen dioxide are well within the air quality standards for Alberta. However the monitoring station has shown a steady increase in measured levels of ozone, one of the principle components of smog.

Residential water consumption continues to show a gradual decline, as conservation efforts and low-flow fixtures help to reduce per-capita use. Water consumption by industrial, commercial and institutional uses increased by 36% from 2011 to 2016, likely due in large part to the increased levels of visitation to Canmore. Upgrades to the waste water treatment plant continue to keep the facility within regulatory guidelines. Water quality testing above and below the effluent discharge point do not show any significant or measurable differences in water quality above and below the facility. Drinking water quality remains high and well within required parameters.

Canmore has expanded waste diversion efforts with the Beyond Curbside Recycling Program, Recyclables and Waste Disposal Bylaw, and the Waste Characterization Study. The animal-proof containers are very effective at reducing wildlife incidents, but create challenges for trying to improve waste diversion efforts. As shown by the Waste Characterization Study a significant quantity of recyclable materials are still being deposited in the garbage bins. Highlighting the need for enhanced community education and effort on the part of local residents.

Reversing previous trends, and in spite of a growing population and increased visitation, total community electricity use was fairly consistent from 2011-2016 and natural gas consumption dropped by 6%. An updated inventory on total community greenhouse gas emissions is currently underway.

The expansion of the public transit system in the Bow Valley continues. Since its first full year of operation in 2013, ROAM regional ridership has nearly doubled to 110,000 riders in 2016. A local ROAM public transit system in Canmore began operations in November 2016. Public transit is a major step towards reducing private vehicle use and providing affordable transportation options to residents and visitors.

The presence of Whirling disease (usually fatal to trout and whitefish) was confirmed in Johnson Lake in Banff National Park in 2016. This is the first case of whirling disease confirmed in Canada. Parks Canada restricted access to Johnson Lake to reduce the spread of this disease. Subsequent testing through 2016 and 2017 has identified Whirling disease in the Bow River and other watersheds in southern Alberta. Efforts to map the full extent and reduce the spread are currently underway.

The Town of Canmore, Alberta Environment and Parks, and their partners continue to make progress on implementing the recommendations of the Human Use Management Review (HUMR). Alberta Environment and Parks is finalizing a remote camera study of wildlife and human use in the lands around Canmore. Preliminary results show that levels of use by humans and off-leash dogs are much higher than levels of use by wildlife.

Canmore continues to be a leader in attempting to reduce wildlife conflict, from the installation of bear proof bins in 1998, the Wildlife Attractant Bylaw in 2017, or the development of the WildSmart community education program. However, human/wildlife conflict continues to be a concern in the community with three 'contact' incidents between humans and bears in 2014, 2016, and 2017. Fortunately, none of these incidents resulted in a human fatality (there was one fatality in 2005). The majority of the occurrences are rated of low or moderate severity and do not involve a direct attack or immediate threat to people. Wildlife habituation or human/wildlife conflict often results in the removal or death of the animal. In 2017, after a series of incidents and encounters (no direct contact incidents or injuries), there was a high

profile relocation of Bear 148 far from its home range to a location near Kakwa Wildland Provincial Park. This is one of many Bow Valley bears who have been relocated or euthanized as a management action, or killed on the road or railway. A total of 70 bears (black and grizzly) were killed or removed from this portion of the Bow Valley between 2011 and 2016 (a range of 2 to 19 bears per year).

After several years of low population numbers, Mountain Pine Beetle infested trees have increased dramatically from 33 in 2011 to 1,329 in 2016. Control efforts (survey, falling and burning) around Canmore in the Bow Valley have resumed to attempt to control the spread of the pine beetles.

Preface

The Program

The Canmore Community Monitoring Program (CCMP) was established to monitor and evaluate trends developing in the community. This was a recommendation in the 1995 Growth Management Strategy Report. The Canmore Community Monitoring Program is designed to assist with municipal and community decision-making; serve as part of an early detection system that assists in identifying risk areas that threaten the health of the community; and present a snapshot of the community’s progress towards its current vision. For this report that vision is the 2006 Mining the Future: A Vision for Canmore (Town of Canmore, 2006), which was crafted with the involvement of over 600 participants. It identified key community values and principles, and goals and criteria to achieve the Vision of the community. The Mining the Future Vision has been further refined with more detailed goals in the Town of Canmore’s 2016-2018 Strategic Plan (Town of Canmore, 2016f). The goals of the Strategic Plan provide the organizational framework for this report.

Goals: 2016-2018 Strategic Plan	
Vision: “Canmore is a resilient and vibrant community socially, economically, and environmentally. Its strength is in its resourceful and engaged citizens, who thrive together on the strength of the community’s heritage, long term commitment to the diversity of its people, and health of the mountain landscape.”	
Category	Goals
Place	Canmore has a unique sense of place
Service	Canmore’s services and programs respond to the aspirations of its residents and visitors and are delivered in an effective, innovative, and fiscally responsible manner
Safety	Canmore is a safe community
Economy	Canmore has a diverse economy that is resilient to change
Affordability	Canmore is a viable community for people of diverse socioeconomic backgrounds
Environment	Canmore is a municipal leader in environmental stewardship
People	We value and support “people” as the corporation’s and community’s strongest asset

The Monitoring Program involves...

- identifying indicators to be tracked and followed over time;
- collecting baseline data for each indicator, including current statistics and historical figures for Canmore, provincial or national averages, and comparative data from similar relevant locations where possible;
- measuring relative to thresholds or goals for indicators when available
- monitoring and updating the data annually for each indicator where available; and

- reporting regularly to Canmore Town Council and the Public on the general health of the community, identifying areas requiring further attention or where progress has been made.

The Indicators

An indicator provides information about an issue or condition. A trend shows the direction in which the issue or condition is heading over time. As this program continues to develop, the indicators will be further refined and more precisely and consistently measured. Indicators are restricted to data that is currently being collected as conducting surveys or conducting primary research is beyond the scope of this process.

If current information was not available for an indicator it was not included in this report. To see the list of indicators which have been 'archived' until updated data is available, please see Appendix A: Archived/Inactive Indicators.

The Thresholds

A threshold is a federal, provincial or locally accepted standard. In this report, some of the indicators have thresholds, others still need to be developed. If no explicit thresholds or goals exist then the data may be compared to a relevant societal average, typically for Alberta, Canada, or other communities.

The Data

This report is based on the most current data collected to date. Comparative data on a community, provincial, or national level is included where appropriate or available.

Due to gaps in municipal census years, some population values have been interpolated or estimated for intercensal years. This was done when population numbers were needed to calculate per capita values:

- 2002, 2004, 2007, 2010, 2012, 2013: no municipal census was conducted for these years, so missing population numbers were estimated using linear interpolation between the adjacent census years.
- There was no municipal census in 2015 or 2016. To estimate 2015 population, the 2014 municipal census population and the 2016 federal census population were used, with a linear interpolation between these two different data sources. It is important to remember that intercensal populations are estimates and not actual census counts.

The federal Census of Canada (Statistics Canada, 2017a) is conducted every 5 years, with the latest update in 2016. At this point in time (September 25, 2017) much, but not all of the 2016 census information has been released. This report used the information that has been made available so far, but unfortunately some information will not be released by Statistics Canada until after this report's publication date. When 2016 information is not available then 2011 data may be the most recently available. However, there are significant complications with some of the data available from 2011. In 2011, the usual mandatory 'long form' census that traditionally collected more detailed information was discontinued and replaced with

the voluntary National Household Survey (NHS). There are a number of concerns and unknowns regarding the quality of the NHS data. Where it is deemed appropriate, information from the 2011 NHS may be included in this report, but it should be treated with caution as it was collected using very different methods than other census years. Due to the one-time changes in methodology, 2011 NHS data is not comparable to the 2006 or previous 'long form' census data, nor is it directly comparable to 2016 or future census data. More information about the 2011 NHS is available at: <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/index-eng.cfm>

The 2014 Canmore Census (Town of Canmore, 2014a) contains some significant differences to prior editions (2011 was the previous census), therefore, 2014 is not always comparable to past census years. This complicates multi-year trend analysis for some indicators. In some cases examining trends is not possible due to differences in the data or census methodology.

- Questions/categorization: For 2014, some questions and/or the categorization of responses are different than the 2011 census. In these cases, year over year trend comparisons are not possible.
- Non-response: In 2014, respondents were presented with the option 'Prefer not to answer'. When combined with the 'Unknown' category, this sometimes results in significant non-responses (sometimes <15% or more). This complicates year over year trend analysis as the high proportion of non-responses could create and/or obscure apparent change, especially for small responses groups. Additionally, it is not known what effect non-response bias could have on the census (e.g. are certain socio-economic groups more likely to respond or not respond to certain questions?).
- Non-permanent (non-permanent) residents: the 2014 census reported substantially fewer non-permanent residents than the 2011 census. Because of the difference in these numbers, any calculations based on per-capita total population must be treated with extreme caution when looking at multi-year data. This issue is discussed further in the relevant sections of this report. Accurately counting non-permanent residents is very challenging. It is expected that the new information and experience gathered in the 2014 Census will help to refine the non-permanent resident count in future editions of the census.

The Report

The report begins with an Executive Summary highlighting the developing and ongoing trends in the community. The body of the report is divided into 7 main sections according to the goals of the Town of Canmore's 2016-2018 Strategic Plan:

- People¹
- Place
- Service
- Safety
- Economy
- Affordability
- Environment


¹ The 'People' section has been placed first in this report so that demographic and census information is at the beginning of the report.

Each of these sections contains a linkage to the strategic plan goals, multiple indicators and measures. The layout of each indicator category consists of a definition, graph(s) or table(s), the source of the data, observations, and interpretations. Where available, indicator thresholds, community initiatives and recommendations for additional information or data collection are also included.

This report is available on-line at www.canmore.ca or www.biosphereinstitute.org.

Preceding Documents

- Town of Canmore Growth Management Strategy Committee 1995 Strategy Report
- Canmore Growth Management Strategy: Thresholds & Monitoring Program 1999 Report
- Canmore Community Monitoring Program 2001 Report
- Canmore Community Monitoring Program 2003 Report
- Canmore Community Monitoring Program 2006 Report
- Canmore Community Monitoring Program 2008 Report
- Canmore Community Monitoring Program 2010 Report
- Canmore Community Monitoring Program 2012 Report
- Canmore Community Monitoring Program 2014 Report
- Mining the Future: A Vision for Canmore 2006
- Town of Canmore 2016-18 Strategic Plan







These reports are available at the Town of Canmore and the Biosphere Institute Resource Centre or online at: <http://biosphereinstitute.org/library/canmore-community-monitoring-report/>

Trend Conditions

The following indicators have been brought forward to highlight some key changes that have happened in Canmore. It is important to remember that a single year of change in the data does not necessarily indicate an emerging trend, and that past changes are not necessarily an indication of future trends and conditions. Rather than only looking at the most recent year of change in the data, the 5 year period 2011 to 2016 (when available) was chosen to put the information in context and to ensure that there are at least several data points in each series (not all data is available for 2016, nor is all of it collected on an annual basis). Note: when 2011-2016 data is not available, the closest 5 year period and/or available data is used.

The following change descriptors were chosen to summarize the trend of the indicator for the available data points during the 5 year period for 2011-2016. The threshold for change is +/- 5% change during that period (to reduce the effect of minor fluctuations or 'noise' in the data).

Trend Descriptor		Trend Condition
Increased		Values have generally trended upwards resulting in a measurable change of at least +5% over the base year
Decreased		Values have generally trended downwards resulting in a measurable change of at least -5% over the base year
Stable		Values have remained relatively stable (within +/- 5% of the base year) without major fluctuations
Variable		Values have fluctuated higher and lower (greater than +/- 5% of the base year) without a clear trend higher or lower

Acknowledgements

We would like to express appreciation to the agencies, organizations and individuals who provided the information for this report and made this information accessible for the report and for the community. We would also like to thank all the people who participated in the Community Monitoring workshops and reviewed the data. They provided expert guidance, data, interpretation and a deep knowledge of the community. A special thank you goes out to Brenda Caston from the Town of Canmore for her many years of hard work and dedication in managing the 7 previous editions Community Monitoring Report from 2001 to 2014. An additional thank you also goes out to Lisa Brown from the Town of Canmore who has filled Brenda's role as project manager for this report.

Workshop Participants

Alaric Fish	Lisa Guest
Amanda Waters	Lori Rissling-Wynn
Andreas Comeau	Meagan Reid
Barb Shellian	Melanie Percy
Brett Boukall	Melanie Watt
Carol Picard	Michael Fark
Connie MacDonald	Michel Dufresne
Donna Trautman	Nick de Ruyter
Dougal Forteach	Paul Zilligen
Ellen Thuringer	Peter Duck
Greg Burt	Ron Remple
Jay Honeyman	Scott Devnick
Jessica Stoner	Shelley Gregorash
John Eneas	Simon Robbins
John Paczkowski	Stephanie O'Brian
Karen Fennell	Tara Gilchrist
Lisa Brown	Yvette Penman

Author, Data Collection & Workshop Facilitator

Bruce Gleig, Program Associate, Biosphere Institute of the Bow Valley

Project Manager – Town of Canmore

Lisa Brown, Manager of Community Social Development, Town of Canmore

Editors and Proofreaders








Melanie Watt, Executive Director, Biosphere Institute of the Bow Valley

Lisa Brown, Manager of Community Social Development, Town of Canmore


People

“We value and support “people” as the corporation’s and community’s strongest asset.”

-Town of Canmore 2016-2018 Strategic Plan Vision and Goals

People– 5 Year Summary			
Section	Indicator	Trend 2011-2016	Comments
Population: Permanent and Semi-Permanent Residents	Permanent Residents		Based on the Census of Canada, Canmore’s population of permanent residents grew from 12,288 in 2011 to 13,992 in 2016 (13.9% increase).
	Non-Permanent Residents	n/a	The previous municipal census was 2014. No updated information is available.
Population: Age Structure	# of Children ages 0-14		From 2011 to 2016 the number of people 14 or younger grew from 1,850 to 2,050, an increase of 10.8% (but declined slightly as a % of the total population)
	# Adults age 55+		From 2011 to 2016 the number of people aged 55+ has grown from 2,980 to 4,075, an increase of 36.7%.
Mother Tongue, Immigration and Cultural Diversity	# of non-native English speakers		The number and proportion of people in Canmore whose first language isn’t English has been gradually increasing year over year. Data on immigration and ethnocultural diversity from the 2016 Census of Canada has not been released yet.
Citizen Satisfaction	Quality of Life		Respondents clearly ranked the quality of life as good to very good in Canmore, with 99% in 2012 and 98% in 2017.
	Perceived Change in Quality of Life		While overall, quality of life in Canmore was rated as ‘good’. 26% of respondents in 2017 felt that their quality of life had worsened during the past 3 years. The primary reason for this was the cost of living and housing affordability.
	Concern About Housing Affordability and Cost of Living		In the Citizen Satisfaction Survey, affordable housing was the Top of Mind Issue for all 3 years of the survey. 18% of respondents in 2012, and 33% in 2017.

Population: Permanent and Non-Permanent Residents

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
People: We value and support “people” as the corporation’s and community’s strongest asset	Permanent Residents	
	Non-Permanent Residents	No update available

The Town of Canmore’s total population is divided into two main components: permanent and non-permanent (aka semi-permanent). The permanent population are those for whom Canmore is their primary residence. The non-permanent population own a property in Canmore, but their primary residence is elsewhere.

Due to significant differences between the methods and results of the 2011 and 2014 Canmore Census (Town of Canmore, 2011a; Town of Canmore, 2014a), there are a number of changes to this section of the report and a number of indicators (e.g. migration and population turnover) that cannot be calculated due to incompatibility of the datasets. The main differences between the 2011 and 2014 census will be discussed in the sections below.

The 2016 Census of Canada (Statistics Canada, 2017a) provides the most recent update for Canmore’s permanent population. Throughout this report this 2016 population total will be used as the most recent count of Canmore’s permanent population.

Definitions

Permanent Resident: For the purposes of the Canmore Census, the definition of “permanent resident” is expanded to include the usual residents of the municipality, and anyone who has been resident at least 15 days, and is employed at the time of the census.


Non-Permanent Resident: persons with a permanent address elsewhere and usually occupy the same household in Canmore on a non-permanent basis (sometimes also known as non-permanent residents, weekenders, or second home owners).

Observations


Permanent Residents

- As measured by the municipal Canmore Census, the 1990s were a period of rapid growth for Canmore’s permanent population, with annual growth rates ranging from 5-10% per year. Annual growth rates dropped sharply after 1998, with no measurable growth from 2003-2005. Since 2005 there has been a moderate growth trend in the permanent population. Between the 2011 and 2014 census years the permanent population increased by a total of 760 people, an average of 253 people or 2.1% per year. Canmore’s permanent population was 13,077 in 2014. Canmore’s permanent population grew by 7.0% from 2009 to 2014 (Town of Canmore, 2014a).
- Every five years the Federal Census of Canada releases population information. In general the results for Canmore’s permanent population are very close (no unusually large variations) to what was

counted by the Canmore Census for the same year. The 5-year Census of Canada population totals are presented here for reference. Based on the Census of Canada, Canmore’s population of permanent residents grew from 12,288 in 2011 to 13,992 in 2016 (a 13.9% increase) (Statistics Canada, 2017a).



Source: (Town of Canmore, 2014a and Statistics Canada, 2017a)




Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017a)

Length of Residency


1. Due to differences in data collection methods for the 2014 Canmore Census, a fully detailed comparison with previous ‘length of residency’ data is not possible. In the 2012 Canmore Community

Monitoring Report it was noted that there had been a definite trend towards an increasing proportion of long term residents (10+ years) since 1995 (Biosphere Institute of the Bow Valley, 2013). This trend appears to have continued through 2014, although results must be treated with some caution due to the increased number of 'Prefer Not To Answer' responses in the 2014 Canmore Census.

- The 2014 Canmore Census report on length of residency for adults only has two length of residency categories that are comparable to past municipal census periods: < 5 years and >5 years. In 2014, 58.1% of adults responded that they had been residents of Canmore for more than 5 years, while 11.9% had been residents for less than 2 years. A total of 14.0% responses were unknown/prefer not to answer (up from 7.2% in 2011). Overall this data appears to show an increasing proportion of longer term residents and a decreasing proportion of shorter term residents. (Town of Canmore, 2014a).




- Updated length of residency information is not yet available from the 2016 Census of Canada, this information is expected to be released later in 2017.



Source: (Town of Canmore, 2014a)

Non-Permanent Residents

1. Information about non-permanent residents is not available from the Census of Canada as it only records details of persons residing in their usual place of residence, and does not provide information about the residents of vacation or second homes.
2. The number of non-permanent residents as measured by the 2014 Canmore Census was substantially different than that reported in previous census years. In 2011, the census reported 5,982 non-permanent residents. There were 3,884 reported in 2014. It is not entirely clear how much of this difference is due to actual change, and how much is due to methodological differences and limitations of the counts undertaken in various census years. Due to the significant difference, the 2014 count of non-permanent residents is being treated as 'not comparable' to previous census years (Town of Canmore, 2014a).
3. There are several reasons and explanations as to why there is such a significant discrepancy between census years. A detailed description and the full text of the 2014 Census Update to Council are available in Appendix C: 2014 Census Update. The primary reasons are:
 - **Dwellings:** some dwellings counted in 2011 could not be identified in 2014, additionally some visitor accommodation units (commercial properties) were counted as residential in 2011. In 2014, there were 641 fewer dwelling units that were identified as being occupied by non-permanent residents.
 - **Occupancy Rate:** in 2011 the occupancy rate of non-permanent residents was calculated at 2.8 per dwelling, this dropped slightly in 2014 to 2.6 per dwelling. The average occupancy rate was applied to dwelling units for which a direct response by the non-permanent occupants was not available, resulting in a difference of 0.2 persons per unit (Town of Canmore, 2015e).




Source: (Town of Canmore, 2014a)

Total Population

1. Due to the challenges and discrepancies in the non-permanent population counts (detailed above), the non-permanent and total population numbers for 2014 are not comparable to previous census years. The full data series from 1995-2014 is presented for illustrative purposes only. Canmore's total

population in 2014 was 16,961. This includes 13,077 permanent residents and 3,884 non-permanent residents (Town of Canmore, 2014a).


2. While Statistics Canada counted 13,992 permanent residents in Canmore in 2016, there is no updated information available for non-permanent residents. Due to the differences in counts and methodologies of the 2014 and earlier Canmore Censuses there is no attempt has been made in this report to assume any trends or make any estimates for the non-permanent population in 2016.



Source: (Town of Canmore, 2014a)

Birth and Death Rates

1. In general, there is a greater range of variation in Canmore's birth and death rates when compared to Alberta as a whole. This is to be expected, as a few individual events can easily sway the totals for a small community such as Canmore, therefore a higher degree of fluctuations is expected in a smaller population.
2. From 1995 to 2016, Canmore has had a lower death rate than the rest of the province (note: this may in part be due to more elderly and infirm persons moving to care facilities in major centres such as Calgary).
3. Compared with the period from 1995 to 2000, on average, birth rates in Canmore were lower for the period from 2001 to 2013 (Service Alberta: Registry Services, 2016). In March 2013 the obstetrics unit at the Banff Mineral Springs Hospital closed and birthing and maternity care for the region were centralized in the Canmore hospital. As a result birth rates for 2014 onwards have been much higher, although not all of these babies were born to Canmore parents.



Source: (Service Alberta: Registry Services, 2016)



Interpretation

1. Due to significant differences between the methodology of the 2011 and 2014 Canmore Census, there are a number of changes to the Population section of the report and a number of indicators (e.g. migration rate and population turnover) that cannot be calculated due to incompatibility of the datasets. Additionally, due to substantially different counts for non-permanent residents in 2011 and 2014 (due in part to differences in methodology), all non-permanent population and total population counts should be treated with caution. Trend comparison of 2014 with earlier non-permanent numbers is not appropriate.
2. After a period of very rapid growth in the 1990s, Canmore's growth moderated in the mid 2000s decade. This coincided with a rapid increase in real estate values, and likely indicates the effects that housing affordability was having on retaining many local residents. The slowing growth rate of the permanent population was offset by a rapidly growing non-permanent population and strong interest in purchasing recreational properties. This dropped off suddenly after 2007/8 due to the global economic crisis and uncertainties in the real estate market. The permanent population experienced modest growth from 2011 to 2014. In Canmore, the high cost of living in general and housing in particular, can be important factors in the decision to stay or leave the community. This is likely one of the major factors influencing the dynamics of the permanent population. Affordable housing, recreational and cultural facilities, educational opportunities, employment and economic opportunities, and a sense of community are all required to maintain a strong population of long term local residents.
3. From 1995 to 2011, the number and proportion of long term residents (>10 years) increased substantially, indicating that although annual growth rates had slowed, there is a growing cohort of longer term local residents in the community. Note: comparable length of residency statistics are not available for 2014.

Recommendations

1. As a popular regional and international tourist destination, Canmore often has an effectively higher daily population, especially during weekends or popular summer months. Developing a consistent methodology for estimating an 'effective total' population figure based on permanent residents, non-permanent residents, and visitors could help provide greater context to a wide spectrum of variety of indicators.
2. Changes in data collection and categorization for many questions in the 2014 Canmore Census prevent comparisons to previous years of census data. It is recommended that future editions of the Census share consistency of collection and categorization to previous editions so as to allow comparisons between data from different census years.
3. Two of the most important 'length of residence' categories in the municipal census are the < 1 year and > 10 year categories. The < 1 year category is needed to help estimate annual population turnover and migration rates. For 2011 and prior census years, the > 10 year category showed significant trends towards an increasing population of longer term residents in Canmore. In future editions of the census it is recommended that both these categories, and categories compatible with previous census efforts be reinstated.


Population: Age Structure

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
People: We value and support “people” as the corporation’s and community’s strongest asset	# of Children ages 0-14	
	# Adults aged 55+	

The age structure of the permanent population is an important indicator for determining current and future community needs. These include the potential demands on programs and facilities for children and seniors, as well as demands on the health care system.


Observations

Census of Canmore




Source: (Town of Canmore, 2014a)

1. In the 2014 Canmore Census, there was a non-response (unknown or prefer not to answer) from 1,463 people, or 11.2% of the permanent population. This is nearly double the 6.6% unknown in the 2011 census. From 2011 to 2014, there are some slight apparent changes in some of the age brackets, however it is difficult to differentiate actual change vs. apparent change due to question non-responses (Town of Canmore, 2014a).
2. From 1995 to 2014, there has been a substantial shift in the age structure of Canmore's permanent residents. The general trend has been towards an older population. From 2009 to 2014, the number of adults over the age of 55 has increased by 36.5% (Town of Canmore, 2014a).




Source: (Town of Canmore, 2014a)

3. The number of children in the community has been following a very different trend than that of older adults. The number of children aged 0-14 peaked in 2003 at 2,042, then dropped by 289 individuals, or 14.2% through to 2008. By 2008 there were actually fewer children living in Canmore than there were in 1995. From 2009 to 2014, the number of children aged 0-14 increased by 56 or 3.1%. In 2014, there are only 59 more children in Canmore than there were in 1995, when the permanent population was much smaller.
4. Relative to the total population of permanent residents, the proportion of children age 14 and younger has decreased from 23.3% in 1995 to 15.0% in 2014 (Town of Canmore, 2014a). The cohort of youth age 15-19 is not included in this discussion as some of these will be teenagers still living at home with their parents, while others will be those who have migrated to Canmore for work or recreation.
5. Over the past 20 years there has been a significant demographic shift in the community. There has been very little real change in the total number of children aged 0-14, and only slight increases in the total number of people aged 15-44 years old. The population cohorts with the greatest growth have been in the 45+ age brackets. In particular, the 55-64 year old cohort, which has nearly tripled in size (Town of Canmore, 2014a).



Source: (Town of Canmore, 2014a)


- The 2014 Canmore Municipal Census also asked non-permanent resident about their age, however the non-response rate was even higher than that of the permanent population with 26.7% as 'Prefer Not to Answer' or 'Unknown'. Based on the available responses the two largest population cohorts were 55-65 (17.2%) and 45-54 (13.9%) (Town of Canmore, 2014a). Due to the high non-response rate this data should be treated with caution.




Source: (Town of Canmore, 2014a)

Census of Canada


1. The Census of Canada provides a snapshot of the population every five years (for Canmore this includes the permanent population only, non-permanent residents are not included). Over the past 20 years, from 1996 to 2016 the age structure of Canmore's population has shown a marked change. As a proportion of the total population, the older age cohorts of 55-64 and 65-74 have all shown growth, particularly since 2006. From 2011 to 2016 the number of people aged 55+ has grown from 2,980 to 4,075, an increase of 36.7%.



2. Conversely, the youngest age groups from 0-4 and 5-14 have declined as a proportion of the total population. The net result is that there are only slightly more 0-14 year olds in 2016 (2,050) when compared to 2006 (1,920). From 2011 to 2016 the number of people 14 or younger grew from 1,850 to 2,050, an increase of 10.8% (but declined slightly as a % of the total population).



- Also of note is the relative decline in the proportion of 25-44 year olds. While this population group hasn't actually decreased in size, it has declined substantially as a proportion of the population. It is worth noting that this age bracket is also the group which would primarily be the parents of younger children and youth showing the demographic change affecting family units (Statistics Canada, 2017a).



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017a)


Interpretation

- Canmore's permanent population continues to shift towards a slightly older demographic. The most rapid growth in recent years has been in the 45-54, and 55-64 year old age brackets. The number of children aged 0-14 decreased from 2003-2008 (during a period of rapid increase in housing prices). A combination of housing affordability and employment opportunities in Canmore, have likely been key

drivers of this demographic shift. Overall, the total population of children is currently similar to what it was in 1995, when Canmore was a much smaller community.

2. As the age structure trends of Canmore's population continue there will be a considerable impact on community services and facilities. If current trends continue there will be an increasing number of older adults and seniors, should they choose to remain in Canmore and 'age in place.' This will have implications for programs and facilities in many sectors such as housing, recreation, and health care.

Mother Tongue, Immigration and Cultural Diversity


Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
People: We value and support “people” as the corporation’s and community’s strongest asset	# of non-native English speakers	

As of the time of this report (September, 2017) Statistics Canada has not yet released the 2016 Census data for immigration and ethnocultural diversity. At this point in time the only census information regarding cultural diversity relates to language (mother tongue and language most frequently spoken at home). This information is important, but is an imperfect proxy for actual immigration and ethnocultural diversity information. As an example, the language information does not specify if a native French speaker is from Quebec or France, or if a native English speaker is from Canada, the USA, the UK or many other possible locations.

Observations

Census of Canada


- Over the past 20 years, the proportion of native English speakers in Canmore has declined from 87.2% in 1996 to 81.1% in 2016. This mirrors a general trend across Alberta and Canada. This is a much higher percentage of native English speakers when compared to Canada as a whole (56.0%) or even Alberta (74.6%).




Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017a)

- During the same 20-year time period native French speakers increased from 2.6% to 5.4%, this is counter to the general trend in Canada where they decreased slightly from 22.9% to 20.6%.

3. For persons with a mother tongue other than an official language (French or English) the three largest groups in 2016 were, by mother tongue: German (335 individuals), Tagalog (Filipino) (280 individuals) and Japanese (175 individuals) (Statistics Canada, 2017a). In 2011, there were 115 Tagalog speakers in Canmore. The increase from 2011 to 2016 likely reflects the increasing number of Filipinos who came to Canmore as temporary workers, but who now have permanent residency or citizenship and have remained in the community (note: updated information on citizenship or permanent residency is not yet available for 2016).








Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017a)



Community Initiatives

Recognizing the challenges faced by newcomers to Canada and the Bow Valley there are several local programs available to provide resources, English language training, and help with community integration. These programs include:

1. Settlement Services in the Bow Valley is a joint program of the Town of Banff, Town of Canmore, the Canadian Rockies Public Schools and Our Lady of the Snows Catholic Academy. The program supports a wide spectrum of Permanent Residents, refugees, Temporary Foreign Workers and others, no matter how long they have been living in Canada. Services include assisting with permanent residency or citizenship applications, volunteering, connecting with community members, language programs, programs to prepare for school in Canada, and more. For more information about Settlement Services and the programs they offer, please visit their website at: <https://www.banff.ca/settlement>.
2. Temporary Foreign Worker Support Services is a program offered in partnership with Calgary Catholic Immigration Services (CCIS) and the Town of Banff. Services include assistance with employment rights and responsibilities, community integration, work permit and permanent residency assistance. Services are available in Banff, Canmore, or other locations in the Bow Valley as needed. Learn more at: <https://www.banff.ca/index.aspx?NID=860>.
3. The Bow Valley Immigration Partnership (BVIP) is a collaborative initiative focused on improving immigrant integration in our local communities. Key priorities in the Partnership's 2015-2018 Integration Strategy include education & language learning, employment, social integration, and civic & political participation (BVIP, 2015). With their partners, BVIP developed The Bow Valley Workplace Inclusion Charter to support the health, success and retention of diverse team members. To learn more about the Partnership and resources available for newcomers, please visit their website at: <http://www.bvipartnership.com/>.
4. The Bow Valley Learning Program is hosted by the Bow Valley Learning Council. This program supports adult learners who need help improving their English skills. This includes native English speakers and English Language Learners. For more information about the program please visit their website at: <http://www.bowvalleylearning.ca/node/16>.
5. Meet the Locals, launched in 2015, (<http://www.meetthelocals.ca/>) is a joint project of the BVIP and Humans of Banff & Canmore (<https://www.facebook.com/humansbowvalley/>). This website is dedicated to celebrating and sharing the stories and diversity of the Bow Valley's residents. The program aims to build a welcoming community and foster increased understanding between locals and newcomers from different backgrounds.
6. Bow Valley WildSmart offers the Nature for Newcomers program that provides second language residents and visitors with wildlife safety information. Education programs are delivered on request and educational materials are available in English, French, Spanish, Tagalog, and Japanese. See the educational brochures at: <http://www.wildsmart.ca/newcomers/>.
7. Alberta Parks provides a wide array of guides, educational materials and regulations in multiple languages through their Nature as a Second Language Program. Learn more at the Alberta Parks




website: <http://www.albertaparks.ca/albertaparksca/about-us/inclusion-accessibility/nature-as-a-second-language/>.

8. As of August 2017 there is one Syrian refugee family that has been resettled in Canmore, and work is currently underway to sponsor a second family. These resettlement are sponsored by Ralph Connor United Memorial Church in conjunction with the Bow Valley Syria Refugee Project. More than 180 community members have collaborated and raised over \$90,000 to help these families find new homes in the Bow Valley. For more information and the latest updates please visit the Bow Valley Syria Project website at: <http://bowvalleysyria.ca/>.

Interpretation

1. Based on the information available so far from the 2016 Census of Canada, Canmore has a higher proportion of native English speakers when compared with the averages for Alberta and Canada. This is not an unusual situation for a smaller community, as the major urban centres are where much of the immigration for new Canadians is concentrated. Based on a comparison of the 2006 and 2016 Censuses there is a declining proportion of native English speakers in Canmore. This in Canmore's population is occurring because of two factors: an increase in the number of native French speakers, and an increase in the number of people whose mother tongue is neither French nor English. This has created enough demand to support a Francophone school in Canmore, and the need for programs for new immigrants as provided by Bow Valley Settlement Services, The Bow Valley Immigration Partnership, or WildSmart's Nature for Newcomers program.

Citizen Satisfaction


Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
People: We value and support “people” as the corporation’s and community’s strongest asset	Quality of Life	
	Perceived Change in Quality of Life	
	Concern About Housing Affordability and Cost of Living	

Observations and Community Initiatives:

1. The 2012, 2014, and 2017 Citizen Satisfaction Surveys were each conducted with a random sample of 300 Canmore residents. The intent of the survey is to gauge residents’ attitudes towards the community and the services available in it. This feedback helps the Town to understand whether its services and programs are meeting the needs and expectations of residents (Ipsos Reid, 2012, 2014 & 2017).

Top of Mind Issues


1. When asked what the most important issues were, respondents in 2012 (24%) and 2014 (38%) and 2017 (42%) all highlighted social issues, primarily the affordability of housing, which was the single most mentioned issue (along with the ‘Availability of housing’ and ‘Cost of living’).
2. In 2017 the second greatest issue of concern was ‘Wildlife management (corridors)’ with 23% of the mentions, followed by ‘Too much growth/development’ with 13% (Ipsos Reid, 2017).



Source: (Ipsos Reid, 2012, 2014 & 2017)

Quality of Life

1. Respondents clearly and consistently ranked the quality of life 'good' to 'very good' in Canmore, with 99% in 2012, 97% in 2014 and 98% in 2017.
2. In 2017, 65% of respondents felt that their perceived quality of life had 'Stayed the same' while 18% felt that it had improved, and 26% reported that it had worsened.
3. In 2014, the most frequent reasons for an improved quality of life was the 'new Elevation Place' (32%) followed by a 'good/stable economy' (19%). 'Improved facilities' (12%) and more 'services/amenities' (12%) also ranked highly. In 2017 the reasons mentioned were more varied, with 'more services/amenities available' (15%), 'more businesses coming in' (8%), 'more housing available' (8%), and 'improved employment/more jobs' (8%).
4. In 2014, the most frequent reasons mentioned for a deteriorated quality of life were "cost of living is too high" (23%) and 'traffic' (21%). In 2017, 'cost of living is too high' (26%) (with an additional 9% of 'housing is not affordable') and 'too much development/growth' (15%) were the top reasons mentioned. 'Traffic' dropped to 5% of mentions in 2017 (Ipsos Reid, 2014 & 2017).



Source: (Ipsos Reid, 2012, 2014 & 2017)

Other Issues

1. The Citizen Satisfaction Survey covers a wide range of issues in the community. Resident's thoughts and feedback on these other issues are included throughout this report in the relevant sections.

Place

“Canmore has a unique sense of place”

-Town of Canmore 2016-2018 Strategic Plan Vision and Goals

Place Indicators - Summary	
Section	Specific Measures/Community Initiatives*
Sense of Community	In 2008, 70% of respondents indicated that Canmore has a strong sense of community. This increased to 80% in 2013 (no updated information is available).
Community Facilities	The construction of Elevation Place, the redevelopment of the old pool as a gymnastics facility, and the redevelopment of the old library as artsPlace represent major initiatives and investments in Canmore’s community facilities.
Arts and Events	-New public art: Utility Box Program -Canada 150: street mural and temporary art -The new artsPlace facility was opened in 2015
Land Use, Development and Planning Standards	-Flood recovery, mitigation, and planning ongoing. -2016 Municipal Development Plan (MDP). -Land Use Bylaw Updates (LUB) underway in 2017. -TSMV planning processes and corridor decisions ongoing. -Peaks of Grassi Land Use Amendment and legal challenge. -Old Daycare Lands redevelopment for affordable housing. -Human Use Management Review (HUMR), Open Space and Trails Plan (OTSP), and Integrated Transportation Plan (ITP) completed.

*This section contains fewer measurable indicators and focuses on community initiatives to meet the goals of the Strategic Plan and the Vision.

Sense of Community

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Place: Canmore has a unique sense of place People: We value and support “people” as the corporation’s and community’s strongest asset	% of residents indicating that Canmore has a ‘strong sense of community’	No update available


Sense of Community:

"A feeling that members have of belonging, a feeling that members matter to one another and to the group, and a shared faith that members' needs will be met through their commitment to be together."
 (McMillan and Chavis, 1986)

The concept of “sense of community” is something that is not captured in a standard population census, demographics statistics, or economic indicators. The Sense of Community Survey collects trending data every five years, reflecting people’s perceptions of various community characteristics. This survey creates a benchmark for future changes in our own sense of community.

Observations

1. A total of 1,445 Canmore citizens participated in the 2013 Sense of Community Survey. The 2008 survey received a total of 1,603 returned questionnaires.
2. The responses to the 2013 Sense of Community Report indicate that 80% agreed that there is a strong sense of community in Canmore (vs. 70% in 2008). 96% of respondents like living in Canmore (vs. 93% in 2008) and 89% feel like they belong in Canmore (vs. 86% in 2008).



Source: 2013 Town of Canmore Sense of Community Survey (HarGroup, 2013)

3. There is some long-standing concern about population turnover and migration rates in the community, however 81% of respondents agreed that “it would take a lot for me to move from Canmore” (vs. 78% in 2008). Only 6% indicated that they had plans to leave Canmore in the next year, and this was primarily due to the cost of living in this community.
4. The responses to community involvement were similar in both the 2008 and 2013 surveys. In 2013, 82% reported that they attend community events and activities (83% in 2008), and 57% reported that they help out by volunteering (59% in 2008).
5. Public amenities such as pathways, parks, the Recreation Centre (and the new Elevation Place) were all identified as key elements contributing to the sense of community.
6. Additional information from the Sense of Community Survey is included throughout this report as it relates to specific indicators (e.g. crime, wildlife and human safety, non-permanent population etc.) (HarGroup, 2008 & HarGroup, 2013).

Interpretation

1. Residents’ perceptions generally suggest that there continues to be a strong sense of community in Canmore from both the permanent and non-permanent population.

Community Facilities

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend
<p>Place: Canmore has a unique sense of place</p> <p>Service: Canmore’s services and programs respond to the aspirations of its residents and visitors and are delivered in an effective, innovative, and fiscally responsible manner</p> <p>People: We value and support “people” as the corporation’s and community’s strongest asset</p>	<p>The construction of Elevation Place, the redevelopment of the old pool as a gymnastics facility, and the conversion of the old library to an arts centre represent major initiatives and long term investments in Canmore’s community facilities. Elevation Place also serves as a key community facility at the gateway to downtown.</p>

Canmore features a wide array of community facilities and recreational opportunities. In addition to very modern indoor recreational facilities, there is an extensive network of trails, pathways, parks, and outdoor green spaces. Canmore is also surrounded by the trails and Provincial parkland of Kananaskis Country and the world class facilities of the Canmore Nordic Centre. The following are key community initiatives undertaken over the past few years:

Observations & Community Initiatives

Elevation Place

1. Elevation Place serves as a hub and gathering place for the community, with recreational, social, and cultural facilities and amenities. This 77,000 square foot facility officially opened in April 2013. It features an aquatics centre, cardio and weight room, art guild gallery, library, climbing wall, child minding, day camps and multi-use community spaces.
2. The popularity of the programs and facilities at Elevation Place has significantly increased recreational program and facility use. Elevation Place has been very busy and well used by residents and visitors. Additionally, the expanded Canmore Library location in Elevation Place has increased use of the facility and circulation of library materials at the new location. More information on the facility, programs, fees, and hours of operation is available at: <http://www.elevationplace.ca/>



Canmore Recreation Centre (CRC)

1. With the construction of Elevation Place, a public engagement process was put in place to gather feedback to help guide the redevelopment of the old swimming pool at the CRC. From the possible options proposed, an expanded gymnastics facility was chosen. In the spring of 2015, the redevelopment of the old pool into a larger gymnastics area was completed, with the old gymnastics space on the 2nd floor of the Recreation Centre converted into a multi-use space.

2. As of 2017 the CRC Lifecycle Maintenance Project is underway with construction planned for 2018/19. The objective of the project is to undertake essential lifecycle maintenance and improvements on the building (which was originally constructed in 1983). More information is available at: <https://canmore.ca/recreation-facility/canmore-recreation-centre/lifecycle-maintenance-project>.

artsPlace – Canmore Community Arts Centre

1. In 2011, the Community Arts Development Task Force began investigating the options for an Arts Development Centre. The Task Force engaged the local arts stakeholders and the broader community and recommended that the former library building (the library was relocated to an expanded location at Elevation Place) be dedicated to this purpose. The new artsPlace was opened in 2015. The facility is governed by the Canadian Mountain Arts Foundation (CMAF) and features studio space for visual arts, performance, ceramics, fabrication, and a hub/gallery for displays and gatherings. For more information on the facility and the programs offered please visit: <http://artsplacecanmore.com/>



Arts & Events

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend
<p>Place: Canmore has a unique sense of place</p> <p>Service: Canmore’s services and programs respond to the aspirations of its residents and visitors and are delivered in an effective, innovative, and fiscally responsible manner</p>	<p>-New public art: Utility Box Program</p> <p>-The new artsPlace facility was opened in 2015-</p> <p>-Canada 150: street mural and temporary art</p>

Canmore is home to an active and thriving arts & culture community. With a wealth of local talent and support from the Town and local community, Canmore’s investment into public art, facilities, and cultural initiatives continues to express a unique sense of place and community. The latest information on arts & culture is available from the Arts & Culture Department of the Town of Canmore on their blog at:

<http://artsandculturetoc.wordpress.com/>

Observations & Community Initiatives

1. The Town of Canmore is a long-time supporter of public art in the community. Touchstone was installed in 2012 at the front entrance to the newly opened Elevation Place. This is a 30’ sculpture of stone, bronze, and stainless steel. A unique feature of the sculpture is the cast bronze impressions of historical artifacts supplied by local residents. For more information about the Public Art Program (and a map of locations) please visit the Town of Canmore’s website at: <https://canmore.ca/residents/public-art>
2. Elevation Place provides a new home and space for the Canmore Art Guild Gallery. Visit their website for more information (<http://www.canmoreartguild.com/>). Elevation Place is also home to the Three Sisters Gallery which is curated by the Community Public Art Committee.
3. The new artsPlace was opened in the former public library building, in September 2015. The facility is governed by the Canadian Mountain Arts Foundation (CMAF) and feature studio space for visual arts, performance, ceramics, fabrication, and a hub/gallery for displays and gatherings. The artsPlace website contains information about the new facility and arts and cultural events and directories for the community. For more information please visit: <http://artsplacecanmore.com/>
4. The Canmore Utility Box Art Program debuted in 2014. In partnership with Fortis and local artists, in 2014/15, 22 boxes were decorated with specialized wraps designed by local artists. Historic photographs from the Canmore museum archives were installed on an additional two boxes. The program adds unique style and character to the downtown core and residential areas, mitigates unsightly graffiti, and provides local artists with an opportunity to display their work in the community. For additional information about the art and a map of locations please visit: <https://canmore.ca/documents/arts-events/1583-utility-box-project-online>



5. In 2017 the communities of the Bow Valley participated in the Canada 150 mural project to celebrate the relationships between the people and communities of the Bow Valley. These relationships include indigenous peoples, multi-cultural communities, intergenerational groups, newcomers, and all who reside here. To learn more about the mural project please visit the Town of Canmore's website at: <https://canmore.ca/residents/public-art/celebrate-canada-s-150th>.



Canada 150 Road Mural Project by Lucie Bause (Source: Town of Canmore)

Land Use, Development and Planning Standards

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend
<p>Place: Canmore has a unique sense of place</p> <p>Service: Canmore’s services and programs respond to the aspirations of its residents and visitors and are delivered in an effective, innovative, and fiscally responsible manner</p> <p>Safety: Canmore is a safe community</p> <p>Economy: Canmore has a diverse economy that is resilient to change</p> <p>Affordability: Canmore is a viable community for people of diverse socioeconomic backgrounds</p> <p>Environment: Canmore is a municipal leader in environmental stewardship</p> <p>People: We value and support “people” as the corporation’s and community’s strongest asset</p>	<p>-Flood recovery, mitigation, and planning ongoing.</p> <p>-2016 Municipal Development Plan (MDP).</p> <p>-Land Use Bylaw Updates (LUB) underway in 2017.</p> <p>-TSMV planning processes and corridor decisions ongoing.</p> <p>-Peaks of Grassi Land Use Amendment and legal challenge.</p> <p>-Old Daycare Lands redevelopment for affordable housing.</p> <p>-Human Use Management Review (HUMR), Open Space and Trails Plan (OTSP), and Integrated Transportation Plan (ITP) completed</p>

Observations & Community Initiatives

This section does not contain specific indicators or measures, rather it presents a summary of major updates, decisions, processes and programs affecting land use and development in Canmore. Due to the complexity of these items, only brief summaries are presented. Interested readers are encouraged to view the original documents and plans for a fuller understanding.

Municipal Development Plan (MDP)

1. The Town of Canmore adopted a new Municipal Development Plan (MDP) in 2016 (Town of Canmore, 2016e), replacing the previous 1998 MDP (Town of Canmore, 1998). The MDP is the Town’s principal long-range planning document regarding the overall policy direction of land use planning and the management of growth. All planning documents such as the Land Use Bylaw (LUB) and Area Structure Plans (ASP) are aligned within the framework of the MDP which serves as the key framework guiding these plans and bylaws. This document is a statutory document for the community and is available online at: <https://canmore.ca/documents/municipal-development-plan/1022-canmore-municipal-development-plan-2016>



- The 2016 MDP builds on many years of community engagement and feedback, including the 2006 Mining the Future (MTF) and the subsequent 2010 Signposts to Sustainability (S2S) (Town of Canmore, 2006; Town of Canmore, 2010c). The key elements of the MDP are based on these vision and values expressed by the community through the MTF and S2S, including the Vision and Foundational Values. These are further expanded on in the guiding principles and strategies which are organized into five categories as per the MTF Vision: Social Fabric, Identity, Environmental Stewardship, Economic Sustainability, and Civic Engagement and Leadership.




Vision (MDP 2016)

Canmore is a resilient and vibrant community socially, economically, and environmentally. Its strength is in its resourceful and engaged citizens, who thrive together on the strength of the community's heritage, long-term commitment to the diversity of its people, and health of the mountain landscape.

(Source: Town of Canmore, 2016e)

Foundational Values (MDP 2016)



(Source: Town of Canmore, 2016e)

- Within the framework of the community Vision and Foundational Values, the MDP sets out a number of key land use and planning concepts which guide future community development. One of the overarching concepts is that of the Growth Boundary, which is defined and delineated in the 2016 MDP. New residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional development is limited to areas within the Growth Boundary. Any proposed development within the Growth Boundary are subject to the policies within the MDP, statutory plans, and any other required approvals. Changes or expansions to the Growth Boundary may be considered if there is a net community benefit and the proposed development does not result in unacceptable environmental impacts.
- Within the Growth Boundary, the MDP identifies the long-term, conceptual pattern of land use (residential, conservation, industrial, etc.) in Canmore, with the understanding that detailed land uses and exact boundaries will be determined through the Land Use Bylaw, ASP, or redevelopment plan.
- The exact delineation of the 'Area To Be Determined' (a portion of the Three Sisters lands) is under consideration and is expected to be finalized after the identification of the wildlife corridors (a

decision from Alberta Environment and Parks is pending) and an Area Structure Plan Process (ASP) (Town of Canmore, 2016e).

6. The MDP also identifies hazard lands and development constraints including steep creeks and flood risk areas, steep slopes, well head protection, high groundwater, wildfire, undermining, etc. Overarching direction on these is provided by the MDP, with specific regulations and detailed planning requirements addressed in individual plans and the LUB.

Land Use Bylaw (LUB)

1. The MDP sets the overarching long-term direction for planning and development in the town, while the Land Use Bylaw (LUB) provided more detailed regulations and site specific guidelines. As such, the LUB needs to align with the direction given by the MDP and provide clear direction and process for development planning. Currently, a number of changes are proposed to the LUB including green building standards, suites, and a number of administrative changes. A draft bylaw received first reading by Council on August 22, 2017 and a second reading is scheduled for October 3, 2017. Updates for the Employee Housing Strategy are currently under further review and are not included in the current round of proposed updates. A backgrounder on the LUB updates is available on the Town of Canmore website: <https://canmore.ca/town-hall/bylaws-policy/land-use-bylaw-updates>.

Three Sisters Lands (Three Sisters Mountain Village – TSMV)

1. In 1992, the Natural Resources Conservation Board (NRCB) issued a decision for the future development of the Three Sisters lands in Canmore (www.nrcb.ca). In the intervening years there have been subsequent ASP approvals and construction has occurred on portions of the lands (primarily residential and golf course). A history of the planning process for the Three Sisters Lands is available on the Town of Canmore website: <https://canmore.ca/residents/residents-development-planning/public-engagement-information/planning-for-three-sisters-lands>.
2. The remaining portions of TSMV are the largest undeveloped parcels of land remaining in the Canmore. In 2009, following the global economic crisis of 2008, Three Sister's Mountain Village (TSMV) went into receivership. Under the stewardship of the receiver (PriceWaterHouseCoopers – PWC) an Area Structure Plan (ASP) was brought to Council in 2013. The ASP was withdrawn prior to the public hearing and 1st reading.
3. The property was then purchased in September 2013 and future planning for the property was restarted under the new ownership group. In 2015, the Town of Canmore, TSMV, and Quantum Place Developments embarked on a collaborative planning process for the Smith Creek Lands (Sites 7, 8 & 9). Background materials and a timeline of the process is available from: <http://www.tsmv.ca/planning/smith-creek/about/>. A primary component of the planning process was the formation of a Community Advisory Group (CAG) (initiated in July 2015) focused on a collaborative planning process for these lands.
4. The Smith Creek ASP was submitted to the Town of Canmore in March 2017, however the proposal has not yet (as of September 2017) been brought before Council for consideration. The ASP process is delayed as a decision about the alignment of the wildlife corridor is currently under review by the Government of Alberta. A final decision on the corridor is expected, possibly in the fall of 2017. It is expected that this planning process, if the outcomes are approved, will finalize the wildlife corridor layout in TSMV and thereby complete the network of corridors in this portion of the Bow Valley. As this planning and approval process is currently underway, there are no outcomes or final land use

decisions available at this time. Current updates on the status of the Smith Creek process are available from the Town of Canmore website at: <https://canmore.ca/residents/residents-development-planning/public-engagement-information/three-sisters-smith-creek>.

5. In addition to the Smith Creek Planning Process, TSMV also proposed an amendment to the Resort Area Structure Plan. TSMV proposed to remove the approved (and partially constructed) 110ha golf course development and instead create additional residential, commercial and resort development. In May 2017 a motion for first reading of this ASP amendment was defeated by Council.

Silvertip

1. Silvertip has expressed an interest in amending the current approved ASP to include a casino and a gondola. The proposed gondola would cross Bow Valley Wildland Provincial Park and terminate at the 'old tea house' on Mount Lady MacDonal. In addition to the Town of Canmore, the development would require additional approvals from the Province of Alberta and the MD of Bighorn. As of September 2017 an ASP amendment application has not been submitted to the Town of Canmore for consideration. Details of the existing ASP and project background are available from the Town of Canmore website: <https://canmore.ca/residents/residents-development-planning/public-engagement-information/silvertip-asp-amendment>.

Peaks of Grassi Land Use Amendment Application

1. In 2014, the Town of Canmore received an application to rezone three parcels of Urban Reserve (UR) land in the Peaks of Grassi subdivision. The application was defeated unanimously at second reading by Council in February 2015. A new application, involving up to 40 units of affordable housing was approved in 2016. The decision was subsequently challenged in court and has become the subject of a judicial review (as of September 2017 review is ongoing).



Old Daycare Lands

1. In 2015 Council passed a motion to approve the disposition of up to 50% of the municipal reserve lands at the former site of the Canmore Daycare for the purpose of developing Perpetually Affordable Housing (PAH). The lands at the corner of 17th Street and 11th Avenue were rezoned in 2016, permitting the construction of residential properties.
2. The decision and bylaw update are available from the Town of Canmore website at: <https://canmore.ca/residents/livable-canmore/quality-housing-in-great-neighbourhoods-for-all/old-daycare-lands>.



3. Details of the planned PAH development are available from the Canmore Community Housing Corporation (CCHC): <http://canmorehousing.ca/17th-street-11th-avenue-affordable-ownership-development>.

Flood Recovery and Mitigation – Steep Creeks

1. In June 2013, Canmore was hit by the most devastating floods in its history. The floods caused significant infrastructure and property damage, from which the community is still recovering. Numerous repairs were required to roads, the railway, homes, businesses and other structures. To reduce the risk of future flood impacts a major rebuild and hazard mitigation project was undertaken at Cougar Creek. For more information about the flooding, steep creek hazards, and mitigation plans and land use changes please see the section on page 84)




Open Space and Trails Plan (OSTP)

1. The OSTP is focused on working towards a well-connected trails and open space network. Additional input was gathered via the HUMR and ITP (see both below) engagement processes. The OSTP was approved by Council for planning purposes in June 2015. For more information please visit: <https://canmore.ca/documents/planning-building.../287-open-space-trails-plan> (Town of Canmore, 2015c).



Integrated Transportation Plan (ITP)








1. The ITP encompasses the entire transportation network, including the walking and cycling network for active transportation. The Plan also considers infrastructure, parking, and local transit. Town Council accepted the ITP for planning purposes in January 2015 (Town of Canmore and HDR Corporation, 2014). The full plan is available at: <https://canmore.ca/permits-forms-menu-item/engineering-permits/446-2014canmoreintegratedtransportationplanfinal/file>.





Service

“Canmore’s services and programs respond to the aspirations of its residents and visitors and are delivered in an effective, innovative, and fiscally responsible manner.”

-Town of Canmore 2016-2018 Strategic Plan Vision and Goals

Service Indicators – 5 Year Trend Summary			
Section	Specific Measures/Community Initiatives	Trend 2011-2016	Comments
1. Volunteer Organizations	# of Volunteer Organizations		# of volunteer organizations remains stable
	# of Registered Charities		# of registered charities remains stable
2. Library Facilities And Use	Circulation		Overall, from 2011 to 2016, library circulation increased by 14.8%. In 2015 circulation was more than 50% greater than the provincial average for Alberta’s libraries.
3. Recreational Program and Facility Use	Facility Use and Recreation Program Participation		Elevation Place and the redevelopment of the old pool represent major initiatives and investments in recreation. Program participation statistics for 2016 show an overall increase in facility usage.
4. Responses to Food Need	Food Bank Hampers		Hamper distribution declined from 2011/12 through 2014/15, then demand increased through 2015/16 and 2016/17.
5. Education of Children and Youth	Student Enrolment (all schools)		Total enrollment in Canmore’s 3 school systems is up by 9.1% overall from 2011/12 through to 2016/17. Note: there was a 2.1% decrease from 2015/16 to 2016/17.
7. Health Services	Emergency Room Visits		The opening of an Urgent Care facility in Cochrane has resulted in fewer drop-in patients to the Canmore Hospital. Visits to the ER showed a gradual annual decrease from 2011/12 through to 2015/16, with an increase in 2016/17, with visits down 3.2% overall during the 5-year period.


Volunteer Organizations

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Service: Canmore’s services and programs respond to the aspirations of its residents and visitors and are delivered in an effective, innovative, and fiscally responsible manner.	# of Volunteer Organizations	
People: We value and support “people” as the corporation’s and community’s strongest asset	# of Registered Charities	

Volunteer organizations are a measure of the level of community activity and community spirit. These organizations enhance Canmore's quality of life by providing a wide variety of services including recreational and cultural opportunities, religious options, support for those in need, or by protecting the environment.

Observations

1. The Bow Valley Community Resource Directory is the most complete listing available of the wide spectrum community and volunteer organizations. Additional lists of charitable organizations are available from the Canada Revenue Agency. There are also a number of informal groups and individual volunteer efforts that are not captured in official lists. As of 2017,




there are at least 140+ Canmore based charities, non-profit and volunteer driven organizations. This number fluctuates slightly on an annual basis, however there has been no significant increase or decrease over the past 5+ years. There are also a number of organizations which are headquartered in Banff and/or the MD of Bighorn which are active throughout the Bow Valley and provide services and opportunities to Canmore residents. These organizations were not included in the count as they are not based in Canmore itself (Town of Canmore and Town of Banff, 2017a; Canada Revenue Agency, 2017).

2. While most of these organizations have a local focus, there are 15+ which have a provincial, national, or even a global focus, but are headquartered here in Canmore. This helps to highlight the importance of the non-profit and charitable sector as a source of employment and economic development in the community (Town of Canmore and Town of Banff, 2017a; Canada Revenue Agency, 2017).

3. In 2015 a survey was sent out to 88 non-profits and community groups in the Bow Valley (Status Report 2015: A Snapshot of BV Non-profits & Community Groups). The response rate was 45% and 79% of respondents indicated that the current condition of their organization was good/very good, 18% fair, and 3% poor. Of these respondents 25% were Canmore organizations, and 35% were Bow Valley wide. Key results included the identification of financial resources as a limiting factor for hiring or creating strong volunteer programs, burnout and/or lack of time as an issue for staff and volunteers, and the reliance on fundraising, donations, and the volatility of government grants (Town of Canmore and Town of Banff, 2015)
4. In survey of 350 Bow Valley residents, 83% responded that they had volunteered in the community in the last year, while 44% responded that their income level negatively affected their ability to volunteer. Many volunteers felt that their time to volunteer is limited due to work schedules (long hours, lack of flexibility, or having more than one job) and that this limits them from being able to get out and feel a sense of community involvement (Banff-Canmore Community Foundation, 2017).
5. While efforts have been made to do so, quantifying the total number of volunteers in the community and their volunteer hours is a nearly impossible task as many organizations do not intensively track this information. Additional information about the state of volunteer organizations in Canada is available from reports by Statistics Canada (<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/11-008-x/2012001/article/11638-eng.htm>) or Volunteer Canada (<https://volunteer.ca/content/bridging-gap-report>). While not specific to Canmore, these reports provide valuable insights into the level of volunteerism in Canada and the challenges faced by the sector.

6. A comprehensive listing of locally based charities is available from the Canada Revenue Agency. As of January 2017, there were 55 registered charities in Canmore (up from 47 in 2012). This is equivalent to 3.9 charities per 1,000 permanent residents. There was an average of 2.2 charities per 1,000 residents in Alberta and 2.5 per 1,000 in Canada (Canada Revenue Agency, 2017).



Community Initiatives

1. There is a “Not for Profit” organizations information sharing network in the Town of Canmore’s Family and Community Support Services (FCSS) Resource Centre. Additionally, FCSS also helps recruit and refer volunteers to volunteer opportunities and provides training on volunteer management.
2. The 140+ community organizations provide a wide array of services and benefits to the community. Their area of services spans the full gamut from youth, seniors, religious organizations, education,

environment, sports, arts, etc. A full listing of all the initiatives of these organizations is not available and would be extremely challenging to compile.


Interpretation

1. Although Canmore is a relatively small community, it continues to be home to a wide range of volunteer and non-profit organizations that provide services and opportunities to many individuals and groups in the community. It is also quite significant that there are so many organizations headquartered in Canmore which work primarily on the provincial, national, or global level. These organizations could be based in almost any community, but have chosen to make Canmore their home.

Recommendation


1. The 2016 Recreation Master Plan (Town of Canmore, 2016a) proposes the development and implementation of a Volunteer Strategy and recording the number of volunteer hours contributed by residents on an annual basis. Recording volunteer hours has been attempted in past years via the Community Resource Directory with variable success. If possible, recording volunteer hours and contributions would lead to a greater understanding of the depth of volunteerism in the community.

Library Facilities and Use

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Service: Canmore’s services and programs respond to the aspirations of its residents and visitors and are delivered in an effective, innovative, and fiscally responsible manner.	Circulation	

The Canmore Public Library is an important community resource that provides access to materials, educational programming, and events. In April 2013, the library moved into a larger space at the newly constructed Elevation Place. For more information about the library, its mission and history, please visit: <http://www.canmorelibrary.ab.ca/>


Observations



Source: (Canmore Public Library Board, 2017)

1. In previous editions of this report Canmore Library membership has been tracked as an indicator. However this measure is not always current and accurate. Occasional database purges remove inactive cardholders from the system, this affects the year-to-year comparability of membership numbers. In 2016 there were 4,531 active cardholders.
2. The annual circulation of library materials has generally been on an upward trend since 2006, with a total circulation of over 205,000 materials in 2016 (a circulation of 14.7 per capita permanent residents). Overall, from 2011 to 2016, circulation increased by 14.8%.

- The Canmore Public Library also participates in an interlibrary loan program with other libraries. Interlibrary loans have been increasing in popularity (both borrowing from and lending to the Canmore library). There were more than 75,000 materials circulated on interlibrary loans in 2016 (Canmore Public Library, 2017).
- In 2015 (the most recent year for which comparison data is available), Canmore’s circulation per capita was over 50% higher than the provincial average for Alberta libraries (Alberta Municipal Affairs, 2016).



Source: (Alberta Municipal Affairs, 2016)

Community Initiatives


- The Canmore Public Library is supported by a dedicated group of volunteers who contributed 430 hours of volunteer assistance to library operations in 2016. The Board of Directors contributed a 250 hours to library governance. The Friends of the Canmore Public Library (a separate group) contributed 842 hours in 2016.
- In addition to offering access to paper and digital materials, the library received over 168,600 in person visits and provided programming to over 11,400 participants in 2016. Programs and events include: movie night, knitting and crafts, language skills, tech help, special events, and the Friends of the Library Speaker Series.
- The Library celebrated its’ 3rd anniversary at the new facility in Elevation Place in 2016. It also created a new ‘Books on the Bus’ program in partnership with Bow Valley Regional Transit, and was the 2016 recipient of the ‘Marigold Making a Difference Award’ for the library’s outreach services to seniors.



Interpretation

- In Canmore, as shown by the high circulation numbers, there is a high level of community interest in the public library. On a per capita basis, Canmore’s library is more active than many other libraries in Alberta. Today’s public libraries are active in many other activities beyond their traditional role as repositories of books. The library’s expanded role in the community includes services such as providing public computer and internet access, interlibrary loan requests, educational programs and general visits. The use of the online library system continues to increase the number of interlibrary loans both to and from the Canmore library.

Recreational Program and Facility Use

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Service: Canmore’s services and programs respond to the aspirations of its residents and visitors and are delivered in an effective, innovative, and fiscally responsible manner.	Facility Use and Recreation Program Participation	

As an active community, recreational programs and facilities are very important to Canmore’s residents. A wide variety of indoor and outdoor recreational activities are enjoyed by a diverse range of residents and visitors. The construction of Elevation Place was a major undertaking and is a significant investment in the community.

Observations

1. The Town of Canmore offers a wide array of recreational programs and facilities. For a full listing please visit the Town of Canmore website: <https://canmore.ca/recreation-facility>. The community is also home to the provincially operated Canmore Nordic Centre which is a world-class facility for cross country skiing and home to numerous summer trails and events: <http://www.albertaparks.ca/canmore-nordic-centre.aspx>.
2. In the 2012 Citizen Satisfaction Survey, 76% of respondents indicated that recreational facilities and programs are very important, this decreased to 68% in the 2014 survey, and 69% in the 2017 survey (Ipsos Reid, 2012; Ipsos Reid, 2014; Ipsos Reid, 2017).
3. In the 2014 Citizen Satisfaction Survey, 17% of the respondents felt that their quality of life had improved in the past 3 years, of these 32% specifically felt this was due to the new Elevation Place. Elevation Place did not get as much notice in the 2017 Citizen Satisfaction Survey, with only 2% mentioning that it was one of the reasons for their improved quality of life (Ipsos Reid, 2014; Ipsos Reid, 2017).
4. In 2016 the Town of Canmore completed a State of Recreation Report and Recreation Master Plan which examined the current status of recreation in the community and developed strategies for future implementation. The Plan used information the State of Recreation Report, mail-out and web surveys, stakeholder interviews, and community events to gather input from residents. The Plan took into account input from over 1,500 households, 47 community groups, 61 individual stakeholders, and 272 students. The importance of recreation was strongly supported in the household survey, 89% of respondents ‘Strongly Agreed’ that ‘Recreation is important to my quality of life’ (Town of Canmore, 2016a; Town of Canmore, 2016b).
5. The 2016 Recreation Master Plan and State of Recreation Report used a prioritization framework to identify key amenities required in the community. The top scoring (ranked 1 or 2) indoor amenities were: walking/running track, indoor multi-purpose field, fitness/wellness facilities, and indoor child playgrounds. The top scoring outdoor amenities were: walking/cycling trail system, nature/interpretive trails and tennis courts (Town of Canmore, 2016a; Town of Canmore, 2016b).
6. In 2015, Council approved the Recreation Services Operating Policy. The Policy lays out the goals and details of the Enterprise Model for recreational services. The primary mission is to promote healthy and active living while operating in an inclusive and sustainable business model. A key component of

the policy is that through user fees and revenues, EP will target a recovery of a minimum of 60% of direct operational costs, while the CRC will target the recovery a minimum of 55% of its annual operating costs (Town of Canmore, 2015a). In 2015 the Town of Canmore achieved cost recovery of 69% at EP and 55% at the CRC (Town of Canmore, 2016a; Town of Canmore, 2016b).

7. In 2015 the Town of Canmore completed Building Condition Assessments for all town facilities (except for the newly constructed Elevation Place). The assessment concluded that many of the existing facilities, including the Canmore Recreation Centre will require significant investment in the coming years to simply maintain current service levels in those facilities (Town of Canmore, 2016a).
8. The Banff-Canmore Community Foundation undertook a survey in 2016 on Sport and Belonging in the Bow Valley. The purpose was ‘to benchmark and find ways to measure our community’s sense of belonging through sport’. Three hundred and fifty people responded to the survey, 78% answered that ‘Sport & Activities’ help them find their sense of belonging. Additionally, sport and activities were identified as the top way to meet people in the Bow Valley. The top three favorite forms of physical activity were: hiking, biking, and skiing/snowboarding/snowshoeing (Banff-Canmore Community Foundation, 2017).
9. The construction of Elevation Place and development of new programming has significantly increased the recreational opportunities available in Canmore. The new facility has been very busy and well used by both residents and visitors. New levels of participation are much higher than, and not really comparable to, pre-Elevation Place program participation statistics. Preliminary program participation levels for 2013 to 2016 are as follows:

Town of Canmore Recreation Programs Participation	2013	2014	2015	2016
Registered Program participation	18,603	17,705	19,718	15,112
Core Class participation	2,875	17,148	17,919	16,236
Member scans	68,439	117,190	113,062	165,000
Drop-in guests	45,883	70,352	74,246	80,055
Public Skaters	-	1,389	4,029	3,853
Usage of other facilities	-	107,331	70,508	97,024
Elevation Place Memberships Long Term (12 month or Monthly Continuous)		2,195	2,185	2,148
Elevation Place Memberships Short Term (Punch cards to 6 Months)		2,169	2,980	4,098
Total	135,800	335,479	304,647	383,526

Source: Town of Canmore, 2017a

Community Initiatives

1. Affordability and financial access to recreation is an issue, to assist Canmore residents, Recreation Fee Assistance is now a part of CSD's Affordable Services Program. Through this program, with one application Canmore residents have access to multiple affordability programs across the community.

2. In 2016 the Town of Canmore launched the Cycling Without Age program for local seniors. Trained volunteers will use 'trishaw bicycles' to take seniors with limited mobility on rides. This provides the seniors with a chance to get outside in the fresh air, connect with the community and make new friendships. Rides are approximately one hour long and can accommodate 1-2 passengers.
3. In 2015 the Town of Canmore signed an MOU with private sector fitness businesses to better clarify the relationship between Elevation Place and the services provided by the private sector. The number of core classes at EP were limited and personal training services at EP were prohibited. As part of this process a program review procedure was developed to evaluate new programming that might be offered by the Town and how it might fit with the existing options offered by local businesses.




Interpretation

1. With the construction of Elevation Place and the redevelopment of the old pool and Recreation Centre, Canmore has made a significant long term investment in the community. When combined with the Canmore Nordic Centre, Recreation Centre, town and regional trail networks, and community parks and green spaces, Canmore has excellent indoor and outdoor facilities to provide a wide range of recreational opportunities for both residents and visitors. Overall use numbers of these facilities and programs shows that they are well used and an important amenity for the community.

Recommendations

1. Continue to track, compile, and refine program and facility use statistics to monitor the use of Town facilities and programs over time. Collection of information on the use of Elevation Place by out of town visitors would help determine its role in attracting and serving tourists.
2. The 2016 Recreation Master Plan contains a wide ranging suite of possible performance measurements. In the future, integrating key measures from the Master Plan into the Canmore Community Monitoring Report could provide a useful metric of the status of recreation in the community.

Responses to Food Need and Food Sustainability

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Service: Canmore’s services and programs respond to the aspirations of its residents and visitors and are delivered in an effective, innovative, and fiscally responsible manner.	Christmas Hampers	
Affordability: Canmore is a viable community for people of diverse socioeconomic backgrounds	Food Bank Hampers	
People: We value and support “people” as the corporation’s and community’s strongest asset	Meals on Wheels	

There are several programs that respond to food need in Canmore including the Christmas and Food Bank Hamper Programs, and the Food for Learning Programs. Food Bank and Christmas Hampers are requested directly by families in need, or by referral from a neighbour or friend. There are many reasons people request hampers including unemployment, underemployment, needs additional to those provided by social assistance, emergency circumstances, and transience. There are several Food for Learning programs at Canmore schools that provide snacks and lunch or breakfast to children whose families are having difficulty providing adequate food for their child. Families in need can self-identify or may be connected to the program by staff aware of the need. Food is also about the sustainability of resources and building and sharing community. Programs such as the new Food Recovery Barn aim to minimize food waste, while others such and the Food and Friends dinner also aim to build community and encourage social integration over a shared meal.


Threshold: The supply of food and donations meets the demand.

Observations

Christmas Hampers

1. The Bow Valley Christmas Spirit Campaign coordinates the delivery of Christmas hampers (non-perishable food and toys) to families in need. The number of Christmas Hampers distributed has risen sharply over the past few years going from 98 in 2013 to 185 in 2016. During the 5 year period from 2011 to 2016 the total number of hampers distributed increased by 71.2% (Bow Valley Christmas Spirit Campaign, 2017).






Source: (Bow Valley Christmas Spirit Campaign, 2017)

Food Bank


1. The Bow Valley Food Bank provides emergency food assistance to individuals and families experiencing a financial crisis. The Food Bank serves Canmore, Kananaskis, and the Bow Valley communities of the M.D. of Bighorn. In 2016/17, 92% of all hamper recipients were from Canmore. The total number served by the Food Bank has fluctuated somewhat over the years reaching a high of 600 hampers and 892 individuals in 2009/10. By 2014/15 the number of hampers distributed had dropped to 338, and then rose sharply to 557 hampers and 952 individuals in 2016/17. Overall, food bank hamper distribution was 18.8% higher in 2016/17 than in 2011/12, however the trend during this time was highly variable with a steep decline, followed by sharp increase in demand in 2015/16 and 2016/17. In November 2015 the maximum number of allowable hampers per year was raised from 6 to 12. This may result in a change in usage patterns, however Food Bank staff report that in practice, people who needed more than 6 hampers in the past were not turned away even if they had surpassed their limit (Bow Valley Food Bank, 2017).



Source: (Bow Valley Food Bank, 2017)

Meals on Wheels

1. The Meals on Wheels program provides home delivered meals to any person whose physical, mental, emotional or social needs make it difficult for them to obtain or prepare adequate meals. In 2017, the program had 22 individual clients or an average of roughly ~7 meals for clients per day. The



program has dropped from serving 43 clients in 2012 to 22 clients in 2017 (Town of Canmore, 2017b).

Food For Learning Program/Lunch Pilot Program

1. In 2016, the Canadian Rockies Public Schools (one of 14 school boards in Alberta) received a \$250,000 grant to pilot a new school lunch/nutrition program. Each day students at Elizabeth Rummel School receive a mini-meal before recess and a full lunch on Mondays. The provincial government has plans to expand the program in future years (Rocky Mountain Outlook, 2016a).



2. The number of children helped through the Food for Learning Program (since 2001) varies throughout each year and between years. Currently, about 6 children per year are receiving assistance through the program at Elizabeth Rummel Elementary School, with about 13 children helped through the Lawrence Grassi Middle School program. The numbers of children in this program are fairly consistent from year to year (CRPS, 2013).

Community Initiatives


1. The local grocery stores accept donations of food for hampers, while the Canmore Hospital has food hampers and used clothing access on site to help address those needs for patients.
2. There is a weekly "Community Food and Friends Dinner" at St. Michael's Anglican Church Hall. The event provides nutritious food and a sense of community, and is popular with up to 200 participants including many young adults and families (<https://www.stmichaelscanmore.com/>)
3. The Canmore Community Garden (located near the Canmore General Hospital) is a non-profit volunteer driven society with a focus on growing food, sustainability and creating local community. The community garden is wildlife safe with an 8' high wildlife fence (<http://canmorecommunitygardening.org/>).

4. The Canmore Food Recovery Barn opened in 2017 next to the Paintbox Lodge on 10th Street. This new initiative aims to redistribute food that would otherwise be sent to the landfill. There is a \$5 suggested donation for food boxes and the initiative is supported by donated food from Safeway, Save-on-Foods and the Organic Box. To learn more about the new Food Recovery Barn initiative please visit their website at: <https://www.facebook.com/CanmoreFoodRecoveryBarn/>

Interpretation

1. While there are annual fluctuations in demand for services, there are consistently individuals and families in the community who are struggling to meet their basic needs. These programs offering food assistance are a vital resource for those who are struggling to make ends meet. While there is a perception of Canmore as an affluent community, the level of participation in these programs indicates that there is a proportion of the population who are struggling to meet their basic needs. The addition of the Canmore Food Recovery Barn is another important step towards helping to reduce the waste of an important resource – food – redirecting it from landfill and back into the community.

Education of Children and Youth

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
<p>Service: Canmore’s services and programs respond to the aspirations of its residents and visitors and are delivered in an effective, innovative, and fiscally responsible manner.</p> <p>People: We value and support “people” as the corporation’s and community’s strongest asset</p>	Student Enrolment (all schools)	

This section focuses on several formal measures relating to the education of children and youth, including enrolment, education results, and class size. A major component of this section is class size, which is a province-wide indicator that is defined as the number of students in a class with a single teacher². While class size is one commonly used indicator, it does not tell the whole story and does not indicate the quality of teacher in the classroom, the quality of the curriculum, nor the educational outcomes of the students therein.

There are three school boards operating in Canmore: Canadian Rockies Public Schools (CRPS), Christ the Redeemer Catholic Schools, and Conseil Scolaire Catholique Francophone Du Sud de L'Alberta.

Observations


Enrollment

1. Enrollment in Canmore’s schools has ranged from a low of 1,720 in 2002/3 to a high of 1,925 in 2015/16. In general, total student population experienced a period of slow decline from 2003/4 through to 2010/11. Since that time, the number of students has been on a generally upward trend over the past five years, with an overall increase of 9.1% since 2011/12. Note: the number of students decreased slightly (2.1%) from 2015/16 to 2016/17 (CRPS, 2017a; Alberta Education, 2017).
2. From 1999/00 to 2011/12 enrollment in the CRPS’s three Canmore schools was in a gradual decline. There were slight increases in 2013/14 and 2015/16, with a further decline in 2015/16. Overall enrollment is down -1.8% in the 5-year period from 2011/12 to 2016/17, with a total of 1,179 students enrolled during the last school year. This is in part due to the addition of two other schools to the community (Our Lady of the Snows and Notre Dame des Monts), which split the total student population between the additional schools. Overall for its school division, CRPS note that the local cost of living is a factor limiting any significant increase in local enrollment numbers. Additionally, they predict that changes in the Temporary Foreign Worker program will likely have a negative effect on student numbers as fewer workers will qualify to bring their families to the area. While the

² This number does not include teacher assistants, teacher librarians, specialist teachers, or administrators and other educators who have classroom responsibilities. (<http://education.alberta.ca/department/ipr/classsize.aspx>). Additional information on class sizes and proposed guidelines may be found at: <http://education.alberta.ca/department/ipr/archive/commission/report/reality/school/implement.aspx>

Province did provide flood stabilization funding from 2013-2015, this program ended in 2016 resulting in a significant reduction in the operations budget (CRPS, 2017b).

3. Enrollment at Our Lady of the Snows Catholic Academy has shown steady increases in enrollment over the past 15 years, with a 33.1% increase over the past 5 years, from 396 to 527 students (Alberta Education, 2017).
4. École Notre-Dame Des Monts has also been slowly but steadily increasing in size from 131 students in 2011/12 to 179 students in 2016/17 (Alberta Education, 2017).



Source: (CRPS, 2017a; Alberta Education, 2017)

Class Size

1. A detailed listing of class sizes by school and jurisdiction is not provided in this edition of the report, nor is it published by all school jurisdictions. Alberta Education provides a listing of average class sizes by jurisdiction (<https://education.alberta.ca/department/ipr/classize/>).
2. Detailed class sizes by school and grade are available from the Canadian Rockies Public Schools (<http://www.crps.ca/view.php?action=documents&id=79>).

Annual Education Results Reports

1. As part of the Accountability Pillar, Alberta Education conducts census surveys in schools of all teachers, Grades 4, 7 and 10 students and their parents to gather information on the quality of education provided by Alberta school jurisdictions and their schools. Full achievement test and diploma exam results are extremely detailed with many measures and metrics. As such they are not easily summarized, and they are too lengthy to be included in this report, but they are available online from their respective websites:

Canadian Rockies Public Schools

<http://www.crps.ca/view.php?action=documents&id=141>

Our Lady of the Snows Catholic Academy

<http://www.ourladyofthesnows.ca/view.php?action=documents&id=29>

Notre Dame des Monts

http://ndm.franco-sud.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Plan-triennal-2016-2019_Version-finale-NDM.pdf



Community Initiatives

1. Locally, the Bow Valley Early Childhood Development Coalition (BVECDC) is a community partnership which invests in the development of the whole child during the critical years of early development, ages 0 to 6. As of 2017 there are more than 75 Bow Valley members in the Coalition with representation from schools, daycares, day homes, community groups, Alberta Health Services, and others. Programs so far have included the spring and fall 'Early Years' fairs, a monthly children's calendar, and a 'Gearing Up for Kindergarten' program. In 2011 and 2013 Early Development Index (EDI) data was collected for all 3 Bow Valley School Divisions. This information was presented in the ECMAAP community profile report (Alberta Government, 2014). Additional EDI data was collected in 2016 and will be compared to the results of the 2014 report (BVECDC, 2016). For more information and upcoming events visit their Facebook page at: <https://www.facebook.com/Bow-Valley-Early-Childhood-Development-Coalition-1683891658526483/>
2. In the fall of 2012, the Alpenglow Community School began offering a Waldorf-inspired Kindergarten program. In the fall of 2013, they began to offer grades 1 through 4 as an alternative program under the Canadian Rockies Public Schools. The school has since expanded to include grade 5 and 6 (the school is capped at grade 6). For more information visit their website at: <http://www.alpenglowschool.ca>
3. In 2015 CRPS and their partners opened the Canadian Rockies Outdoor Learning Centre (CROLC) at Bow Valley Provincial Park (<http://olc.crps.ca/>). This collaborative Centre provides youth with opportunities for outdoor recreation, leadership and environmental education.

Interpretation

1. There are three operational school boards in Canmore and a Waldorf-inspired Kindergarten to grade 6 program. The presence of multiple options in a small community provides a wide array of high quality educational choices for Canmore families. However, sustaining this number of educational choices for a relatively small population of students is challenging, as funding and resources are limited.
2. There are a wide variety of educational outcome measures available from the schools and from Alberta Education, however, it is challenging to find key metrics that will provide critical insights into the schools. "Success" in an educational concept carries a high degree of individual subjectivity. Those that are interested are encouraged to read the detailed educational outcomes reports listed above, with the understanding that measuring educational success can be a difficult endeavor, and that these measures of success are not always universally agreed upon.

Health Services


Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Service: Canmore’s services and programs respond to the aspirations of its residents and visitors and are delivered in an effective, innovative, and fiscally responsible manner.	Emergency Room Visits	
	# of Physicians	

This section reports on the accessibility and level of use of health services in the community. Alberta Health Services does not calculate population health indicators specific to Canmore due to the relatively small population of the community. Standardized health indicators such as mortality rates, low birth weight babies, injury, disease etc. are not available for this community.

Observations

Emergency Room Visits


1. After rising steadily since 1995/6, there was a sharp drop in Emergency Department visits in 2004/5 with the introduction of a walk-in clinic with evening and weekend availability. The number of emergency room visits had reached a high in 2009/10, and has since dropped slightly each year through 2015/16. There was a slight increase in 2016/17, but overall there were 3.2% fewer emergency room visit in 2016/17 than in 2011/12. In 2011, the Urgent Care facility opened in Cochrane, which has resulted in a reduction in drop-in patients from Cochrane and Morley, as well as fewer ambulance transfers to the Canmore Hospital (Alberta Health Services, 2017a).



Source: (Alberta Health Services, 2017a)

Deliveries



1. The number of babies delivered at the Canmore Hospital has been generally trending upwards due to several factors including: an increase in the number of physicians in Canmore who have obstetrics as part of their practice, and partly due to an increase in the number of patients from Field to Cochrane and some from Calgary



as well. As of 2013, Banff Mineral Springs Hospital ceased to handle deliveries and that service is now centralized at the Canmore Hospital, resulting in more deliveries in 2014 and 2015. From 2015-16 there was a 16.3% decrease in the number of babies delivered in the Canmore Hospital, however not all these babies were born to Canmore residents, and not all Canmore residents give birth in the Canmore Hospital (some will travel to a Calgary hospital for medical or other reasons) (Alberta Health Services, 2017a).

Physicians

1. Note: the following statistics do not differentiate between full and part-time physicians, nor do they necessarily indicate access to or waiting times for family doctors, and do not reflect the numbers of doctors who may provide services in multiple communities. They are intended as a general indicator showing population relative to the number of physicians in the community.
2. The number of physicians (including locums) with privileges at the Canmore Hospital increased from 64 in 2006 to ~85 in 2017 with a core group of 21 family physicians (the numbers fluctuate slightly). In part, this is due to an increase of specialists and/or physicians with temporary or locum privileges and reflects a minimal increase in the number of family physicians (Alberta Health Services, 2017a).
3. Bow Valley Primary Care Network (PCN) consists of ~42 local family doctors in 9 clinics who work with the PCN team to provide health care services to over 26,000 patients (Bow Valley Primary Care Network, 2015).
4. The College of Physicians & Surgeons of Alberta (CPSA) lists 60 doctors that are located in Canmore (CPSA, 2017). This is equivalent to approximately one doctor per 231 residents, compared to an average in Alberta of one doctor to 312 people, or 1:598 in Cochrane or 1:923 in Airdrie. These numbers do not necessarily indicate access to or waiting times for family doctors, and do not reflect the numbers of doctors who may provide services in multiple communities, but are intended as a high level indicator showing population relative to the number of physicians in the community.
5. The number of registered physicians practicing as family doctors is also available from the CPSA. In 2017 there were 46 doctors registered as practicing family medicine (301 residents per family physician). This is much lower than the Alberta average of 837 people per family physician (CPSA, 2017).



Source: (CPSA, 2017)

Care Services

1. There are 23 beds available for Continuing Care at the Canmore Hospital. In 2014, there was an average of 16 clients on the wait list for long term care. The wait list dropped to 12 in 2015 and 8 in 2016. These numbers include people in other facilities waiting to transfer to Canmore (Alberta Health Services, 2017a).
2. The number of individuals receiving Home Care Services in Canmore dropped from 250 in 2014 to 200 in 2016 (Alberta Health Services, 2017a).











Interpretation

1. Canmore has access to a wide variety of specialists and family physicians and does not experience the same difficulty as many communities across Alberta in terms of access to medical services. This is partly due to “amenity migration” by physicians and specialists who have become permanent or non-permanent residents of Canmore. This has allowed the community increased access to specialist services close to home (cardiology, internal medicine, dermatology, vascular surgery, gynaecology, etc.).

Safety







“Canmore is a safe community”

-Town of Canmore 2016-2018 Strategic Plan Vision and Goals

Safety Indicators – 5 Year Trend Summary			
Section	Specific Measures/Community Initiatives	Trend 2011-2016	Comments
Community Safety	Property Crimes		The rate of property crimes showed some annual variability from 2011 to 2016, but overall the rate decreased by 14.8%.
	Violent Crimes		Overall, the violent crime rate dropped 26.8% from 2011 to 2016.
	Total Offenses		The rate of total offenses fluctuated slightly during the years from 2011 to 2016, with a slight overall increase of 2.2%.
	Violent Crime Severity Index		The violent crime severity index declined from 59.5 in 2011 to 22.6 in 2016.
	Crime Severity Index		The overall crime severity index declined from 66.6 in 2011 to 55.0 in 2016.
Domestic Abuse	BVVA Domestic Abuse Caseload		BVVA Domestic Abuse Caseload has increased by 28.4% from 2011/12 to 2016/17 (number of people assisted).
	Spousal Abuse (RCMP flagged)		From 2012 to 2016 the number of Spousal Abuse incidents flagged by the RCMP have doubled. Note: much of the increase relates to visitors and not necessarily the local permanent residents.
Sexual Violence	BVVA Sexual Assault Caseload		Note: due to the low rate of reporting sexual assaults it is difficult to draw conclusions from the local community numbers. While there is some slight variability on an annual basis, police reported numbers are generally less than 10 assaults per year.
	Police Reported Sexual Assault		
Wildland/Urban Interface-FireSmart	FireSmart Mitigation		Fuel modification and FireSmart efforts continue with an annual program to reduce the hazard in the wildland/urban interface.

Flood and Steep Creek Hazards	Flood and Steep Creek Hazard Mitigations		<p>Following the flood of 2013 the Town of Canmore initiated an extensive program of steep creek hazard assessment and mitigation. A proposed flood and debris retention structure on Cougar Creek is currently undergoing the approvals process.</p>
-------------------------------	--	---	---

Community Safety

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend			
Safety: Canmore is a safe community	Property Crimes (Rate)		Violent Crime Severity Index	
	Violent Crimes (Rate)			
	Total Offences (Rate)		Crime Severity Index	

Safety and security are important parts of the social fabric of the community. Violent crimes and property crimes are of particular concern since these can have the most direct and traumatic impact on the victims and the community. It is important to note that these statistics reflect reported criminal code offences. The actual number of crimes is likely higher, and reporting rates can vary by the type and severity of crime.

Threshold



The average crime rate and crime severity index for Alberta.

Observations

Crimes and Crime Rate

1. Typically, crime rates are reported per 100,000 population. Due to the small population of Canmore, these rates have been recalculated on a per 1,000 person basis, for permanent residents only. The effective population of the town would be much larger if non-permanent residents and visitors were factored in. Therefore, the crime rate is a relative over-estimate when compared to many communities which have a higher proportion of permanent residents and fewer visitors. There is currently no mechanism to determine if offences are being committed by residents of the community or non-residents. Several approaches to estimating the 'total effective population' (including visitors and non-permanent residents) of Canmore have recently been developed (e.g. the Municipal Benchmarking program), however current and consistent data for the non-permanent and visitor population is not available for the 1998-2016 period so these population estimates have not been used to calculate crime rates.
2. The crime rate is based on the volume of reported offenses, and as such, the reporting frequency of relatively less serious offenses can significantly impact the crime rate. For example, in Canada about 40% of all reported crime is from thefts under \$5,000 and mischief (Statistics Canada, 2012).
3. The graphs in this section each use different scales on the y-axis to better show the detail and variation of each category. This is due to the large difference in volume between violent crimes and property crimes.


- After spiking in 2003/4, the number and rate of total criminal code violations (excluding traffic) declined rapidly through to 2009. From 2009 onwards the total number of violations has fluctuated slightly, but remained relatively constant. From 2011 to 2016, the rate jumped in 2015, dropped again in 2016, and ended the 5-year period with an overall increase of 2.2%. Since 2007, the rate of criminal code violations has been at or below the Alberta average, and above the Canadian average (Statistics Canada, 2017a,b).



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017a,b)


- Violent crimes in Canmore spiked sharply in 2004, with an unusual number of assaults reported. There was also a homicide in 2004, fortunately a very rare occurrence in Canmore. From 2005 to 2014, violent offenses dropped off sharply, followed by a 39.6% increase in 2015 (44 actual offenses). This upward spike did not continue as a new trend and the rate of violent crimes dropped 31.7% in 2016. There is no indication that this spike in 2015 was related to any community-wide issue relating to

violent crime. Seventeen of the 44 offenses related to 'Uttering threats' while the remainder appear mostly to be small random fluctuations in the data. Overall, the violent crime rate in 2016 was 26.8% lower than in 2011. Since 2005, the rate of violent crime has been below the Alberta average, and at or below the Canadian average (Statistics Canada, 2017a,b).



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017a,b)


- The rate of property crimes peaked in 2003 to 2005, this was largely associated with an increase in the number of reported breaking and entering offenses. The rate then declined sharply through to 2014, with a 23.6% increase in 2015 (111 actual offenses), then dropping again in 2016. The 2015 increase in property crimes relates in part to some break and enters and some theft under \$5,000, but 46 of these 111 offenses were reported as 'mischief'. Overall, the rate of property crimes was 3.2% lower in 2016 than in 2011. Over the past five-year period, the rate of property crimes has dropped by 27.2%. Since 2007, the rate of property crime in Canmore has been below the provincial average (Statistics Canada, 2017a,b).



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017a,b)


Crime Severity Index

1. Traditionally, the 'crime rate' measures the volume of crime being reported to the police, divided by the size of the population. Statistics Canada has now developed a 'Crime Severity Index' which is a composite measure, accounting for the volume of crime and also the relative seriousness of the crimes. This is a new way of looking at crime statistics and is designed to address some of the limitations of the traditional crime rate measures (Statistics Canada, 2012). For example, under this ranking system, the 'seriousness' of a homicide is ranked 1,000 times greater than that the possession of cannabis. More information on the Crime Severity Index is available from Statistics Canada: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-004-x/2009001/part-partie1-eng.htm>




Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017d,e)

2. Most years, the Crime Severity Index (CSI) for Canmore is lower than the CSI for Alberta and Canada. The exception to this was in 2003 when there were an unusual number of breaking and entering offenses, and in 2004 when there were a higher number of violent offenses, including a single murder. (Statistics Canada, 2017d,e).



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017a,b)

3. Similarly, the Violent Crime Severity Index for Canmore is generally well below the provincial average, with the exception of 2004. In this year there were an unusually high number of assaults reported, along with a murder, attempted murder, and aggravated sexual assault. Fortunately, all other years in the study period show a significantly lower Severity Index for Violent Crimes (Statistics Canada, 2017d,e).
4. For 2016 Canmore was identified as the RCMP Municipal Detachment with the lowest violent crime severity index (22.6) in Alberta (RCMP, 2017).



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017d,e)

5. The non-violent CSI for Canmore is typically below the index value for Alberta, and is generally similar to the overall non-violent CSI for Canada as a whole. The primary exception is 2003 when there was a brief increase in the number of break and enter offenses (Statistics Canada, 2017d,e).

Citizen Satisfaction Survey

1. The 2017 Citizen Satisfaction Survey indicated that more than 99% of respondents consider Canmore to be a safe community (99% in 2012 and 98% in 2014). In 2017 only 0.3% of respondents thought that Canmore is not safe. The biggest safety concern was theft/burglary (32% in 2012, 28% in 2014 and 38% in 2017) (Ipsos Reid, 2012, 2014 & 2017).
2. In 2014, 88% reported that they were satisfied with the Police Services provided by the RCMP, this increased to 91% in 2017.



Community Initiatives

1. As part of the Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative (ABMI, begun in 2012), Canmore and the local RCMP detachment have participated along with other Alberta municipalities in the development of a benchmarking approach to community policing services. The initiative examines comparative statistics of efficiency and effectiveness with regards to policing costs, crime rates, crime severity, clearance rates, workload, etc. within the context of an estimated total population (residents plus visitors). The initiative is ongoing and undergoing refinement. The draft report notes that there are some data gaps including time spent on 'preventative policing' and some gaps created by lack of consistency in data reporting (Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative, 2017a)

Interpretation

1. Canmore is generally a very safe community, with low levels of serious offenses and violent crime. Overall, the rate and severity of offenses have generally been declining for the past decade. This is a positive trend for the community, especially when increased population (both permanent and non-permanent residents), more tourists and visitors, and continually increasing highway traffic through the Bow Corridor are considered. The crime statistics presented here are on an annual basis and do not give an indication of the seasonality, timing or geographic pattern of offences. The RCMP and emergency services typically expect greater call volumes on the weekends when the community is busiest.


Domestic Abuse

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Safety: Canmore is a safe community	BVVSA Domestic Abuse Caseload	
	Spousal Abuse (RCMP flagged)	

Domestic and family violence includes a broad spectrum of abuse, maltreatment, and violence in the home and between family members, children, seniors, and intimate partners. Overall the societal rate of reporting to police is very low (as with sexual assault reporting rates) with less than 30% of victims of spousal violence and less than 7% of victims of childhood abuse reporting the crime to the police (Statistics Canada, 2017f). The reasons for this are many and complex, as the abuse occurs within the context of a domestic, family, economic, or intimate relationship, and many victims are children who are unable to advocate on their own behalf.

Observations

1. This indicator records the number of complaints responded to by the Bow Valley Victim Services Association (BVVSA) about harassment, intimidation, and violence by a spouse or common-law partner, or by an estranged spouse or common-law partner in the area serviced by the Canmore RCMP. Only reports of criminal acts, alleged criminal acts or inquiries if a criminal act has occurred are recorded. Beginning in 2010/11 the Canmore RCMP now refers all reported domestic abuse cases to BVVSA, however, their assistance may be declined by the victim.




Source: (BVVSA, 2017)

2. Since 1995/96, the BVVSA has assisted with an average of 55 individuals per year from the Canmore area who have been affected by domestic abuse. Annually, the total number of people assisted has

increased over time, ranging from 22 in 1996/97 to a high of 91 in 2014/15, dropping slightly to 86 in 2016/17. In the five-year period from 2011 to 2016, the number of people assisted increased by 28.4% overall.

3. The BVVSA provides assistance in a wide range of occurrences from personal and property crimes to traumatic events such as sudden deaths. Of all occurrences responded to by the program, domestic abuse is the most frequent occurrence typically accounting for 30-40% of the all BVVSA files in Canmore (Note: 2013 is an exception, as there were 478 persons assisted by BVVSA after the flood).
4. The rate of domestic abuse caseloads has generally trended upwards over time, ranging from a low of 2.4 per 1,000 permanent residents in 1996/7 to a high of 7.0 in 2013/14, declining slightly to 6.1 in 2016/17. During the last five-year period from 2011/12 to 2016/17 per capita rate of persons assisted increased by 13.0% (BVVSA, 2017). For more information about domestic abuse from the BVVSA please visit their website at: <http://www.bowvalleyvictimservices.org/domestic-abuse>

5. The RCMP flag identified incidents of spousal abuse in their database. These records are then tracked and reported to ensure follow up by a supervisor and incident tracking as domestic violence and spousal abuse are often repeat offenses. The number of incidents flagged by the RCMP in Canmore has more than doubled from 32 in 2012 to 68 in 2016. In a



presentation to Town Council on March 8, 2016, the RCMP noted that the increase in incidents from 2014 to 2015 was primarily related to incidents occurring amongst the transient and/or visitor population and were not primarily related to an increase of spousal abuse amongst the local permanent resident population (Town of Canmore/RCMP, 2017).

Community Initiatives

1. The BVVSA provides support, assistance and information to victims of crime and trauma, including occurrences of domestic abuse. In 2016/17 the program assisted 225 individuals in Canmore alone. Across the Bow Valley, assistance was provided to a total of 623 people in 2016/17. Other services include school programs on relationships and abuse, 24 hour crisis intervention, court assistance, education programs, safety planning, and information on legal services.
2. In 2016 BVVSA developed a questionnaire to be completed by individual who received assistance for crimes or trauma from a Victim Services program. This questionnaire was distributed across Alberta, and the final results will be available in 2018. The final report will help inform BVVSA polices regarding the services they offer.






3. In 2016/17 BVVSA offered 40 educational programs to over 900 individuals in the Bow Valley, examples of some programs include: Prevent Alcohol and Risk Related Trauma in Youth (PARTY) program, presentations on healthy relationships and domestic abuse, community education on suicide, trauma, sexual assault, sudden death, and domestic abuse (BVVSA, 2017).
4. The YWCA Banff and Shoppers Drug Mart organize the annual YWCA Walk a Mile In Her Shoes event. This event has raised awareness, \$78,000 in 2016, and over \$450,000 in the past 8 years for the YWCA's work in preventing intimate partner violence. To learn more about the event please visit: <https://www.bowvalleywalkamile.ca/>
5. The YWCA Banff operates the Bow Valley Women's Emergency Shelter (BVWES), which offers support and safety to women and children in need. In September of 2017, The YWCA and the St. George in the Pines church opened The Bridge House in Banff. This program offers transitional short term housing beyond the Emergency Shelter while women and children in need find an affordable, permanent place to live. In Canmore, the YWCA is working towards developing the Higher Ground Women's Emergency Shelter. For more information on these programs and initiatives please visit the YWCA Banff website at: <http://ywcabanff.ca/>



Interpretation

1. The increasing number and rate of domestic abuse cases may be a reflection of increased levels of domestic violence in the community, or it could be due to increased awareness and utilization of the BVVSA. As the reporting rate of incidents of domestic violence is traditionally low relative to the actual number of incidents, these statistics do not reflect the full extent of domestic abuse within our community. Continued interagency cooperation and public education is important to ensure all those affected by domestic abuse receive the support and assistance they require.
2. Coding and flagging incidents of spousal abuse in the RCMP case files so that they can be tracked separately from other forms of assault is an important step towards a better understanding of the extent of domestic abuse in the community. It is also hoped that continued identification and tracking of these incidents will better enable victims of domestic abuse to receive the help they require. It is important to note that societal rates of reporting are still very low, and the recorded statistics only reflect criminal acts or alleged criminal acts, therefore, other non-criminal forms of domestic abuse such as verbal, psychological, emotional and/or financial abuse may not be reflected in these statistics.

Sexual Violence

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend*	
Safety: Canmore is a safe community	Sexual Assaults (UCR2 Reported)	
*Note: due to the low numbers of reported sexual assaults each year, and the variation shown by different data sources, it is not clear if there is a distinct trend up or down, however there is slight variation on an annual basis (reported incidents).	Sexual Assaults (RCMP Detachment Reported)	
	BVVSA Sexual Assault Caseload	

The full extent of sexual violence and sexual assault in society is difficult to measure since the crime is widely underreported. While estimates differ slightly, most studies suggest that only ~5% of sexual assaults are reported to police³ and that annual rates of reporting (limited as they may be) are fairly consistent from year to year in Canada (Statistics Canada, 2017g). The reasons for the low rate of reporting are many, including key factors such as: emotional trauma, personal or professional relationships, shame, concerns with being believed, low rates of prosecution and conviction, and the difficulty of the legal process. In over half (51%) of sexual assault incidents, the perpetrator was a friend, acquaintance, or neighbour of the victim (Statistics Canada, 2009). Due to the very low rate of reporting sexual assaults to the police, the numbers presented in this section provide a very limited window into understanding the full extent of the problem in the community and should be treated with caution. The annual variation shown in these statistics may not be indicative of actual trends, and likely have as much to do with one or more individual’s decision to report an assault to the police or seek assistance following a sexual assault.


Observations

1. As reported in the Uniform Crime Reporting Survey (UCR2) by Statistics Canada, there are 3 levels of sexual assault in the Criminal Code with increasing levels of violence from Level 1 to Level 2 (weapon or bodily harm) to Level 3 (aggravated). From 1998 to 2016 the UCR2 reports 112 police reported sexual assaults in Canmore. The majority of these were Level 1, with 2 Level 2 and 3 Level 3 reported sexual assaults in the period from 1998-2016 (Statistics Canada, 2017a,b). Note: the numbers reported by the UCR2 Survey may differ slightly from the numbers reported at the local detachment level. Statistics Canada uses an extensive data cleaning and checking process that will focus on the number of victims and most serious offence in an incident, and as such typically records fewer final offenses than the local detachment reports. For more information about the definitions of Sexual

³ For a detailed discussion of sexual assault and reporting please visit Statistics Canada: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2017001/article/14842-eng.htm>
 For more information about sexual assault in society, the law, and the reasons for underreporting sexual assaults please see: http://sieccan.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/SIECCAN-Sexual-Health-Issue-Brief_Sexual-Assault.pdf


Assault and the UCR2 please visit the Statistics Canada website at: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85f0033m/85f0033m2008019-eng.htm>

2. In a high profile report by the Globe and Mail, an investigation revealed that approximately 1 in 5 sexual assaults in Canada were classed as ‘unfounded’ and dismissed by police. This is a higher unfounded rate than for other crimes (e.g. twice the rate of non-sexual assaults) and the actual number varied widely across towns, cities, provinces and police forces (Globe and Mail, 2017a). The Globe and Mail’s report has sparked a larger societal discussion about how the police handle victims of sexual assault, which is ongoing through 2017 as investigations continue. Statistics Canada stopped reporting unfounded numbers more than 15 years ago, but has resumed data collection and will have the first results available in 2018 (Globe and Mail, 2017b). It is hoped that the question of unfounded rates will be further explored and better understood in the near future.



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017a,b)

3. On an annual basis the UCR2 reports a range of 1 to 16 sexual assaults per year, with the 16 assaults occurring in 2004 (this is reflected in the Crime Severity Index values for that year). For the 5-year period from 2011-2016 the number of sexual assaults has ranged from 3 to 7, while there is the appearance of a declining trend from 2012-2016 the total number of reported incidents is small so it is difficult to draw any clear trend conclusions as a single reported incident could affect annual totals (Statistics Canada, 2017a,b).
4. Crime rates are typically reported on a rate per 100,000 population basis. For the purposes this report they have been recalculated at a rate of 1,000 to provide better applicability of the small town context of Canmore. In general, with the exception of 2004, the rate of sexual assault reported to the police is lower than the average rate for all of Alberta (Statistics Canada, 2017a,b).
5. Based on the RCMP Canmore Municipal Detachment Report there were 7-10 incidents of sexual assault reported to police in the 2012-2016 period (Town of Canmore/RCMP, 2017).
6. The Bow Valley Victim’s Services Association’s (BVVSA) caseload has dealt with a range of 9-14 sexual assaults per year for the period from 2012/13 to 2016/17. People seeking assistance from the BVVSA may have been referred by the police, hospital, other agency or may have sought assistance on their own (BVVSA, 2017).



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017a,b)

Community Initiatives

1. The Bow Valley Harmony Project, a collaborative project of the YWCA Banff, is a multi-stakeholder group developing a collaborative, coordinated response to sexual assault in the communities of the Bow Valley. The Harmony Project also engages in prevention work and education, in local Bow Valley bars and clubs, and with new residents (e.g. through the BanffLife program). For more information please visit the YWCA Banff website: <http://ywcabanff.ca/programs-services/bow-valley-harmony-project/>.
2. The Bow Valley Harmony Project has published a Survivors Guide for victims of sexual assault, their families, and their friends. This guide provides valuable information on how to get help, medical attention, reporting to the police, the court process, and what to do after the assault. It also provides guidance on what to do if someone you know has been sexually assaulted. The guide is available from the YWCA Banff website: <http://ywcabanff.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Harmony-Project-Survivors-Guide-05.17-1.pdf>.
3. The Town of Canmore FCSS department continues to offer healthy relationship workshops in local schools.
4. Bow Valley Victims Services (BVVSA) continues to offer assistance, counselling, and education programs about sexual assault and sexual violence. In 2016 BVVSA developed a questionnaire to be completed by individual who received assistance for crimes or trauma from a Victim Services program, including sexual assault. This questionnaire was distributed across Alberta, and the final results will be available in 2018. The final report will help inform BVVSA polices regarding the services they offer.




Wildland/Urban Interface – FireSmart

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Safety: Canmore is a safe community	FireSmart Mitigation	Fuel modification and FireSmart efforts continue with an annual program to reduce the hazard in the wildland/urban interface.


The Wildland/Urban Interface is where human development meets or intermingles with native wildland vegetation. The lands surrounding Canmore are heavily forested, presenting a considerable forest fire risk to the community. Prior to European settlement, fire was a common disturbance in the Bow Valley. The last large fire in the 1880s burned most of the Bow Corridor. Since that time the local forest has developed heavy accumulations of fuel and an aging forest structure. This situation results in a considerable risk of wildfire, with the potential for significant damage to Canmore and other communities of the Bow Valley. To reduce the risk of wildfire in the Bow Valley the Town of Canmore and its partners have adopted a preventative FireSmart approach (<http://wildfire.alberta.ca/firesmart/default.aspx>).

Observations



Source: (Walkinshaw, 2010)

1. The 2002 Bow Corridor Wildland/Urban Interface Plan (Walkinshaw, 2002) guided FireSmart and fuel modification programs for the 2000s decade in Canmore. The Plan was updated and revised in 2010. The new Town of Canmore FireSmart Mitigation Strategy (Walkinshaw, 2010) reviewed the progress made over the previous decade and developed priority FireSmart mitigations required based on the present and planned future growth of Canmore. The report highlighted the high/extreme hazard in many developed areas and noted that there is significant threat for structure loss within the Town of Canmore, particularly on the Wildland/Urban Interface. As shown in the FireSmart hazard map, a significant portion of the local landscape is rated Extreme hazard level. The report identifies past fuel management work and future priority areas. The implementation plan also highlights priorities for public education, legislation, emergency planning, cross-training and interagency cooperation that would be required to reduce the risk of a wildfire and increase community preparedness (Walkinshaw, 2010).



Source: (Town of Canmore. 2017c)

2. Since 1999, a total of 234.9 ha of vegetation have been modified on provincial, municipal and private land surrounding Canmore. Banff National Park has also conducted fuel modification and created fire breaks on significant quantities of land near the east gate of the park. This has direct protective impact on Canmore from a landscape perspective. Beginning in 2014 the Town of Canmore started to undertake FireSmart work on provincial land within the municipal boundary (e.g. Larch Island)

3. Fuel modification and vegetation management is only one of the seven disciplines of an effective wildland/urban interface. All components need to be addressed to produce a FireSmart community: 1) Vegetation Management; 2) Development Options; 3) Public Education; 4) Legislation; 5) Interagency Cooperation; 6) Cross-Training; and 7) Emergency Response Planning.
4. There are several developments in Canmore that have a high percent of untreated wood roofing (Walkinshaw, 2002).

Community Initiatives

1. On a regional basis prescribed burning and landscape restoration in the Bow Valley, Kananaskis, and Banff National Park are being actively used as tools to reduce the risk of uncontrolled wildfire, while restoring forest age structure diversity, increasing habitat diversity and reducing the risk of mountain pine beetle infestations. *The Evan-Thomas 10-year Vegetation Management Strategy 2016-2025* provides detailed insight into the fire history and future plans for the lands adjacent to Canmore in the Kananaskis Valley (Alberta Environment and Parks, and Alberta Agriculture and Forestry, 2016).
2. Opening the forest canopy through FireSmart thinning and prescribed burning can result in the growth of Buffaloberry and other vegetation that is an attractive food source for bears and other wildlife. This work is coordinated with wildlife attractant management efforts to remove food sources in areas of high human use such as communities or recreational facilities.
3. Alberta Environment and Parks completed a fire history study of the Bow Valley. This study provides detailed information about forest stand ages, fire cycles, and historical vegetation conditions in the valley (Jevons, 2015).
4. The 2016 MDP recognizes the threat of wildfire to the community and may require proposed developments adjacent to a wildfire hazard area to undertake a risk assessment, and follow FireSmart principles and fire prevention measures (Town of Canmore, 2016e).

Interpretation

1. Suppression of forest fire in the lands surrounding Canmore have resulted in local forests with heavy accumulations of fuel and an aging forest structure, resulting in a high hazard situation with significant risk to many structures in the town of Canmore, particularly along the urban/wildland interface. Continued effort in fuel modification and adhering to FireSmart principles is hoped to reduce the future risk of wildfire and threat to the community.
2. Continued inter-jurisdictional cooperation and training between provincial, municipal, and federal agencies in the Bow Valley on fire management is important, since wildfires are a regional and trans-boundary concern.
3. Fuel modification and vegetation disturbance can create ideal growing conditions for buffaloberry bushes. Management programs for buffaloberry in high human use areas should be considered when planning fuel modification projects. Similarly, fuel modification projects in more remote areas, may over the short and long term, create additional habitat and food sources for wildlife that are not adjacent to developed areas of the community and high human use areas.

Flood and Mountain Creek Hazard Mitigation

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Safety: Canmore is a safe community	Flood and Steep Creek Hazard Mitigation	Following the flood of 2013 the Town of Canmore initiated an extensive program of steep creek hazard assessment and mitigation. A proposed flood and debris retention structure on Cougar Creek is currently undergoing the approvals process.


In June 2013, Canmore was hit by the most damaging and devastating floods in its history. The floods caused significant infrastructure and property damage, from which the community is still recovering. Numerous repairs were required to roads, the railway, homes, businesses and other structures. Significant damage from the floods occurred along the banks of steep mountain creeks (such as Cougar Creek) which swelled to many times their normal spring flows and carried a high percentage of debris, increasing the erosive and destructive effects of the water. The Bow River did not overflow the protective dykes downtown, but many low-lying neighbourhoods were affected by high ground water levels which caused water damage in the below ground basements of many properties.

Observations/Community Initiatives

Steep Creeks

1. Following the flooding of 2013 the Town of Canmore initiated the Mountain Creek Hazard Mitigation Program. Responding to the initial threat and possibility of another flood event, short-term mitigations were in place on most of the mountain creeks by May 2014. After the short-term mitigations were in place, the focus shifted to hazard assessment, risk assessment, option analysis and finally long-term mitigations. The goal is to install infrastructure that will protect the community against future, potentially larger, events. The largest and most visibly obvious of the mitigations is the armouring and other work along Cougar Creek. A debris dam has been proposed at the narrow mouth of the creek to protect downstream residents and infrastructure from the threat of catastrophic debris flows and flooding. The application for the proposed Cougar Creek Debris Flood Retention Structure was submitted by the Town of Canmore to the NRBC and AEP in 2016 and the proposal is currently under review (<https://nrcb.ca/Projects/CurrentProjects/CougarCreek.aspx>). Funding (\$48.6 million), primarily from federal and provincial sources, is in place pending the approvals from the NRBC and AEP. Updates to hazard mitigation and an online hazard and risk map are available at: <https://canmore.ca/residents/mountain-creek-hazard-mitigation>
2. The Steep Creek Hazard and Risk Policy was approved in 2016 (Town of Canmore, 2016d). The objective is to 'avoid and reduce intolerable risk associated with steep creek hazards'. Risk is measured in terms of safety (individual risk and group risk) and economic cost (economic risk). Steep Creek Hazard Zones were assessed and classified as Extreme/High, Moderate, and Low. The hazard rating determines what new development (if any) will be allowed in an identified hazard area, ranging from no new development in an extreme/high hazard area to development is potentially allowable

(based on risk assessment) in low hazard areas. Critical facilities and utilities should not be located in the hazard zones. These specifics are outlined in detail in the 2016 MDP (Town of Canmore, 2016e)



Source: (Town of Canmore, 2016d)


Mountain Creek	Status Date	Project Status
Cougar Creek	July 2017	-Landscaping and pathways in progress. -Environmental Impact Assessment for the proposed Debris Dam was submitted and is under review by AEP. -Funding from federal and provincial sources for the debris dam construction is in place, pending development approvals.
Pigeon Creek	April 2017	-Short-term mitigation work is currently underway (led by the MD of Bighorn).
Stone Creek	April 2017	-Long-term mitigation to be undertaken at a later date (TBD).
Stoneworks Creek	April 2017	-Construction of long-term mitigation is planned for 2018.
Three Sisters Creek	April 2017	-Construction of the long-term mitigation is underway, completion is expected later in 2017.

Other Creeks	April 2017	<p>-Town of Canmore has applied for funding to conduct hazard and risk assessment on the creeks above Peaks of Grassi.</p> <p>-Hazard studies in the Smith Creek (Three Sisters) area are being undertaken by a private developer.</p> <p>-Hazard and risk assessment of Stones Canyon Creek was completed in 2016.</p>
--------------	------------	---

Source: Town of Canmore, 2017k

- The Town of Canmore has made a comprehensive collection of mountain creek hazard resources available on their website, including the hazard studies, open house information, and proposed mitigations. To learn more please visit the website at: <https://canmore.ca/residents/mountain-creek-hazard-mitigation/creek-resources>

Flood Risk Areas










Source: (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2015c)

4. The Province of Alberta is responsible for identifying and delineating and flood hazard areas (floodway, flood fringe and overland flow areas) based on a 100 year flood. Most of the valley bottom (including portions of Canmore) is classified as being within one of the flood hazard zones. The flood hazard mapping takes into account existing mitigations, such as the existing dykes along the Bow River through Canmore, which reduce the risk of flooding from the Bow River. Customized maps can be viewed and outputted from the Provinces online flood hazard mapping site: <http://maps.srd.alberta.ca/FloodHazard/>
5. During the flood of 2013 the Bow River remained within its banks and did not breach the system of dykes armouring its course through the centre of Canmore. Recognizing that there is future potential for significant flood hazard from the Bow River the Town of Canmore set up a seasonal high water monitoring webpage with river levels and updates at: <https://canmore.ca/residents/mountain-creek-hazard-mitigation/seasonal-flood-monitoring>
6. Alberta Environment and Parks maintains an online resource of current river flows and levels. The closest upstream measuring station to Canmore is the Bow River at Banff (05BB001). To see current river levels and historical normals please visit the website for the Bow River Sub-Basin at: <http://www.environment.alberta.ca/apps/basins/Map.aspx?Basin=8&DataType=1>

Economy




“Canmore has a diverse economy that is resilient to change”

-Town of Canmore 2016-2018 Strategic Plan Vision and Goals

Economy Indicators – 5 Year Trend Summary			
Section	Specific Measures/Community Initiatives	Trend 2011-2016	Comments
Employment Status of Adults	Regional Unemployment		From 2011 to 2016 the regional labour market (Banff-Jasper-Rocky Mountain House) has undergone a significant shift with a reduction in the labour force size, reduction in participation, and an increase in the unemployment rate from 3.5% to 6.4% (Note: these are regional statistics and Canmore and Banff’s labour markets were not as impacted as the rest of Alberta by the crash in oil prices)
	EI Benefits/Claimants		The number of persons in Canmore claiming Employment Insurance (EI) payments was following a gradual downward trend from 770 in 2010 to 630 in 2014, rising sharply to 730 in 2015 (2016 numbers are not yet available).
	Bow Valley Job Orders		At the Job Resource Centre, job orders (employers seeing employees) for the Bow Valley decreased by 10.4% from 2011 to 2016.
Employment by Industry	Employment by Industry	% change uncertain	As of 2014, Accommodation & Food was still the #1 sector of employment. Construction was still the #2 sector of employment.
Tax Base Ratio	Residential/Non-Residential Assessment Share		The residential/non-residential assessment share (tax base ratio) has been very slowly widening each year and was 84:16 in 2016.
Business License Registry	Total Businesses		The total # of registered businesses increased by 12.6% in the 5 year period from 2011 to 2016.
	Resident Businesses		The # of resident businesses increased very slightly (4.4%) from 608 in 2011 to 635 in 2016.
	Home Occupations		Home occupations increased by 31.0% from 551 in 2011 to 722 in 2016.

	Non-Resident Businesses		From 2011 to 2016 the number of non-resident businesses dropped by 9.1%
Building Permits and Housing Starts	Total Building Permits		Total building permit values increased by 13.4% from 2011 to 2016.
	Housing Starts		Housing starts increased by 141% from 44 in 2011 to 106 in 2016 but remain well below pre-2008 levels.
Commercial Vacancy and Lease Rates	Commercial Lease Rates		Rates are variable by location and property type, but have generally risen after a softening in the market caused by a combination of the 2008 recession and the 2013 flood.
Tourism Industry and Visitation	Canadian Rockies Tourism Region		From 2009-2014, the Canadian Rockies Tourism Region estimated total visitation increased by 38.5% from 3.15 to 4.35 million visitors per year.
	Banff National Park		Annual visitation to BNP increased by 23.6% from 2010/11 to 3.9 million visitors in 2015/16.
	Trans-Canada Highway Traffic Volume		Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) on the TCH through Canmore increased by 30.1% from 2011 to 2016.
Tourist Accommodations and Occupancy Rates	Occupancy Rates		CHLA reported hotel occupancy rates showed increased occupancy from 2010-2015. For 2016 and onwards occupancy rate data will be switching to a new data source from Tourism Alberta.

Employment Status of Adults

Strategic Plan Linkages	Trend	
Economy: Canmore has a diverse economy that is resilient to change	Regional Unemployment	
Affordability: Canmore is a viable community for people of diverse socioeconomic backgrounds	EI Benefits/Claimants	
	Bow Valley Job Orders	


Employment status is a key indicator for assessing the overall health of the local economy. A high unemployment rate, lack of full time work, or low participation rate in the labour market may indicate depressed economic conditions in a community. An unemployment rate of 4-6% is generally considered "healthy" by economists as there is sufficient flexibility in the potential labour pool to accommodate fluctuations in the supply/demand of the job market.

Observations


Regional Labour Force Statistics

1. Statistics Canada provides estimates of labour force statistics for the Economic Regions (ER) across the country. Canmore is located within ER4840: including Banff, Jasper, Rocky Mountain House. This ER has a 2016 population of approximately 72,300 persons, of which, 19.4% or 13,992 live in Canmore. As such these labour force statistics may be representative of some conditions in Canmore, but they are also heavily affected by tourism trends in the mountain parks and resource based economies on the eastern slopes. This is the smallest geographic region for which official labour force statistics are available.
2. Historically the ER4840 region has been characterized by a large labour force, high participation rates, and very low unemployment rates. From 1995-2004 the regional unemployment rate averaged at 4.5%. From 2005-2007⁴ the unemployment rate dropped below 2.0%. Over the past 5 year period (2011 to 2016) the population in ER4840 increased slightly by 0.6% but the number of people employed, or in the labour force has dropped substantially. The participation rate decreased from 76.5% to 67.5%, and the employment rate decreased from 74.0% to 63.2%. The unemployment rate increased from 3.5% in 2011 to 6.4% in 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2013 and Statistics Canada, 2017h).
3. As of January 2017 Alberta's unemployment rate was 8.8% (7.4% in January 2016). Banff/Canmore's unemployment rate was estimated to be less than ~5%, one of the lowest in the province, due to the tourism-based economy (Job Resource Centre, 2017).


⁴ From 2005 to 2007 the unemployment rate for ER4840 was suppressed by Statistics Canada since the number of unemployed persons did not meet their minimum confidentiality thresholds (of 1,500 persons), indicating a very low level of unemployment in the region.



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2013 and Statistics Canada, 2017h)




Source: (Statistics Canada, 2013 and Statistics Canada, 2017h)



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2013 and Statistics Canada, 2017h)

Canmore Employment Statistics

Note: In each iteration of the Canmore Census there are a variable number of “Unknown/Prefer Not to Answer” responses (13.9% for this category in 2014). This creates a varying degree of uncertainty in the results so caution should be used regarding apparently small fluctuations in the numbers. For the employment status question the rate of non-response is double that in the 2011 Census. Therefore, apparent changes in 2014 should be treated with caution.




Source: (Town of Canmore, 2014a)


1. The proportion of adults who were employed full time, peaked in 1999 (68.2%) and dropped by 10.2% to 58.5% in 2011. This decrease was not due to increasing unemployment, but rather was partly due to slight increases in the proportion of retired individuals and part-time workers. By 2014 the proportion of full time workers had dropped to 50.7%.
2. The percent of unemployed adults as measured by the Canmore Census fluctuated between 1.4% and 3.1% between 1995 and 2011. In 2011 it was 2.7%, dropping to 1.7% in 2014. Note: The percent unemployed from the Canmore Census is not directly comparable to regional or provincial unemployment rates as calculated by Statistics Canada (Town of Canmore, 2014a).
3. It is important to note that this census data was collected in June, which is part of the busy summer season in Canmore. Many years of trend data from the Bow Valley Labour Market review indicates that there is a distinct seasonality to the supply and demand of jobs in the Bow Valley. During the summer season at the Job Resource Centre there is often a surplus of job orders, while later in the fall there is typically a surplus of job seekers (Job Resource Centre, 2015a).

Employment Insurance (EI)


1. Data on Employment Insurance (EI) recipients in Canmore is available via taxfiler data from Statistics Canada. As such there is a lag time of several years before the information from a given tax year is compiled and made available to the public. The most recent data available is from 2015. It is likely that the number of EI recipients actually understates the actual level of unemployment. Not all unemployed persons qualify for EI, and some people



- who lack steady employment may move on to other job markets in search of work. The EI program also encompasses several other programs such as maternity leave, parental leave, and compassionate care. A separation of these various programs is not available at the community level. Additionally, not all seasonal or temporary workers may be eligible for EI benefits if they have not accumulated sufficient hours in their job position to make a claim.
2. The number of persons in Canmore claiming Employment Insurance (EI) payments ranged from a low of 520 in 2007 to a high of 770 in 2010, dropping to 630 in 2014, then rising to 730 in 2015. For 2014, this is equivalent to 9.2% of taxfilers in Canada and 6.0% of taxfilers in Canmore. (Statistics Canada, 2017i).
3. The Economic Dependency Ratio (EDR) for EI payments is the total of EI dollars received as benefits, compared to every \$100 of employment income. For example, an EI dependency ratio of 2.5 means that \$2.50 in EI benefits was received for every \$100 of employment income. Historically, the EDR for EI payments in Canmore has been generally similar to the rest of Alberta and typically much lower than the EDR for all of Canada. In Canmore the EDR decreased from 1.3 in 2009 to 0.8 in 2014, rising to 1.0 in 2015 (Statistics Canada, 2017i).




Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017i)



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017i)

Bow Valley Job Demand (Orders)

1. At the Job Resource Centre, the number of ‘job orders’ (from employers in Banff and Canmore) reached a low of 1,691 in 2009 following the economic crash of 2008, then recovering to a high of 3,858 in 2014. Job orders dropped by 21.9% to 3,013 in 2016. (Job Resource Centre, 2017).



Source: (Job Resource Centre, 2017)

Temporary Residents - Work Permit Holders


1. Foreign workers are allowed to work and reside in Canada with the appropriate visas and work permits. The permit requirements vary by sector of employment, work program and country of origin of the worker. These requirements and programs are also subject to change over time, which can make it more or less difficult to obtain positions and placements for foreign workers and domestic employers. To learn about the current programs and regulations please visit the Citizenship and Immigration Canada website: <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/work/index.asp>.



Source: (Employment and Social Development Canada, 2017)

2. The International Mobility Program (IMP) allows employers to hire temporary workers without a Labour Market Impact Assessment (LMIA). These positions are based on a determined need within Canada, or reciprocal benefits with other countries. The Temporary Foreign Worker Program (TFWP)

are hired on a temporary basis to fill temporary labour and skill shortages. The TFWP requires a LMIA to verify that there is a need for the temporary worker, and that no Canadians are available to do the job. In 2014, the Government of Canada announced significant changes and reforms to the TFWP program. The net effect is that it has become much more difficult for employers to obtain TFW placements. For more information regarding the TFWP please visit Employment and Social Development Canada: http://www.esdc.gc.ca/eng/jobs/foreign_workers/index.shtml



Source: (Employment and Social Development Canada, 2017)

3. Prior to 2006 there were less than 150 Temporary Residents working in Canmore. This began to rise sharply from 2006 through 2008 with increases coming from both the TWFP and IMP programs. From 2008 to 2014 TFWP workers became increasingly common in Canmore, peaking at 240 in 2014. After 2014 (the year TFWP regulations changed) the number of TFWP permit holders dropped sharply to only 40 in 2016 (IRCC, 2017). The number of TFWP positions issued based on a positive Labour Market Impact Assessments (LMIAs) peaked at 318 in 2012, dropping sharply to 46 in 2016 (Employment and Social Development Canada, 2017).
4. As with TWFP workers, IMP participants became increasingly common in Canmore starting in 2008, rising from 80 in 2007 to a peak of 210 in 2011 and 2013. In 2016 there were 195 IMP workers present in Canmore. This program has not been affected by the same regulation changes that caused the reduction in TFWP workers.
5. Overall the total number of Temporary Residents with work permits had dropped from a peak of 450 in 2013 to 235 in 2016, primarily due to the rapid availability of TWFP participants following the change in federal regulations in 2014 (IRCC, 2017).

Interpretation

1. Analyzing the apparent decline in the number and proportion of full time workers in Canmore is complicated by the high percentage of non-response to the employment question in the 2014 Canmore Census. With that in mind, it is possible that the number of persons employed full time in Canmore may be in a declining trend. A generally aging population, job losses in some sectors post-2008 crash, and an increasing societal trend towards self-employment and/or part-time employment could all be combining to result in fewer full time workers in Canmore (both in number and as a proportion of the total labour force).
2. The economic crash of 2008 resulted in some significant changes and job losses in the local labour market. This was especially prevalent in the construction sectors. With the slowing economy there were less job positions available, more EI recipients and increasing unemployment. A modest rebound in housing starts and building permits shows increased activity in the construction sector, however it is not nearly as active as it was in the mid-2000s decade. The 2014 drop in world oil prices has had a significant impact on Alberta's economy and this impact is noticeable in the regional (ER4840) labour force and unemployment statistics. To a certain degree, the Bow Valley and local employers have been less affected from the direct job loss impacts of the oil crash, as tourism has remained strong and visitation to the valley is increasing. While there is a slight decrease in job orders at the Job Resource Centre, there are still businesses experiencing labour shortages in Canmore and the Bow Valley and front line staff are typically in demand at many businesses.
3. The availability and affordability of housing continues to be a challenge and limiting factor in the local labour market. The Canmore Community Housing Corporation (CCHC) in conjunction with the Town of Canmore and local developers continues to create additional units of Perpetually Affordable Housing (PAH), however, housing is still a significant challenge for many residents and employers. The low vacancy rates, high shelter costs, and employee shortages suffered by some local businesses highlight the importance to the economy of maintaining an adequate availability of housing.

Employment by Industry


Strategic Plan Linkages	Trend	
Economy: Canmore has a diverse economy that is resilient to change	Accommodation & Food	% change uncertain
	Construction	% change uncertain

It is important to encourage economic diversity and to build a strong, vibrant and diversified local economy and business base that is resilient to changes in any one sector. A diversified economy is more stable over the long term as the economic ups and downs of a particular sector can be balanced out by other sectors. Note: while tourism is a key element of Canmore’s economy, there is no specific ‘tourism industry’ category to measure the full extent of direct employment in the tourism sector. Many sectors such as Accommodation & Food, Health & Wellness, Retail, Transportation, are heavily (but not wholly) linked to the tourism sector.

Observations

Employment by Industry (Canmore Census)

- Note: In each iteration of the Canmore Census there are a variable number of “Unknown/Prefer Not to Answer” responses (18.7% for this category in 2014). This creates a varying degree of uncertainty in the results, so caution should be used regarding apparently small fluctuations in the numbers. For the employment status question, the rate of non-response is more than double that in the 2011 Census. Therefore, apparent changes in 2014 should be treated with caution.



Source: (Town of Canmore, 2014a)

- Since 1995, Accommodation & Food has continuously been the largest, and Construction the 2nd largest employment categories in Canmore. In 2008, the construction industry almost matched the number of people employed in Accommodation & Food, however this dropped sharply during the recession that followed the market crash of 2008 (Town of Canmore, 2011a). Interpreting the 2014 Census results is challenging due to the high proportion of 'Unknown/Prefer Not to Say' responses (18.7% of the total) (Town of Canmore, 2014a).

Employment by Industry	2014	Employment by Industry (con't)	2014 (con't)
Unknown/Prefer Not to Say	18.7%	Transportation, Communication, Utilities	4.0%
Accommodation & Food	15.7%	Financial, Insurance, Real Estate	3.4%
Construction	8.6%	Personal Services	1.8%
Health and Wellness	8.2%	Manufacturing	1.2%
Professional Services	7.5%	Environment	1.0%
Retail-Wholesale Trade	6.6%	Professional Athlete	0.5%
Education	5.9%	Agriculture & Forestry	0.4%
Government	4.7%	Other	0.3%
Mining & Oil	4.5%	Total	100.0%

Source: Town of Canmore, 2014a

Location of Employment

- In the 2014 Census, 17.9% of responses were 'Unknown/Prefer Not to Answer'. This is nearly double the 9.1% 'Unknown' response in the 2011 Census. This greatly increases the uncertainty of interpreting the 2014 data.
- In 2014, at least 27% of all employed adults were working outside of Canmore. Banff, Calgary, and other communities in the Bow Corridor were the three most common locations for working outside of Canmore.
- In 2014, at least 555 or 6.5% of employed adults were working in Calgary.
- Home-based workers are an important and emerging sector which represents a growing opportunity for economic development in the community (Western Management Consultants, 2010). Some of these are artists, home-based small businesses, or 'knowledge workers'. In 2014, at least 532 or 6.2% of employed adults were working out of their own residences (Town of Canmore, 2014a).

Location Of Employment 2014	Number of Adults	% of Total
At residence	532	6.2%
Banff	807	9.4%
Bow Corridor	373	4.4%
British Columbia	25	0.3%
Calgary	555	6.5%
Canmore	4,141	48.3%
Cochrane	17	0.2%
Elsewhere in Alberta	300	3.5%
Morley and Kananaskis	53	0.6%
Other	235	2.7%
Unknown/Prefer not to answer	1,536	17.9%
Grand Total	8,574	100.0%

Source: Town of Canmore, 2014a

Community Initiatives

1. The Bow Valley Chamber of Commerce is a new initiative launched in early 2017. The Chamber an advocate and champion for the business community with a Vision of becoming the “Bow Valley’s business champion: an organization for local entrepreneurs and business owners to grow, connect, and find the support and programs needed to thrive and prosper.” To learn more about this new initiative, their activities, and opportunities for membership please visit their website at: <http://www.bowvalleychamber.com/>.


Interpretation

1. The high proportion of non-response to the employment questions in the 2014 Canmore Census complicates historical comparisons of employment trends. The construction sector was especially hard hit by the 2008 crash. After building permits peaked in 2006 and 2007, they dropped sharply from 2008 through 2012, seriously impacting this important sector of employment. These economic challenges highlight the need to diversify the economy and have alternative economic plans in place for full build-out.
2. The non-permanent population has likely had a significant influence on the construction, service, food, and retail industries. The non-permanent residents provide a broader base of support for the local economy, likely making Canmore’s economy less susceptible to fluctuations in the national or international tourism markets.

Recommendation

1. The ‘prefer not to say’ option in the 2014 Canmore Census resulted in significantly fewer substantive responses in the employment questions (and other questions as well). If possible, it is recommended that the ‘prefer not to say’ option be removed from the Census questions so as to improve data gathering and completeness.

Municipal Taxation: Assessment and Tax Share

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Economy: Canmore has a diverse economy that is resilient to change	Residential/Non-Residential Assessment Share	


A balanced tax base ratio is important, as it is generally understood that the residential component of any community provides insufficient tax revenue to support the community's infrastructure. A balanced tax base means the burden of increased taxes is shared between residents and businesses, to help maintain affordability for residents. To achieve the required annual tax levy, and to account for fluctuations in assessed values, tax rates (the 'mill rate') for different property types are adjusted up or down on an annual basis by the municipality.

Threshold

- Assessment Share (Tax Base Ratio): The 2006 Municipal Development Plan sets a goal of achieving a 2/3 residential and 1/3 non-residential assessment split.
- Tax Share (Taxes Paid Ratio): In 2014 the Town of Canmore adopted a goal of a 65/35 split between the total residential/non-residential taxes collected. This goal is based on assessed values modified by taxes paid via the mill rate.

Observations

Assessment Share (Tax Base Ratio)



Source: (Town of Canmore, 2016c)

1. In the 1998 MDP, a goal of achieving a 60:40 split between residential and non-residential values was set. While the residential/non-residential tax base ratio has fluctuated slightly each year (sometimes due to slight changes in assessment categories), it has slowly trended upwards from 77:23 in 1995 to


84:16 in 2016 (Town of Canmore, 2016c). Compared to other similar ‘competitor’ communities in the Alberta/BC region, Canmore’s assessment share is similar to the average (81.5:18.5 in 2014) (Town of Canmore, 2015b).

Tax Share (Taxes Paid Ratio)

1. In 2012, Canmore Council set up the Town of Canmore’s Property Tax Taskforce. The resulting report: A Property Tax Policy Framework for the Town of Canmore: Analysis and Recommendations (Brunnen, 2013) examined Canmore’s tax situation and compared it to other nearby municipalities. One of the key objectives proposed by the report was “Equity and competitiveness in the distribution of the residential and non-residential tax share.” Following the Property Tax Taskforce recommendations, Council approved the 2014 Property Tax Rate Bylaw. The bylaw requires that the tax rate move to a 65/35 split over the next 2 years, beginning in 2014. The 65/35 split is based on an updated review of the competitor municipalities (such as Golden, Cochrane, Fernie, Revelstoke, etc.) featured in Brunnen (2013). This differs from the assessed tax base values in that it is calculated on actual taxes levied, not just on assessed values. In 2014, the tax share split was 63.5% residential to 36.5% non-residential.
2. As with the assessment share, Canmore’s tax share split of 65/35 is similar to other ‘competitor’ communities in the Alberta/BC region (average of 65.6:34.3 in 2014) (Town of Canmore, 2015b).

Tourism Communities Benchmarking

1. The 2015 Alberta Tourism Communities Benchmarking and Competitiveness Review explored the financial and revenue challenges faced by tourism communities such as Canmore. The report noted that traditional municipal revenue sources (e.g. property tax) and grant funding formulas (e.g. per capita permanent residents) fail to fully cover the goods and services consumed by visitors. The report explores alternative options for special revenue tools for tourism communities to more fully fund infrastructure and services. Compared to selected competitor communities in the USA, Alberta resort communities have significantly lower revenue sources per capita. A wide array of taxes and levies are used in other tourist communities to increase municipal revenues. Three revenue tools were identified and suggested as options for Canmore, Banff, and Jasper:
 - Tourism Consumption Levy – introducing a value-added tax on tourist service consumption
 - Real Estate Transfer Levy – introducing a levy on recreational property sales
 - Provincial Revenue Sharing – visitor based population funding(Headwater Group, 2015).







Source: (adapted from the Headwater Group, 2015)

Interpretation

1. Residential assessments alone are ordinarily insufficient to pay for a complete range of municipal services, therefore an appropriate balance between residential and commercial is essential. Achieving this balance, without overburdening either sector, is very important for the future economic sustainability in Canmore. The nature of future commercial development will have a direct impact on the economic diversity and employment opportunities in the community. Canmore's assessment share (tax base ratio) has not shifted towards the goal of increased commercial tax base, and commercial assessments have remained much lower than residential.
2. The Tourism Benchmarking study showed that tourism-based communities such as Canmore, Banff, and Jasper must bear significantly higher costs per capita (with less tax revenue) to service the daily visitor and tourist population, in addition to the local residents. While tourism brings many economic and employment benefits to a community, it also creates challenges for the municipality in funding the required infrastructure and services to support the effective increase in population generated by the tourists.


Business Licenses

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Economy: Canmore has a diverse economy that is resilient to change	Total	
	Resident	
	Non-Resident	
	Home Occupations	

Each business operating in Canmore is required to register for an annual business license. This indicator provides information on the number and type of businesses registered in Canmore each year. To reduce the variability introduced by Hawker/Mt. Market, Regional, B&B, Temporary, and Specialized Service businesses, only the three largest categories of Resident, Home Occupations, and Non-Resident Businesses were included.

Observations

1. The total number of registered businesses reached a high of 1,594 in 2008, in part due to the number of construction related businesses operating in the community. From the high in 2008 registered businesses dropped 1,363 in 2013, rising again to 1,578 in 2016. The total number of registered businesses increased by 12.6% in the 5 year period from 2011 to 2016.



Source: (Town of Canmore, 2017d)





2. The number of resident businesses increased very slightly (4.4%) from 608 in 2011 to 635 in 2016.

3. Home occupations have been the fastest growing category of business licence, increasing by 31.0% from 551 in 2011 to 722 in 2016.
4. The number of registered non-resident businesses fluctuates more than some of the other categories, as many of these businesses are linked to the construction industry and other projects which only require their services for a specified time period. From 2011 to 2016 the number of non-resident businesses dropped by 9.1% (Town of Canmore, 2017d).

Interpretation

1. The business registry numbers fluctuate due to changes in the number of businesses (particularly non-resident businesses), however, they may also be influenced by registration compliance. The slight upward trend from 2013-2016 is in large part due to an increased number of registrations of home-based businesses. This is an increasingly important part of Canmore's economy and, based on general societal trends and Canmore's location near a major city and an international airport is anticipated to continue to grow in size in future years.
2. The number of non-resident businesses is largely related to out-of-town trades in the construction industry. These numbers will likely be much lower during economic downturns (as seen from 2008 onwards), or eventually when the town reaches build-out and new construction decreases.


Building Permits and Housing Starts

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Economy: Canmore has a diverse economy that is resilient to change	Total Building Permits	
	Non-Residential Building Permits	
	Residential Building Permits	
	Housing Starts	

The number and value of building permits issued by the Town of Canmore are important indicators of the condition of the local economy. The construction and development sector is one of Canmore’s primary economic drivers and sources of employment. Comparisons between the residential and commercial values help determine if the future municipal tax base ratio is moving towards balanced and sustainable levels.


Observations

1. Note: not all building permits are used or fully constructed during the year in which they were issued. With the economic crash of 2008, some projects approved in the previous year were stalled then restarted later. Additionally, some of the permits for 2013/2014 are from rebuilding following the floods of 2013.




Source: (Town of Canmore, 2017e)

- The total value of building permits issued hit a peak of more than \$220 million in 2007, then dropped sharply to a low of \$33 million in 2009 following the global economic crisis of 2008. There was a slight rebound in 2011 driven by Institutional and Government construction (particularly Elevation Place). Overall building permit values increased by 13.4% from 2011 to 2016 (with a significant drop in 2012 following the construction of Elevation Place).



Source: (Town of Canmore, 2017e)

- During the past 5 year period (2011-2016) the total value of residential building permits has varied substantially: from \$21.9 million in 2011 to \$60.0 million in 2013, dropping to \$35.6 million in 2016.
- In 1996, the average value of residential building permits peaked at \$781,065 in 2007. By 2016 the average value per permit had dropped to \$182,133 (reflecting a switch away from new residential construction to repairs and renovations).
- The total value of commercial permits peaked at \$65.3 million in 2007, in part due to the increased development of tourist homes/vacation rental suites and large commercial projects. Commercial building permits dropped sharply after 2008, reaching a low of \$1.3 million in 2012. In 2016 a total of \$26.3 million in permits were issued, of which three major hotel projects are the largest component (the Malcom Hotel, Base Camp, and Super 8) in Spring Creek is the largest component (Town of Canmore, 2017e).
- The number of housing starts fell dramatically from a high of 553 in 2006 to 17 in 2009, remaining low through 2012. Starts rebounded in 2013 with a total of 106 housing starts in 2016 (CMHC, 2017). Note: some of these new




Source: (CMHC, 2017)

housing starts in 2013 and 2014 are due to projects that were delayed in starting due to the economic challenges following the 2008 economic crash.

Interpretation

1. In retrospect, the 2006/7 peak in building permits were an outlier, rather than part of a long upwards trend of ever increasing development and construction. The permits issued in that time may also not reflect the actual level of construction activity that occurred, as not all permits issued at that time broke ground due to the crash of 2008. Some of these projects took several years to get started due to the global financial difficulties. Since 2008, financing has become correspondingly harder to obtain, making it highly unlikely that numbers like those from 2006 and 2007 will be attained again in the near future (note: proposals and potential plans for TSMV and SilverTip may result in a significant increase in construction activity, pending approvals and financing for projects). There were also several large institutional, commercial and tourist home/vacation rental suite properties under construction at that time in Canmore, contributing to the overall permit values.
2. The construction of vacation homes, tourist homes, timeshares, and even weekend residences are prone to more risk and volatility during an economic downturn. These types of properties are not primary residences, but are discretionary in the sense that they are purchased as recreational properties or as investments.
3. Construction is a major source of employment in Canmore and has a substantial multiplier effect throughout the community. The downturn in the local construction industry following the crash of 2008 has had significant consequences for the local economy. Although the industry has rebounded somewhat from the post-2008 years, there are still fewer projects and housing starts than there were a decade ago.

Commercial Vacancy and Lease Rates

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Economy: Canmore has a diverse economy that is resilient to change	Commercial Lease Rates	

Commercial vacancy and lease rates are important measures of the condition of a local economy. Rates can be highly variable by location, zoning and type of business.

Observations

Commercial Needs Study

1. The 2015 Commercial Needs Study examined the issue of commercial vacancy rates. The report noted that the 2014 vacancy rate is 9.5%, with most of the vacancies found in units with a lower standard of design, or which have limited visibility and/or access. A vacancy rate closer to 0% was reported for locations which are up to modern retailer standards (Rollo & Reurbanist, 2015a).
2. There is a total of 92,919m² occupied and 9,750m² vacant retail and service commercial space. Much of this space is located near or within the town centre. With strict limitations on ‘big box’ stores, Canmore has maintained a concentrated retail environment in the walkable downtown core. This is in contrast to many other western Canadian communities which often have larger retail stores on the periphery, drawing business away from the downtown core (Rollo & Reurbanist, 2015a).
3. Retail and services businesses are a major component of Canmore’s economy. The Commercial Needs study estimated that they achieved \$270 million in total sales volume from personal expenditures in 2014 (Rollo & Reurbanist, 2015a).

2010 and 2016 Local Market Reports

Average Net Lease Rates per sq ft per Annum	2010	2016
Industrial bays	\$10.00 to \$12.00	\$12 to \$18
Second level industrial	\$7.00 to \$10	\$8 to \$10
Offices	\$14.00 to \$18.00	\$14.00 to \$22.00
Main Street retail	\$25.00 to \$32.00	\$28.00 to \$35.00
Secondary downtown and Bow Valley Trail retail	\$20 to \$23	\$22 to \$28
Local commercial	\$18.00 to \$25.00	n/a
	*2010 rates were down ~20% from the peak in 2007/8, and were roughly equivalent to 2005 rates	Lease rates rebounding after recession and 2013 flood.
*Note: the prices presented here are an average range and may vary significantly by location, property, and amenities. They are intended to provide a general overview of commercial rental prices.		
Source: Town of Canmore, 2011b (from Biggings) & Biggings 2016		

1. The combination of the world-wide economic downturn beginning in 2008 and the floods of 2013 contributed to a 12-15% drop in the commercial real estate market, with a decrease in sales, prices, and leasing volumes.
2. There has been a scarcity of industrial bays since 2005, but vacancies in office and retail space have been available throughout downtown, Bow Valley Trail, Railway Ave, and the Elk Run area. Sales of major commercial buildings in Canmore are infrequent (Biggings, 2016).




Interpretation

1. The global economic crisis of 2008 had a significant effect on both residential and commercial real estate markets. The 2013 flood created further challenges for local businesses and commercial real estate. In 2014, lease rates appear to be rebounding and vacancy rates are low in properties with good locations that meet modern retailer standards.

Recommendation

1. This indicator provides valuable insights into the local economy. Collecting this information in a standardized and consistent format would help to better understand changes in the market over time.

Tourism Industry and Visitation

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Economy: Canmore has a diverse economy that is resilient to change	Regional Tourism Visitation	
	Banff National Park Visitation	
	Annual Trans-Canada Highway Traffic	

Tourism is a major component of Canmore’s economy. The town continues to grow in popularity as a tourism and recreation destination. For tourism to continue its driving role in Canmore’s economy, the tourism industry needs to be fostered, for employers and employees alike. At the same time, the overall economy needs to be diversified and strengthened, to increase economic stability and reduce the risk of heavy reliance on one sector of the economy.

Goal

For the tourism sector, the 2020 target is a visitor spend of \$500 million (an increase from \$278 million in 2012), which is the region’s key economic driver (CBT, 2015).


Observations

Canmore

1. Travel Alberta estimates that in 2011, tourism had a \$240 million economic impact in Canmore. Of this, \$54 million was from the accommodation sector, \$45 million for food and beverage, and \$28 million for retail (Travel Alberta, 2012).
2. In 2012, the Government of Alberta commissioned an economic impact assessment of tourism in Canmore. The report had the following key conclusions:
 - Estimated direct spending by tourists in the community was >\$278 million in 2012. These expenditures increased the income of the community by \$203 million and increased Alberta’s Gross Provincial Income by >\$330.5 million.
 - At least 3,313 full time equivalent jobs are needed to sustain this level of tourism in Canmore. Provincially there are 4,328 jobs sustained because of tourism in Canmore. Canmore’s tourism industry is important locally and provincially.
 - In 2012, \$150 million in tax revenue was collected by all 3 levels of government based on the province-wide tourism impacts of Canmore. The local municipal government realizes \$13.1 million of this total amount (Econometric Research Limited, 2014).

Canadian Rockies Tourism Region

1. The Canadian Rockies Tourism Region includes the areas of Canmore, Kananaskis, Banff, and Jasper. From 2009-2014 estimated total visitation increased by 38.5% from 3.15 to 4.35 million visitors. This increase was primarily due to increased visits by Albertans (“Rubber Tire Traffic”). In 2014, the Canadian Rockies tourism region received 13% of the total visits to Alberta. The region was a key destination for visitors from the United States and overseas, accounting for 34% and 71% of the provincial total respectively. (Alberta Tourism, Parks and Recreation, 2014, Alberta Culture and Tourism. 2016ab). The lower Canadian dollar and lower gas prices likely made the region an attractive travel location for Americans and domestic (‘rubber tire’) visitors from other parts of Alberta and Canada (Alberta Culture and Tourism. 2016c).




Source: (Alberta Tourism, Parks and Recreation, 2014, Alberta Culture and Tourism. 2016ab)

Banff National Park


1. Parks Canada tracks annual visitation to Banff National Park (BNP). While this is not a measure of direct relevance to Canmore it can provide some insight into regional trends as some visitors to BNP will also spend part of their time in Canmore, either as day visitors or overnight stays. Visitation to BNP increased by 23.6% from 2010/11 to a record of 3.9 million visitors in 2015/16. Official numbers for the 2016/17 fiscal year haven't been released yet, but it is anticipated that the summer of 2017 (2017/18 fiscal year) will be very busy in the national parks as free parks 'Discovery Passes' are available to celebrate Canada 150 (Parks Canada, 2016).

Trans-Canada Highway Traffic Volume

1. The Trans-Canada Highway (TCH) is the major east/west route through the Bow Valley. As the major transportation artery the highway is a blend of visitors, in-town traffic and long distance through traffic, and is not a direct measure of visitation to Canmore.
2. Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) on the TCH through Canmore increased by 30.1% from 2011 to 2016, with an average of approximately 23,000 vehicles per day on the highway. This is the highest AADT since the construction of the highway (Alberta Transportation, 2017).




Source: (Parks Canada, 2016)



Source: (Alberta Transportation, 2017)

Daily Visitor Population


1. The effective daily population (residents plus visitors) for Canmore was estimated at 68% greater than the resident population. Based on 2011 numbers it was estimated that the effective daily population is over 20,000 people: 8,363 visitors plus a resident population of 12,317. It is important to note that this is an estimate, and that definitive counts of the number of visitors to Canmore are not available. (adapted from Headwater Group, 2015 calculated from Brunnen 2012).



Source: (adapted from Headwater Group, 2015 calculated from Brunnen 2012)


2016 Tourism Economic Impacts study

1. The Banff, Jasper and Canmore Tourism Economic Impact Study (June 2016) study explored the estimated tourism spending in these three tourism communities and the overall significance of their provincial and federal economic impacts. Total initial tourism expenditures in Canmore were estimated to be almost \$345 million in 2015. The total income of Canmore (value added) was increased by over \$273 million annually by these initial tourism expenditures. Combined, the direct and indirect economic impacts of tourism in Canmore were estimated at over \$554 million for the year.



Source: (Grant Thornton et al., 2016)

2. The employment impacts of tourism were more estimated at more than 2,600 direct and 1,400 indirect/induced jobs in Canmore, totalling more than 4,000 positions. Tourism is identified as the dominant employer in the community, with employment in the trade sector as the second highest.
3. The estimated provincial impact of Canmore’s tourism industry is over \$405 million indirect and \$531 million in indirect expenditures, totalling over \$876 million. Canmore’s local share of the total value added impacts is estimated to be relatively high due to the generally local nature of the tourism expenditures and the labour intensive nature of the industry. The study also noted that Canmore provided significant economic and spending benefits to the greater Calgary and Area Tourism Region as many of the goods and services required by Canmore are supplied by Calgary (Grant Thornton et al., 2016).



Source: (Grant Thornton et al., 2016)

Community Initiatives


1. In 2016, Canmore Business & Tourism (CBT) (also known as Tourism Canmore Kananaskis (TCK)) ceased operations in July 2016 due to the lack of a secure and sustainable source of funding. For the previous 8 years CBT had received its main funding (totalling over \$7.1 million) through the Canmore Destination Marketing Fund (DMF). The DMF was funded by a voluntary charge collected on hotel room stays, however declining participation and membership (~20% of hotel rooms in early 2016) resulted in the DMF ending its operations and the funding for CBT (Travel Alberta, 2016; Rocky Mountain Outlook, 2016b). As of the end of 2016, CBT/TCK resumed operations under a new structure, board and funding formula in 2017 (Rocky Mountain Outlook, 2016c). For information on their current and planned future operations for 2017 and beyond please visit their website at: <http://www.tourismcanmore.com/>.
2. In 2016 the construction of a new, 124 room hotel and 6,500 sq ft conference centre in Spring Creek was approved. Completion of the \$37 million dollar “The Malcolm Hotel & Conference Centre” is expected in late 2017. In addition to hotel rooms and a restaurant the property will provide significant conference space and facilities (<https://www.springcreekrealestate.ca/the-malcolm-hotel-conference-centre/>).

3. The Towns of Canmore, Banff and Jasper partnered with the Headwater Group to conduct the 2015 Alberta Tourism Communities Benchmarking and Competitiveness Review (Headwater Group, 2015). This study undertook surveys and benchmarking of municipal service assets and functions on a per capita basis, with the goal of helping to better understand the municipal service demands of tourism communities. The report highlighted the implications for housing, transportation, taxation, and municipal services. These topics will be discussed in the relevant sections of this report.

Interpretation

1. As one of the major local industries, tourism is a key element of the local economy with significant direct and indirect economic impacts. The available data indicates that visitation to Canmore and the Bow Valley continues to increase, and is expected to be especially busy for the Canada 150 celebrations, in part due to the free Discovery Passes allowing free entry into the national parks. Located on the eastern edge of Banff National Park, Canmore has been increasing in popularity as a destination for international travellers to the area, as well as more regional visitation from Calgary and other Albertans.
2. Visitors and recreational property buyers from the regional market (such as Calgary and Edmonton) are very important components of Canmore's economy and community. As such the strength of Alberta's economy is an important factor in the sustainability of Canmore's real estate and development industries. Over the past few years the downturn in oil prices has significantly impacted Alberta's economy. This may have trickle down effects on real estate, employment, and government funding available in Canmore.



Tourist Accommodations and Occupancy Rates

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Economy: Canmore has a diverse economy that is resilient to change	Occupancy Rates	

Tourism is one of Canmore’s major industries. The occupancy rates of local hotels and motels are an important measure of health of the local tourism industry. Occupancy rates and daily rates are affected by levels of visitation, the proportion of overnight visitors, length of stay, and the accommodation choices made by visitors. The accommodation, hospitality, and food sector is one of Canmore’s main economic sectors and sources of employment.


Observations

1. In Canmore, there were an estimated 2.2 million visitor nights across all accommodation types in 2014, plus an estimated additional 1.2 million daytrip visitors. The estimated spending by overnight and day visitors in 2014 was \$146 million (Rollo & Reurbanist, 2015a). The total direct tourism spending on accommodation in Canmore was estimated at over \$105 million dollars in 2015, this represents approximately 25% of all estimated tourism spending in the community (Grant Thornton et al., 2016).
2. In 2014, there were approximately 2,791 units/rooms in motels, hotels, hostels, home rentals, B&B, and other forms of visitor accommodations. 43% of these were in single ownership hotels and another 43% were in multiple ownership condo hotels. The remainder are in tourist homes (10%), B&B (2%) and private dwelling rentals (2%). Note the actual number of private (illegal) rentals is difficult to tabulate and may be underestimated, however, they are estimated to capture only a ~1% portion of total visitor accommodation demand (Rollo & Reurbanist, 2015b). By its very nature, occupancy statistics are not available for the private and unlicensed rentals in the community. The impacts of this increasingly popular short-term rental market on the accommodation sector are not fully understood and is an issue of growing debate in Canmore and other communities.



Source: (reprinted from Rollo & Reurbanist, 2015b)

- Demand for accommodation has been estimated to have increased by about 14,300 room nights per year, each year for the past 15 years. This is a slow but steady increase in demand for accommodation over time. There were more than 750 units added to the market between 2008 and 2010. This increase in supply during the global financial crisis led to a decrease in occupancy rates, which then recovered after 2010 (Rollo & Reurbanist, 2015b).



Source: (CHLA, 2016)


- The Canmore Hotel and Lodging Association (CHLA) tracks occupancy rates of participating properties. The mix of participating properties changes slightly annually, and not all properties participate in the survey. In 2009, occupancy rates in hotel/motel units dropped to a low of 44%, increasing to 68% in 2015. Condo/Suite units followed a similar pattern, rising from 45% in 2009 to 63% in 2015. Updated occupancy rate information is not available from the CHLA for 2016 (CHLA, 2016).
- Beginning in 2016, Tourism Alberta is now publishing monthly (and annual) summary hotel industry statistics for selected communities, including Canmore. This data is from the CBRE Hotels Trends in the Hotel Industry National Market Report and STR Inc. As more data becomes available it is hoped that this will help to better establish consistent reporting of the annual and seasonal trends in occupancy and hotel rates. It is anticipated that this data source will replace the CHLA occupancy statistics that have been historically used in the Canmore Community Monitoring Report.

- For 2016, Tourism Alberta reported an annual average occupancy rate of 58.9% for Canmore. The data also show a distinct seasonal trend with lower occupancy rates in the fall, rising slightly in the winter through spring, then

Accommodation Indices	Occupancy Rate (%)	Average Daily Room Rate (ADR)	Revenue per Available Room (RevPar)
Banff	70.8%	\$214.97	\$152.12
Canmore	58.9%	\$155.91	\$91.90
Jasper	64.4%	\$219.66	\$141.47
Total Alberta	54.3%	\$147.51	\$80.07

Source: (Alberta Tourism, 2017)

exceeding 90% occupancy for the peak summer months. In addition to the occupancy rates, Tourism Alberta also reports an overall Average Daily Room Rate (ADR) of \$155.91 and Revenue per Available Room (RevPar) of \$91.90 (Alberta Tourism, 2017).



Source: (Alberta Tourism, 2017)








Interpretation


1. Tourism and its related industries are the largest sectors of Canmore's economy and the major source of employment in the community. The hotel and accommodation industry is an important part of the tourism sector and is estimated to account for approximately 25% of all direct tourism spending. Occupancy rates dropped sharply in 2009 following the global economic recession that began in 2008. Since this time, Canmore's hotel and accommodation sector has continued to grow. The post-2008 rebound in occupancy rates from 2010 onwards occurred within a context of a larger number of accommodation units, indicating that there were more visitors staying in more units. Peak summer occupancy rates are continually near full occupancy for many properties (particularly on weekends, but the shoulder and off-seasons continue to show a significant seasonal decrease in visitation. It is anticipated that the addition of new conference facilities will help to increase visitation and tourist spending in the often slower shoulder and off-season in Canmore.

Affordability




“Canmore is a viable community for people of diverse socioeconomic backgrounds”

-Town of Canmore 2016-2018 Strategic Plan Vision and Goals

Affordability Indicators – 5 Year Trend Summary			
Section	Specific Measures/Community Initiatives	Trend 2011-2016	Comments
Income and Wages	Mean Individual Income		In the five year period from 2010 to 2015, mean individual incomes increased by \$18,568 (33.2%) to \$74,429.
	Median Individual Income		From 2010 to 2015 median individual incomes in Canmore increased by 17.2% to \$44,520.
	Mean Employment Income		Overall mean individual employment income rose by 20.1% to \$58,485 from 2010 to 2015. (Note: mean individual employment income dropped by \$1,968 or 3.3% from 2014 to 2015)
Living Wage	Living Wage	n/a (1st year of data)	The estimated 2015 living wage in Canmore is: \$23.40 (each) for a couple with 2 children, \$24.25 for a lone parent with 1 child, and \$20.03 for a single adult.
Social Assistance – Income Support Programs	# of Social Assistance Recipients		The number of people receiving social assistance has fluctuated slightly but overall is down 10.5% from 2010 to 2015.
Rental Housing: Cost, Availability and Affordability	Rental Prices		From 2011 to 2016 average advertised prices increased a total of 41.2% for 1 bedroom units, 40.3% for 2 bedroom units.
	Rental Vacancy Rates		From 2011 to 2016 the average # of advertised rental units available per month decreased from 123 to 78 (36.7%)
Ownership Housing – Resale Prices and Affordability	Average resale house & condo price		After a decrease tied to the global economic crisis in 2008, average real estate prices recovered strongly from 2011 through 2016 rising by 14.6% (all units average).

	Price-to-Income Ratio (Median Multiple)		The ratio of median house prices to median family incomes has remained fairly steady from 2011 to 2016 ranging from 5.2 to 5.4 as both average house prices and average incomes have increased during this time.
Price of Goods and Services	Spatial Price Index (All-Items)	n/a	Spatial price index values are not comparable over time (the previous survey was in 2010), however in 2016, Canmore had the highest ranking in Alberta. Shelter costs were a major component of Canmore's high price index.

Income and Wages

Strategic Plan Linkages	Trend	
<p>Economy: Canmore has a diverse economy that is resilient to change</p> <p>Affordability: Canmore is a viable community for people of diverse socioeconomic backgrounds</p>	Mean Income	
	Median Income	
	Employment Income	

Income levels are a key economic and quality of life indicator. Insufficient income negatively impacts an individual’s or family’s ability to meet their basic needs. These “working poor” may be constantly subject to stresses from inflationary pressures, increased housing costs, or variable income due to fluctuations in economic conditions. Income is only one component of a more complex equation and has strong linkages to affordability and cost of living. The income/affordability relationship is a key driver of demographic trends in the community as individuals or families who struggle with affordability may leave the community in search of better economic prospects.

Observations

The following information is drawn from summaries of Canada Revenue Agency income tax returns compiled by Statistics Canada. The income data is compiled by postal code, so it reflects income for permanent residents of Canmore (regardless of where they earned the income), but excludes non-permanent residents or temporary workers who maintain a primary residence in another postal code.

Due to Canmore’s small population, a detailed analysis of many aspects of community income is not feasible. Statistics Canada’s confidentiality regulations require the suppression of data when there are less than a certain number of individuals in a category. Because of this restriction, it has not been possible to obtain data to examine other subjects of interest, such as average income by employment sector.


The most recent income data available from Statistics Canada is from 2015. As such it will partially, but perhaps not fully reflect what may have happened to average incomes in Alberta following the crash in oil prices from August 2014 onwards.

Average Individual Income

1. Mean individual income in Canmore rose sharply from 2003-2007 peaking at \$65,338, then trended downwards by nearly \$10,000 from 2007 to 2010. Since that time, average incomes have generally trended upwards. In the five year period from 2010 to 2015, mean individual incomes increased by \$18,568 (33.2%) to \$74,429.
2. Mean incomes in Alberta and Canada are subject to smaller annual fluctuations than Canmore (smaller sample size) and have shown a general upwards trend since 2003 with only a very slight


decline during the 2008 recession. From 2010-2015 mean individual income rose 16.2% across Canada and 20.8% in Alberta.

- Overall, 2015 mean individual income in Canmore was higher in Canmore (\$74,429) than in Alberta (\$63,117) or Canada (\$47,679) (Statistics Canada, 2017i,j).




Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017i,j)

- The median is a representation of the middle income point, which helps to reduce the influence of very high or very low values. Compared to the fluctuation in mean income, the median individual income in Canmore (and across Canada) only showed a very slight decrease in 2009 following the global financial crisis. Overall, median incomes in Canmore increased by 17.2% from 2010-2015, compared to a 16.0% increase across Canada and 16.8% increase in Alberta. As with mean income, the effects of the August 2014 crash in oil prices may not be fully reflected in 2014 and 2015 income data.
- Overall 2015 median individual income was higher in Canmore (\$44,520) than in Alberta (\$41,770) or Canada (\$33,920) (Statistics Canada, 2017i,j).




Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017i,j)

Income by Category



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017j)

1. When incomes are grouped into broad categories, there are a number of similarities and differences between individual incomes in Canmore vs. the rest of the country. These differences tend to be clustered at the extremes of income (high or low), while the middle income categories are more similar. Compared to the rest of Canada (38.6%) and Alberta (31.7%), Canmore has a substantially smaller proportion of individuals earning under \$25,000 per year (26.4%).
2. In the category of individuals earning \$100,000 a year or more, Alberta (14.8%) and Canmore (15.7%) are almost double the average for the rest of Canada (8.3%) (Statistics Canada, 2017j).



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017j)

Overall Income Profile

1. Looking at the overall income profile of the community as a whole provides an insight into the relative importance of various income sources (e.g. employment income vs. EI) to the community. The overall income profile of Canmore has several significant differences relative to Canada. On average, Canmore derives a lower proportion of income from

Income Profile 2015	Canada	Alberta	Canmore
Employment income (includes self-employment)	70.6%	74.9%	64.2%
Government Transfers (Includes EI)	12.7%	7.6%	5.0%
Investment Income	6.5%	10.7%	18.9%
Private Pensions / RRSP	7.6%	4.1%	6.3%
Other income	2.6%	2.6%	5.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%


Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017i)

employment (64.2%) when compared to Canada (70.6%) and Alberta (74.9%), but has much less reliance on government transfer payments (including EI, and Social Assistance payments).

2. The proportion of investment income (interest and dividends) derived by Canmore residents was almost triple that of the rest of Canada and almost double that of Alberta. Income derived from investments accounts for 18.9% of the total income for Canmore's residents. This is a substantial difference and it is important to remember that average income statistics include investment income, not just wages and salaries (Statistics Canada, 2017i).


Employment Income

1. Overall, mean individual employment income in Canmore (and Alberta as a whole) is much higher than the Canadian average. As with total income, there is higher variability in the statistics for Canmore when compared to the province or the rest of the country (due to the smaller population of Canmore). It is also important to note that this is a measure of average employment incomes, and that there is a high degree of variability in what individuals actually earn.



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017i)


- From 2003-2008 Canmore's mean employment income was higher than that of Alberta, but following the 2008 financial crisis, mean employment income in Canmore fell by more than \$6,000 between 2007-2009. Since that time, the mean employment income in Canmore has generally trended upwards (increasing by 20.1% from 2010-2015). In 2015, the mean employment income in Canmore was \$58,485, slightly less than Alberta (\$59,753) and much higher than Canada (\$46,200).
- Canmore's mean individual employment income dropped by \$1,968 or 3.3% from 2014 to 2015. On a community wide basis this is a reduction of over \$11 million dollars in total employment income reported by Canmore's residents.
- As a % of total income in Canmore, employment income decreased from 78.3% in 2003 to 64.2% in 2015. This is partially due to the decrease in employment income from 2014 to 2015, but is primarily due to the increasing amount of investment income (Statistics Canada, 2017i).



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017i)


Investment Income

- Investment income includes interest and dividends (but not capital gains). In 2015, 41.6% of taxfilers in Canmore reported investment income (compared to 28.5% overall in Canada). The average \$ of investment income (per person reporting) in Canmore is substantially higher than the average for Alberta and Canada. In 2015 the mean investment income (per person reporting) in Canada was \$10,935 compared to \$20,951 in Alberta and \$33,749 in Canmore. From 2010-2015 mean individual investment income in Canmore increased by 91.6% from \$17,469 to \$33,749 (Statistics Canada, 2017i).



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017i)

- In terms of the overall importance, the proportion of total community income coming from investment income by Canmore residents was nearly triple that of the rest of Canada and almost double that of Alberta. Income derived from investments accounted for 18.9% of the total income for Canmore’s residents (Statistics Canada, 2017i).




Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017i)

Capital Gains

- Capital gains are realized from the sale of real estate or investments. They are not counted as or included in Statistics Canada’s definition of ‘total income’. Average capital gains per person in Canmore are highly variable, but followed a general downwards trend from \$61,207 in 2008 to \$23,648 in 2013, rebounding in 2014, and then dropping slightly in 2015 (to \$36,939). A detailed


breakdown of the source these capital gains is not available (e.g. sales of equities vs real estate) (Statistics Canada, 2017k).



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017k)

Household Income⁵


1. Household income data is for 2015 is available from the 2016 Census Profile from Statistics Canada. Note: this data includes income from all sources, not just employment income. The median 2015 household income in Canmore was \$98,906 for all households, \$44,576 for one person households and \$116,975 for two or more person households. For each category this is slightly higher than the average for Alberta, and much higher than the Canadian average (Statistics Canada, 2017a)



2. Compared with Canada as a whole, the distribution of household income in Canmore is more heavily weighted towards the higher income brackets. For each of the income categories under \$70,000, Canada has higher proportion in each category. As household incomes categories grow larger, the

⁵ 'Private household' refers to a person or group of persons who occupy the same dwelling and do not have a usual place of residence elsewhere in Canada or abroad. (Statistics Canada, 2017a)

proportion of Canmore residents in that category become increasingly more than the Canadian average. For example, in 2015, 14.7% of Canmore’s households reported an annual income of \$200,000 or greater, compared to 6.8% of households in Canada (Statistics Canada, 2017a).




Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017a)

3. Compared with Canada as a whole, the distribution of household income in Canmore is more heavily weighted towards the higher income brackets. For each of the income categories under \$70,000, Canada has higher proportion in each category. As household income categories grow larger, the proportion of Canmore residents in that category become increasingly more than the Canadian average. For example, in 2015, 14.7% of Canmore's households reported an annual income of \$200,000 or greater, compared to 6.8% of households in Canada (Statistics Canada, 2017a).

Family Income (Economic Families)⁶

1. As defined by Statistics Canada, the 'economic family' differs slightly from the 'household' as such the statistics available for families and households are not directly comparable. Economic family data is also available as couples (with or without children), lone parent families, and persons not living in an economic family. Note: this data includes income from all sources, not just employment income.




2. In 2015, the median economic family income (all family types) in Canmore was \$115,900, slightly higher than Alberta (\$109,997) and more than \$27,000 higher than the median for Canada (\$88,306). Median incomes for couples with no children were slightly lower than the median for all families, while median incomes for couple families with children were the highest of the categories (\$135,526). Median incomes for lone parent families were less than half that of couple families with children (\$59,494), and median incomes for lone persons not in economic families were even lower (\$42,667) (Statistics Canada, 2017a).

⁶ Statistics Canada definition: 'Economic family' refers to a group of two or more persons who live in the same dwelling and are related to each other by blood, marriage, common-law union, adoption or a foster relationship. A couple may be of opposite or same sex. (Statistics Canada, 2017a)

Low Income Measures

1. Statistics Canada uses several approaches to measure low income status in Canada. Two of the commonly used approaches are presented here: Low Income Measure After Tax (LIM-AT) and Low Income Cut Off After Tax (LICO-AT). Both of these are 'relative' measures of low income, that identify persons who are substantially worse off than average. They differ from concepts such as Market Basket Measure (MBM) or the Living Wage which attempt to determine the minimum income threshold required to afford a minimum standardized basket of shelter, goods, and services. It is important to note that neither LIM nor LICO are a precise measure of 'affordability' in a particular community. It is also important to note that because LIM and LICO use different methodologies, they will produce different numbers and results.



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017a)

2. As a measure of low income, LIM-AT is defined by 50% of the median adjusted after tax income of private households, which is then multiplied by the square root of household size (an equivalence scale to take household economies of scale into account). Based on 2015 income data 7.0% of Canmore's residents were below the LIM-AT threshold, this is roughly half the incidence of low income in Canada (14.2%) (Statistics Canada, 2017a). For a full definition and the of LIM-AT please visit the Statistics Canada website at: <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/dict/fam021-eng.cfm>
3. Another measure of low income, LICO-AT is designed to identify persons who are expected to spend 20% or more than average on food, shelter and clothing. For 2015, 4.5% of people in Canmore fell below the LICO-AT threshold, which is roughly half the incidence of low income in Canada (4.5%) (Statistics Canada, 2017a). For a full definition of LICO-AT please visit the Statistics Canada website at: <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/ref/dict/fam019-eng.cfm>.

Low-income measures thresholds (LIM-AT) for private households, 2015		Low-income cut-offs, after tax (LICO-AT) for economic families and persons not in economic families, 2015	
Household size	After-tax income	Economic Family Size	Small population centres with less than 30,000 persons
1 person	\$22,133	Person not in an economic family	\$15,261
2 persons	\$31,301	2 persons	\$18,576
3 persons	\$38,335	3 persons	\$23,129
4 persons	\$44,266	4 persons	\$28,856
5 persons	\$49,491	5 persons	\$32,859
6 persons	\$54,215	6 persons	\$36,441
7 persons	\$58,558	7 or more persons	\$40,024

Source: Statistics Canada, 2017a

Interpretation

- Overall, the average individual incomes in Canmore are as high, or higher than Alberta as a whole. Canmore has a much lower percentage of low income earners than the Canadian average, and a similar proportion of mid to high income earners as the rest of Alberta. However, these 'average' income statistics may conceal many important details and not all income is earned equally by all residents. Canmore's higher average incomes may relate in part by the need to afford the high cost of housing (higher shelter costs may dissuade many lower or mid income earners). A high participation rate combined with low unemployment rates could combine with working long hours and/or multiple jobs to make ends meet. In terms of total community income, Canmore reports a very high proportion of investment income when compared to Alberta or Canada. The gap between total income (including investments) and employment income has widened in 2014 and 2015 both from an increase in investment income and a slight decrease in employment income. The high levels of investment income indicates that a proportion of the community has significant assets and non-employment sources of income, which are likely not evenly distributed amongst local residents.
- The dip in mean individual income from 2007 to 2010 is largely likely due to the slowdown in the local construction industry and real estate industry, a reduction in investment income, and other factors relating to the global economic troubles that began to affect the economy at that time. In 2011 and 2012 average incomes began to trend upwards again and have continued to do so through 2015. The slight decrease in employment income from 2014 to 2015 may in part relate to the challenges faced by the 2014 crash in oil prices, but the data is not yet available to indicate if this trend has carried on through 2016.

Living Wage

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
<p>Economy: Canmore has a diverse economy that is resilient to change</p> <p>Affordability: Canmore is a viable community for people of diverse socioeconomic backgrounds</p>	Living Wage	n/a (1 st year of data)

The Living Wage is:

“...not the same as the minimum wage, which is the legal minimum all employers must pay. The living wage sets a higher test - a living wage reflects what earners in a family need to bring home based on the actual costs of living in a specific community.”

(Living Wage Canada, 2013a).

In recent years the concept of a ‘living wage’ has become an important tool to help many communities across Canada and around the world to better understand local living costs, affordability, and poverty. The living wage differs from the ‘subsistence wage’ (the bare minimum to support life) and the ‘minimum wage’ (the mandated legal minimum). A living wage is “the hourly rate at which a household can meet its basic needs” (Living Wage Canada, 2013a). As such, a living wage includes inputs such as income and government transfers; and outputs such as taxes, childcare, housing, medical expenses, etc. A list of communities across Canada and their living wage calculations is available from: <http://livingwagecanada.ca/index.php/living-wage-communities/> (Living Wage Canada, 2013b).

For 2015 the Town of Canmore commissioned a report and calculation on Living Wage based on the Canadian Living Wage Framework and using the most recent data available (M. Haener Consulting Services, 2015). The basic calculation used to determine Living Wage was as follows:

Calculation Method - Living Wage is the hourly wage rate that allows this formula to balance:						
Annual Family Expenses	=	Employment Income	+	Income from Government Transfers	+	Taxes



(M. Haener Consulting Services, 2015)

Using this formula, a Living Wage was estimated for three representative household types:

- 1) Single adult
- 2) Lone parent, 1 child
- 3) Couple, 2 children

Observations

1. For 2015, in Canmore, the estimated living wage is \$23.40 (each) for a couple with 2 children, \$24.25 for a lone parent with 1 child, and \$20.03 for a single adult.
2. Shelter costs were the biggest expense for each of these household types, while childcare and food were also large components of the budget for the couple family with two children. A complete description of the methodology, data and assumptions is available in the full report (M. Haener Consulting Services, 2015).
3. The estimated living wage in Canmore is higher than many other communities across Canada (a sampling of communities is provided in the graph below). Largely this reflects the high cost of housing in Canmore. Note: community comparisons can be problematic due to differences in approach and methodology. The following values are the most recently published Living Wage for these communities, and are be more fully explained and documented at: <http://www.livingwagecanada.ca/>



Source: (M. Haener Consulting Services. 2015 and Living Wage Canada, 2017)

4. In 2014 the general minimum wage in Alberta was \$10.20 per hour. The Government of Alberta enacted a strategy to raise the minimum wage to \$15.00 per hour by 2018. As of October 1, 2016 the minimum wage in Alberta is \$12.20 per hour and is scheduled to increase to \$13.60 per hour on October 1, 2017 and then to \$15.00 per hour on October 1, 2018. (Alberta Labour, 2016).

“We’re committed to bringing Alberta’s general minimum wage up to \$15 per hour to give lower-income Albertans the ability to support their families.”

- Christina Gray, Minister of Labour

5. The Town of Canmore will be updating the Living Wage calculation in 2018 and will be joining an inter-municipal Living Wage network which is working towards standardizing Living Wage equations and assumptions, and creating an online Living Wage calculator.


Interpretation

1. The high cost of living in Canmore is primarily a reflection of the relatively high cost of housing (both rental and ownership housing). This creates a challenging situation for many individuals and businesses in the community. The living wage provides an important benchmark to help understand the income and wages required to afford to live in this community.
2. There is a significant gap between low income-based thresholds for social services and the living wage. Many people earning more than the low income thresholds are in the situation of earning too much to receive social assistance or qualify for subsidies, yet they do not earn enough to comfortably afford housing, food, transportation and other key elements reflected by the living wage. This situation is a particular problem for many lone parents or even dual income parents who find themselves struggling to earn enough to provide the barest necessities for themselves and their children.
3. It is important to note that the Living Wage calculation is based on a number of assumptions and specific to each household type presented. Different results are to be expected if the family composition is changed or alterations are made to the core assumptions and/or methodology.

Recommendation

1. By using a standard methodology (e.g. Canadian Living Wage Framework) it is possible to more accurately compare and benchmark Canmore against other communities. Aligning methodologies with other communities is important to be able meaningfully calculate and track this indicator over time. As a growing number of communities adopt the concept of a Living wage the importance of all communities using a standardized methodologies will become increasingly important, otherwise the Living Wage values have limited utility for comparison.


Social Assistance – Income Support Programs

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
<p>Economy: Canmore has a diverse economy that is resilient to change</p> <p>Affordability: Canmore is a viable community for people of diverse socioeconomic backgrounds</p>	<p># of Social Assistance Recipients</p>	

There is a wide array of provincial and national programs which are available to qualifying individuals⁷. These income support programs are tracked using taxfiler data from the Canada Revenue Agency. These social assistance programs include: “payments made in the year on the basis of a means, needs or income test (whether made by an organized charity or under a government program)” (Statistics Canada, 2015).

Observations⁸

1. The most recent data available from Statistics Canada is for the 2015 tax year. As such this may not represent the full effect on income and social assistance in Alberta following the August 2014 crash in oil prices.




Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017)

2. The number of people in Canmore receiving social assistance in the form of income support decreased slightly from 330 in 2003 to 310 in 2008, rising to 390 in 2011, and then trending downwards to 340


⁷ Examples include: Assured Income for the Severely Handicapped (AISH), Personal Income Support Benefits (PSIB), Alberta Works Income Support Program, and the Alberta Adult Health Benefit (AAHB).

⁸ Note: totals were rounded by Statistics Canada to meet confidentiality requirements.

in 2015. Overall the number of persons receiving social assistance dropped by 10.5% from 2010 to 2015.



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017I)



Source: (Statistics Canada, 2017I)

3. The proportion of taxfilers receiving social assistance in 2015 was lower in Canmore (3.0%) than in Alberta (5.8%) or Canada (7.4%) (Statistics Canada, 2017I).
4. The relative importance of social assistance payments to a community can be expressed in terms of an Economic Dependency Ratio (EDR): "For a given area, the EDR is the ratio of transfer dollars to every \$100 of total employment income. For example, where a table shows an EDR of 12.1, it means

that \$12.10 was received in transfer payments for every \$100 of employment income for that area" (Statistics Canada, 2015).

5. Overall, the EDR for social assistance in Canmore is much lower than the rest of Alberta or Canada. In 2015 it was 0.4 in Canmore, 1.0 in Alberta, and 1.3 for Canada (Statistics Canada, 2017).

Community Initiatives

1. In 2017 the Town of Canmore launched the new Affordable Services Program (Town of Canmore, 2017). The program is designed to assist residents with affordability challenges with supports from a single point of contact. By signing up at one location they are able to access a variety of services including transit, food supports, recreation fee assistance, workshops, arts and culture program, library membership and more. The program is for Canmore residents with a single individual income below \$31,200, or a total family income of \$62,400 (proof of income is required). As of July 2017, the program has approved 373 applications (602 individuals) for access to the program. To learn more about the program please visit the Town of Canmore's website: <https://canmore.ca/residents/affordability-assistance/affordability-services-program>



Examples of services being used in the first 5 months of 2017 include:

- Free local Roam bus passes - 198 six month passes issued
- Volunteer income tax program - 44 income taxes completed
- Campership program - 33 children attended camp at no cost
- Discounted Elevation Place passes - 318 individuals accessed Recreation Fee Assistance
- artsPlace discounts - 123 individuals accessed discounted programs
- Free Canmore Public Library card - 66 library cards issued

Interpretation

1. Compared to provincial and national averages, Canmore has a much lower proportion of people receiving social assistance payments for income support. Canmore also has a lower rate of economic dependence on social assistance payments (relative to employment income). In part, this reflects the high participation rates in the labour force, and the historically low unemployment rate in Canmore.
2. Many social assistance programs provide very modest payments which do not keep pace with the increasing cost of living, make it more difficult for people on social assistance to live in Canmore (not only in Canmore, but in many other communities as well).

Rental Housing: Cost, Availability and Affordability


Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Economy: Canmore has a diverse economy that is resilient to change	Rental Prices	
Affordability: Canmore is a viable community for people of diverse socioeconomic backgrounds	Rental Vacancy Rates	

The availability and affordability of appropriate rental accommodations is one of the key community issues in Canmore. A shortage of accessible and affordable housing creates challenges for both workers and employers, low to middle income earners, families, and many other members of the community.

Observations

Canmore Community Housing Corporation

1. Since 2009, the Canmore Community Housing Corporation (CCHC) has been recording advertised rental rates in Canmore to gain a more precise understanding of market rates in the community. The CCHC methodology is very rigorous and involves checking for duplicate listings to avoid double counting any units. This is the most accurate and complete data available for Canmore’s rental market. (Note: this only reflects advertised rental prices, some people, such as long term renters may be paying less than current advertised market rates).



Source: (CCHC, 2017a)


2. In general, average pricing for rental units showed steady increases from 2009 to 2016, with a slight softening in average prices for 3+ bedroom units in 2016. From 2011 to 2016 average prices increased a total of 41.2% for 1 bedroom units, 40.3% for 2 bedroom units, and 28.7% for 3 bedroom units. This

is equivalent to average annual price increases of roughly 8% per year for 1 & 2 bedroom units, and 6% a year for 3 bedroom units (CCHC, 2017a).

- The average monthly rental costs are often beyond the affordability thresholds for many individuals, particularly single persons and lone parent families. The affordability gap between what a rental unit costs, and what a person can afford has been increasing as average prices rise. (CCHC, 2015a).

CCHC Rental Survey: Unit Type	Average Advertised Monthly Rent								
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% Change 2011-2016
Shared	\$584	\$560	\$548	\$597	\$623	\$710	\$756	\$785	43.3%
Studio	\$684	\$710	\$746	\$785	\$796	\$917	\$932	\$1,028	37.8%
1 Bedroom	\$958	\$978	\$954	\$1,007	\$1,130	\$1,264	\$1,327	\$1,347	41.2%
2 Bedroom	\$1,337	\$1,273	\$1,296	\$1,393	\$1,537	\$1,734	\$1,765	\$1,818	40.3%
3 Bedroom	\$1,641	\$1,632	\$1,736	\$1,828	\$2,066	\$2,264	\$2,346	\$2,234	28.7%
4+Bedroom	\$2,429	\$2,620	\$2,286	\$1,931	\$2,157	\$2,819	\$3,198	\$2,533	10.8%
Average # of units available per month (not including shared)	172	152	123	97	54	63	72	78	-36.7%

Source: CCHC, 2017a



Source: (CCHC, 2017a)


- The average number of units advertised as available (all unit types, per month) decreased by 36.7% from 2009 to 2016. Advertised vacancies dropped from 172 in 2009 to a low of 54 in 2013. After 2013 availability has increased slightly, reaching an average of 78 per month in 2016 (CCHC, 2017a).

Rental Housing Affordability 2016	Average Monthly Rent*	Income Required**	
		Hourly	Annual
Shared	\$785	\$15.09	\$31,391
Studio	\$1,028	\$19.76	\$41,109
1 Bedroom	\$1,347	\$25.90	\$53,878
2 Bedroom	\$1,818	\$34.97	\$72,734
3 Bedroom	\$2,234	\$42.97	\$89,368
4+ Bedroom	\$2,533	\$48.72	\$101,338

**Affordability threshold is 30% of gross income

Source: based on average advertised rents from CCHC, 2017a

- Traditionally, the general rule of thumb for determining shelter affordability is 30% of gross income, (before-tax household income). Households spending more than this amount are likely to experience greater than average challenges in affording other necessities such as food, clothing, and transportation (CMHC, 2017a; Statistics Canada, 2010). To meet the affordability threshold for the average rental accommodation in 2016 in Canmore a renter (or renters) would require an hourly wage (individual or combined of \$25.90 for a one-bedroom apartment, or \$34.97 for a two-bedroom apartment (calculation based on average advertised rents from CCHC, 2017a).




Source: (based on average advertised rents from CCHC, 2017a)

- Accessory suites (legal or otherwise) are an important source of rental housing in Canmore. Based on 2011 data, it was calculated that there are 163 legal suites and 179 illegal suites in Canmore. However, the actual total may be as high as 500 or 600 secondary suites, mostly illegal. Illegal suites are a long-standing issue (parking, tenant house and safety issues, etc.) in certain neighbourhoods, while legal

suites in some other neighbourhoods are underutilized. For example, many R1B/R1S suites (single family homes with legal suites) in areas of Three Sisters and Eagle Terrace are likely not being used as rental suites. It is likely that illegal secondary suites are underreported on both the municipal and federal census, leading to an underestimation of actual population numbers (CCHC, 2015c).

Bow Valley Labour Market Review

1. Rental price information from the Bow Valley Labour Market Review provides longer continuous time series than the data from CCHC. While the average prices shown are similar, there may be some differences in average prices due to collection and data filtering methodologies.
2. The Job Resource Centre tracks rental market rates as advertised in local newspapers. Advertised rental rates peaked in the 2nd half of 2007, nearly doubling from 2002 prices. From 2008 to 2010, rates generally trended downwards, with the cost of a two bedroom apartment dropping by over \$400 a month, and the cost of a one-bedroom dropping by almost \$200 a month. From 2010 to July 2016, average rates have trended upwards again reaching a new high of \$1,481/month for a 1 bedroom and \$1,854/month for a 2 bedroom. Advertised rates were reported as declining slightly in the 2nd half of 2016 (Job Resource Centre, 2017).



Source: (Job Resource Centre, 2017)

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC)

1. CMHC conducts annual surveys of rental prices and vacancy rates in communities with >10,000 residents. CMHC Rental Market Statistics only include apartments in buildings containing 3 or more units. This survey is undertaken twice a year. CCHC includes all advertised properties and continually

updates their survey throughout the year. Therefore, the average rental costs from these two surveys are not directly comparable. Prior experience with the CMHC survey suggests that prices for the Canmore market are grossly underestimated (due to the sampling methodology). Therefore, average rental price information from CMHC is not presented in this report.

2. While the methodology used by CMHC includes a limited sampling of Canmore's spectrum of rental properties, it is interesting to note that apartment rental vacancy rates were reported to be 0% for both October 2013 and 2014. This was reported to be the lowest vacancy rate in Canada (CMHC, 2014).

Community Initiatives

1. The Town of Canmore and Council have recognized the affordability challenges and have made affordable housing solutions a priority: 'Livable Canmore – Quality Housing in Great Neighbourhoods for All.' To move



towards the goal of having sufficient affordable, appropriate and accessible housing the community the Town has moved towards rezoning lands at the Old Daycare site and Peaks of Grassi for the development of affordable housing, launched the new Affordable Services Program in 2017, begun a process for the construction of employee housing on the 'Moustache Lands' near the Trans-Canada Highway, and more. To learn more about these programs and actions please visit the Town of Canmore's website: <https://canmore.ca/residents/livable-canmore/quality-housing-in-great-neighbourhoods-for-all>.

2. CCHC is an arms-length non-profit corporation, wholly owned by the Town of Canmore that was established in 2000 to provide housing solutions for a healthy and balanced community. CCHC has a mission to bridge Canmore's housing affordability gap with long-term options. It does this through the development and management of affordable housing properties and programs, notably the Perpetually Affordable Housing (PAH) Program. PAH is a community investment in Canmore's housing infrastructure. This investment allows CCHC to provide homes at below-market prices to eligible households. To ensure that the community's investment and the "perpetual affordability" are retained for the benefit of future residents, resale and rental price formulas are used. This means that for owners, a resale price formula indexed to inflation is used to calculate how much their home can increase in value each year, and that rents will remain at least 10% below market rates. To learn more about CCHC and their programs please visit their website (<http://canmorehousing.ca/>).



3. There are 108 PAH rental units and 44 PAH ownership units in CCHC's portfolio. An additional 49 units are planned to be built on the Old Day Care Lands. For more information on this development please see the latest news on the CCHC website (<http://canmorehousing.ca/17th-street-11th-avenue-affordable-ownership-development>) or the Town of Canmore (<https://canmore.ca/residents/livable-canmore/quality-housing-in-great-neighbourhoods-for-all/old-daycare-lands>).

4. Mountain Haven Cooperative Homes (MHCH) has 44 stacked townhouse units which are comprised of 12 non-equity (lease-to-own) units and 32 equity (for sale) units. CCHC leases land to MHCH Mountain Haven Cooperative Homes Ltd. who administer their own PAH program.
5. In 2015, CCHC published a report on the status of accessory suites in Canmore, with an examination of possible options for increasing the stock of legal rental suites. Increasing the number of accessory suites could increase the supply of affordable rental unit while facilitating entry level home ownership via the rental income provided by the suites (CCHC, 2015b).
6. Bow Valley Regional Housing (BVRH) manages social housing, seniors housing, and administers the provincial Rent Supplement Program for the communities of the Bow Valley. In the Bow Valley, BVRH houses or assists 84 residents in seniors' lodges, 62 one bedroom seniors' independent housing units, 58 family housing residences for low income families, and a rent supplement program for ~40 households who require financial assistance. The This Is Home project has constructed an additional wing for the Bow River Seniors' Lodge in Canmore with 63 new residential units (replacing 43 aging rooms and adding an additional 20 rooms). This new development is expected to be finalized in the fall of 2017 and will offer more flexibility in the level of care offered to seniors to help them remain in the community. For more information on BVRH and their projects please visit their website at: <http://www.bvrh.ca/>.





Interpretation

1. Canmore has one of the highest costs of living in Alberta, driven primarily by high housing and shelter. Following the economic crash of 2008, the average advertised rental rates mirrored the drop in the economy, decreasing through 2009, then climbing from 2010 through to 2014. The current trend of very low vacancy rates is increasing pricing while demand for rental units is very high. With the high prices and low vacancy rates, finding housing has become a central issue in the community and a limiting factor for businesses and the labour market.
2. Short term rentals (such as Airbnb or VRBO) have become increasingly popular and their impacts on long term rental markets in Canmore have not been well quantified. Some short term rentals are conducted with appropriate zoning and licensing for tourist homes or B&Bs, while others operate illegally without licenses in residential neighbourhoods. A study by McGill University (Wachsmuth et al, 2017) on the effects of short term rentals on Canada's major housing markets suggests that some neighbourhoods have seen 2-3% of the housing stock converted into short term rentals (a quantity roughly equivalent to the vacancy rate in some cities). While short term rentals can be an important income source for homeowners trying to make their mortgage payments, they may also have the unintended consequence of removing housing stock from the long term rental market which further exacerbates the existing situation of high rental prices and low vacancy rates. As of September 2017 the Town of Canmore has begun increased enforcement against unlicensed short term rental properties, to learn more about the regulations please visit: <https://canmore.ca/residents/livable-canmore/quality-housing-in-great-neighbourhoods-for-all/vacation-rentals>.
3. Attracting and retaining workers is a serious challenge for many local businesses, and housing is an important factor in this equation. A variety of options will likely be required to meet this need. Rental

properties, entry level housing, legal secondary suites, and staff housing are all part of the spectrum of housing options that may be required to meet the demand in the community.

4. Much of the market-priced ownership housing is beyond the average income for many residents in the community. This gap between income and housing prices creates challenges for both people who would like to remain in the community and for employers who would like to recruit and retain long-term staff.
5. Certain groups are most likely to be in core housing need, including: unattached individuals, single-parent families, couples with one income earner, seniors and persons with physical or mental disabilities, service industry employees, and large families with low to moderate incomes. The construction of PAH and implementation of the Canmore Housing Action Plan (CHAP) targets (Town of Canmore, 2011c) are important steps towards providing suitable housing options for many residents.

Ownership Housing – Resale Prices and Affordability

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Economy: Canmore has a diverse economy that is resilient to change	Average resale house & condo price	
Affordability: Canmore is a viable community for people of diverse socioeconomic backgrounds	Price to Income Ratio	

Real estate values are an important economic indicator with social and demographic implications. While high house prices may be an indication of high demand and a strong economy, they may also have significant implications for housing accessibility for low and middle income individuals and families. The resale prices of homes in Canmore are compiled locally and recorded in the Canmore Real Estate Industry database. However, many of the new homes are not included as builders are selling these properties directly, and not through the agencies participating in the database (private sales by the owner are also not included).


From the closing of the coal mine in 1979 through to today, Canmore has grown from a small mining town to a destination community for recreation, tourism, and mountain lifestyle. During this time, the availability and affordability of housing has become a major challenge for many residents and workers. Housing and cost of living have many socio-economic implications for the community, including the availability of workers, demographics and the retention of families and children in schools.

Observations:


Resale House and Condo Prices

1. Canmore’s real estate market saw a period of strong and sustained growth and rising prices from 1995 through to 2007. The 2007/8 global financial crisis resulted in a dramatic slowing in Canmore’s real estate market. In Canmore, sales volumes dropped sharply and prices plateaued in 2008. While there are annual fluctuations, in general, mean prices dropped sharply in 2009, and then bottomed out in 2012. Prices recovered strongly from 2013 through 2016 and continued to rise after the oil price crash of 2014. For the 5-year period from 2011 to 2016 the mean resale value (all units) rose by \$84,000 (14.6%) from \$577,000 to \$661,000. Initial data from the spring of 2017 indicates that average prices continued to rise in the early months of 2017.
2. In 2007, single family homes peaked at a mean sale price of \$915,149, dropping to \$758,000 in 2012, then recovering to \$942,000 in 2015 and \$956,000. Overall mean prices increased by 19.4% during the 5-year period from 2011 to 2016.
3. The mean price of multi-family/condo peaked at \$544,496 in 2008, falling to \$440,000 in 2012, then rising to \$520,000 in 2016. Mean prices increased by 25.0% from 2011-2016.

4. After the 2008 economic recession, median⁹ prices showed a much more steady and measured decline than mean prices from 2008-2011 (which were quite variable during that time). Median prices increased through 2015/16 and showed a 14.6% increase for the 5-year period from 2011 to 2016 (RE/MAX Alpine Realty, 2017).



Source: (RE/MAX Alpine Realty, 2017)



Source: (CMHC, 2014; CMHC, 2016a,b; RE/MAX Alpine Realty, 2017)

⁹ Median: the midpoint of all sales, which is less effected by the highest and lowest extremes of the market.

5. Similar to Canmore, many real estate markets in Canada had also shown more than a decade of sustained price increases through to 2007. In 2008/9 the global economic crisis resulted in price corrections in many markets across the country. After 2010, prices and sales volumes began to rebound in Alberta and across much of Canada as well, with most markets recovering and prices increasing through 2016. National averages for sales prices increased rapidly through 2015 and 2016 in large part due to a sharp price increase in the Greater Toronto Area, the largest market in Canada (RE/MAX Alpine Realty, 2017; CMHC, 2014, 2016a, 2016b).


Affordability of Home Ownership

1. According to the last three editions of the Citizen Satisfaction Survey, the most frequently mentioned 'Top of Mind Issue' for local residents was affordable housing. Affordable housing was mentioned by 18% of respondents in 2013, 22% of respondents in 2014 and 33% in 2017 (Ipsos Reid, 2012; Ipsos Reid, 2014; Ipsos Reid, 2017).
2. One standard measure of housing affordability is the Price-to-Income ratio (or Median Multiplier) which expresses the ratio of housing median purchase price to the number of years of median income. Typically, the 'Median Multiplier' (Price-to-Income ratio) compares median house prices to median household incomes. Unfortunately median house price information is not readily available for most markets therefore for the purposes of this report an alternative ratio has been substituted. Using available data, the ratio of average (mean) housing prices to median family income is used in this report to track affordability trends. A larger ratio (e.g. 2:1) indicates greater affordability, while a smaller ratio (e.g. 10:1) indicates lower affordability relative to income. At current interest rates a ratio of 4 or less would generally be considered affordable (median house price is 4 times median annual income). Tracking this indicator over time helps determine if the affordability gap between incomes and housing prices is growing or shrinking. Note: this ratio is similar to, but not exactly the same as the typical Price-to-Income ratio, as using mean house prices will result in greater fluctuations. More information on the Median Multiplier and international affordability trends can be found in the Demographia International Affordability Survey (Demographia, 2017).
3. From 2003 to 2007 housing prices in Canmore grew at a much faster rate than family incomes, reaching a Price-to-Income ratio of 7.6 in 2007. Lower average house prices from 2008 to 2012 brought the ratio down to 5.7 in 2012. A more active real estate market and higher prices brought the ratio back up to 6.0 in 2013 and an estimated 6.1 in 2016¹⁰. Alberta's Price-to-Income ratio has hovered near 4.0 from 2008 to 2016, while the ratio for Canada has steadily increased over the past decade in large part due to continuing price increases in major markets such as Vancouver and Toronto (GTA), reaching an estimated 6.1 in 2016, equal to the ratio in Canmore. This is a significant shift when compared to the large gap that existed in 2007 (7.6 in Canmore vs 4.6 in Canada) and highlights the major price increases that have

Vancouver and Toronto house prices increased the equivalent of annual household incomes over the last year.
Source: (Demographia, 2017)


¹⁰ Median incomes for 2016 are estimates based on estimated increases/decreases in provincial and national average weekly incomes and therefore should be treated with caution.

occurred in some Canadian markets (without a corresponding increase in wages or incomes) (RE/MAX Alpine Realty, 2017; CMHC, 2014; CMHC, 2016a,b; and Statistics Canada, 2017m).



Source: (RE/MAX Alpine Realty, 2017; CMHC, 2014; CMHC, 2016a,b; and Statistics Canada, 2017m)

- For Canmore, median values are available for both house prices and family income. Using these median values (instead of mean house price values as used for national and provincial comparison above) the Price-To-Income ratio for Canmore is slightly lower and less variable year to year. From 2011 to 2016 the ratio has ranged between 5.2 and 5.4 as both average house prices and average incomes have increased. However it is important to note that this reflects total family income (including investments and other sources) and not just employment income. So for families without significant assets that must rely solely on employment income, the affordability challenge is somewhat underestimated by this Price-to-Income ratio calculation (RE/MAX Alpine Realty, 2017; CMHC, 2014; CMHC, 2016a,b; and Statistics Canada, 2017m).



Source: (RE/MAX Alpine Realty, 2017; CMHC, 2014; CMHC, 2016a,b; and Statistics Canada, 2017m)

Interpretation

1. An extended period of economic growth in Alberta, and demand for mountain recreational properties fuelled rising real estate values in Canmore from the 1990s through to 2007. This was reflected in the rapid population increases in Canmore’s non-permanent residents, especially during the period from 2003-2007. The growth of the non-permanent population slowed considerably in 2008, corresponding with the lower prices and sales volumes. After a market correction or crash, recreational properties are typically slower to recover than markets for primary homes and Canmore’s market remained slower than ‘normal’ through 2012. Sales volumes and prices rebounded through 2014 resulting in a return to near-2007 prices and a busy market for buyers and sellers. The oil price crash in 2014 had a devastating effect on many sectors of Alberta’s economy, however real estate sales in Canmore in 2015 and 2016 were strong and average resale prices continued to increase. If the demand for properties continues, there is very little extra inventory to satisfy demand until such a time as major projects like TSMV, begin to bring more units online.


Price of Goods and Services

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend
<p>Economy: Canmore has a diverse economy that is resilient to change</p> <p>Affordability: Canmore is a viable community for people of diverse socioeconomic backgrounds</p>	<p>Spatial price index values are not comparable over time (the previous survey was in 2010), however in 2016, Canmore had the highest ranking in Alberta. Shelter costs were a major component of Canmore’s high price index.</p>

The local price of goods and services has a significant impact on many aspects of a community. It can have a profound influence on demographics, social fabric, the labour force, and the local economy. On an intermittent basis from 1977 to 2016, the Government of Alberta conducts a Spatial Price Survey which compares prices of standardized goods and services across selected communities in the province. Canmore has been included in this survey from 2001-2016. The most recent survey was conducted in 2016, with the previous survey in 2010. This ‘market basket’ of prices is aggregated into a series of indices and are then ranked relative to an index value of 100.0 in Edmonton. Costs are compared across communities via complex or aggregate indices (e.g. all-commodities index) or individual sub-aggregate indices (e.g. shelter index). It is important to note that this survey is specifically not a ‘cost-of-living’ calculation, but is simply designed to measure and report on the relative costs of a market basket of goods and services in each community.

Observations

1. A total of 35 communities (see map on the next page) across the province were surveyed for the 2016 edition of the report (note: Banff is not included in the surveyed communities). The survey was conducted in the spring of 2016, before the Fort McMurray wildfire, so rankings may not reflect price changes that have occurred as a result of the fire.
2. The all-commodities index for Canmore was higher than the baseline for Edmonton in all survey years. In 2010 and 2016, it was the highest all-commodities index value of all the communities surveyed (119.4 in 2016). This indicates that on average, overall prices were nearly 20% higher than Edmonton. The main contributing factors to Canmore’s high index value are shelter costs (which includes both rental and purchase prices), transportation costs, and, food prices (to a lesser extent).
3. In 2016 Canmore’s food index was 111.2, which ranked 3rd highest after Jasper and Fort McMurray. Within food categories, Canmore’s highest average costs were for Processed Fruits & Vegetables (124.9), and Cereals & Breads (121.9).
4. Canmore’s non-food index was 120.5, the highest in Alberta, followed by Fort McMurray and Jasper. The highest sub-indices were Shelter (140.6) and Transportation (122.0).




Source: (Alberta Government, 2016)

Interpretation

1. Affordability, particularly of housing, has been a long standing concern in Canmore. The community has been working on providing affordable housing options since the early 1990s, and more recently with the development of PAH such as Palliser Village. Finding appropriate and affordable housing remains a challenge for many, as rental costs and availability, and purchase prices are high compared to wages and average incomes.
2. Prices of goods and services, and in particular of housing, have had a significant influence on shaping Canmore's demographic profile and community fabric. Beginning in 2003, and coinciding with rapidly increasing real estate values, there was a substantial decline in the number of children and youth (ages 0-14), likely due to the out-migration of a number of families with children. In spite of the overall growth of the community, the total number of children and youth is approximately similar to 1995 levels in Canmore.
3. Higher costs in Canmore, particularly of housing, have created a number of challenges for employers, especially with regards to attracting and recruiting new employees, or with retaining employees and keeping them in the community.
4. The Spatial Price index is calculated separately than the Living Wage, but the results of this index reinforce the high values as calculated by the Living Wage. Both approaches differ from Statistics Canada's relative measures of low income (LIM and LICO) in that they take a Market Basket Measure approach to calculating the actual cost of goods and services in a community, and thereby more accurately reflect the cost of living as compared to other locations.

Figure 1: Spatial Price Index (All-Items) By Location
 Spring 2016 (Edmonton = 100)











Source: Statistics Canada, Consumer Prices Division; map by the Office of Statistics and Information, Alberta Treasury Board and Finance










Source: (Alberta Government, 2016)






Environment

“Canmore is a municipal leader in environmental stewardship”




-Town of Canmore 2016-2018 Strategic Plan Vision and Goals

Environment – 5 Year Summary			
Section	Indicator	Trend 2011-2016	Comments
Air Quality	Sulphur Dioxide		For 2012-2016, average monthly SO ₂ levels have ranged from 0.3 to 0.7 ppb, well within the air quality objective of 8 ppb.
	Ozone		From 2012-2016, average annual ozone levels have increased from 19.2 to 31.9 ppb. This trend may indicate increasing sources of emissions (such as vehicle traffic).
	Nitrogen Dioxide		For 2012-2016, average monthly NO ₂ levels have ranged from 5.0 to 5.7 ppb, well within the air quality objective of 24 ppb.
Water Consumption	Total Water Production		From 2011-2016, actual total annual water production increased by 17.4% to 2.7 million cubic meters in 2016. Based on estimated total population for 2016 this is above the ESAP goal, largely due to increases in ICI water consumption.
	Residential Water Consumption		Total residential water consumption dropped by 6.6% from 2011 to 2016. Based on estimated total population for 2016 per capita residential water consumption is below the 2015 and 2020 ESAP goals.
	ICI Water Consumption		Total ICI consumption increased by 36.0% from 2011 to 2016 and is well above the 2015 ESAP goal (note: ICI use is affected by visitation levels).
Drinking Water Quality	Drinking Water Quality		Canmore has high quality drinking water that continues to meet or exceed provincial operating regulations.
Wastewater	Wastewater Effluent Characteristics		Effluent characteristics are well within regulatory guidelines and there is no significant measurable difference in water quality above and below the WWTP discharge point (based on measured parameters).
	Ammonia Nitrogen Loading		Annual ammonia nitrogen loading to the Bow River was variable but did not show a clear trend from 2011-2016.

	Phosphorus Loading		Phosphorus loading to the Bow River decreased by 8.0% from 2011 to 2016.
Resource Conservation and Waste Management	Total Solid Waste Land Filled		From 2011 to 2016, total solid waste landfilled per capita increased from 0.46 to 0.55 T (total population). There was an increase in landfilled waste in 2013 and 2014, likely related to debris and construction waste from the flood of 2013. From 2010 to 2016 the per capita quantity landfilled has remained below the 2015 ESAP target.
	Residential and ICI Wastes Sent to Landfill		Residential and ICI waste sent to landfill also increased in 2013 and 2014 following the floods, then dropped to 0.35 T per capita (total population). Overall waste sent to landfill is up when compared to 2011, but the 2015 ESAP goal was met in 2016.
	C&D Wastes Land Filled at Francis Cooke Landfill and Resource Recovery Centre		On a per capita basis (total population) the quantity of dry waste landfilled at the Francis Cooke has remained below the 2015 ESAP goal of 0.25 T per capita for the 2011-2016 period.
	Waste Diversion Rate		The total waste diversion rate dropped from 51.0% in 2011 to 37.7% in 2016. Note: the overall diversion rate is strongly affected by the volume of construction and demolition debris that is landfilled or diverted.
Energy Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Electricity Use		Total community electricity use from 2011 to 2016 has been fairly consistent with only a 1.4% rise overall.
	Natural Gas Consumption		From 2011 to 2016 total community natural gas consumption dropped by 6.2%.
Transportation	TransCanada Hwy 1 Traffic Volumes		From 2011 to 2016, the annual average daily traffic on the Trans-Canada Highway has increased by 30.1% or 5,300 vehicles per day (17,630 to 22,930).
	Public Transit Use		Since its first full year of operation in 2013, ROAM regional ridership has nearly doubled from 58,917 riders to 110,441 riders in 2016. A local ROAM public transit system in Canmore began operations in November 2016.
Aquatic Health and Fisheries	Aquatic Health and Fisheries	n/a	In 2016 the presence of Whirling Disease was confirmed in the Bow River.
Wildlife Movement Corridors and Habitat Patches	Wildlife Corridors and Land Use	n/a	TSMV land use and corridor decisions is ongoing and awaiting a decision from the Alberta Government on wildlife corridor alignment.

	Recreational Trail Management	n/a	The Town of Canmore and its partners continue to implement the recommendations of the Human Use Management Review strategy.
	Research and Monitoring	n/a	Alberta Environment and Parks is finalizing a remote camera study of wildlife and human use in the lands around Canmore. Preliminary results show high levels of use by humans and off-leash dogs.
	Wildlife Crossing Structure Use		The Wind Valley and Stewart Creek underpasses have shown variable trends over the past 5 years with an overall decrease at Wind Valley and an overall increase at Stewart Creek.
Human/Wildlife Conflict	Bears		From 2011 to 2016 the number of human/bear conflicts has been highly variable by year, with an unusually low number of conflicts in 2013 (flood year) and two contact incidents in 2014 and 2016. Final numbers for 2017 are not yet available but there was one additional contact incident in 2017.
	Bear Deaths / Management Removals		Bear deaths/removals fluctuate on an annual basis. A total of 70 bears were killed or removed from the Bow Valley between 2011 and 2016 (a range of 2 to 19 bears per year).
	Cougars		Reported cougar conflict varied year by year from 2011 to 2016 ranging from a low of 18 to a high of 42 incidents. No human injuries or death relating to cougar conflict.
	Coyotes	n/a	No updated information is currently available. As of 2013 (most recent data) Coyote conflict had dropped substantially from the high in 2007/8.
	Ungulates	n/a	Reported incidents do occur, but are uncommon: no measurable trend.
Forest Health – Mountain Pine Beetle	Mountain Pine Beetle Affected Trees		Mountain Pine Beetle infested trees have increased dramatically from 33 in 2011 to 1,329 in 2016. Control efforts in the Bow Valley have resumed.

Air Quality

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Environment: Canmore is a municipal leader in environmental stewardship	Sulphur Dioxide	
	Ozone	
	Nitrogen Dioxide	

Threshold

To remain below the Annual Alberta Air Quality Objective for nitrogen dioxide (NO₂). Note: there are currently no Alberta objectives for ozone (O₃) or sulphur dioxide (SO₂).

Observations


- In the fall of 2012, the Calgary Regional Airshed Zone Society (CRAZ) installed a passive monitoring station (station 3 and duplicate station 3d) near Canmore. This station is one of 40 across the airshed zone and became operational in September 2012. It records Sulphur Dioxide, Ozone and Nitrogen Dioxide (SO₂, O₃ and NO₂) which are reported on a monthly basis. Results from September 2012 through 2016 indicate that average levels of NO₂ are fairly stable on an average annual basis and are well below the annual air quality objectives for Alberta. There is no specific annual objective for SO₂, but average annual levels remain low and are fairly consistent.

CRAZ - Canmore Passive Monitoring Station	Annual Averages (ppb)		
	SO ₂ *	O ₃ *	NO ₂
2012 (Sept-Nov only)	0.7	19.2	5.7
2013	0.6	24.3	5.2
2014	0.7	26.4	5.2
2015	0.3	28.5	5.2
2016	0.3	31.9	5.0
365 Day AB Objective	-	-	24

*No annual Alberta objective

Source: (CRAZ, 2017)

- Ozone is a 'secondary pollutant' created through reactions with other airborne substances (can form smog). Ozone levels have shown average monthly increases year over year from 24.3 in 2013 (the first full year of data) to 31.9 in 2016. There is no



annual air quality objective in Alberta or Canada for ozone. Typically, the largest source of ozone is vehicle exhaust. The increasing ozone levels may relate, in part, to the increasing volume of vehicles using the Trans-Canada Highway.

3. To see the passive monitoring network locations visit the CRAZ website: <http://www.craz.ca/monitoring/passive/>

Community Initiatives

1. The Calgary Regional Airshed Zone Society (CRAZ) is comprised of government agencies (federal, provincial and municipal), non-government organizations, industry and the public. The airshed approximately follows the boundary of the Alberta Health Services (including Canmore). This area represents 40% of Alberta's population. For more information visit their website at: <http://www.craz.ca/>.
2. The Bow Valley Clean Air Society (BVCAS) has been actively supporting the development of CRAZ and the passive monitoring network, and educating and advocating for air quality in the Bow Valley. For more information about their programs and activities please visit their website: <http://bowcleanair.org/>.







Interpretation

1. After 4 years and 3 months of monitoring, the results suggest that the air quality in Canmore is, on average, well within the 30 day air quality targets for sulphur dioxide and nitrogen dioxide. The annual increases in average ozone levels suggest that there are increasing sources of emissions (possibly related to the increased traffic volume on the Trans-Canada Highway and other roads). It is important to remember that this passive monitoring network is only recording 3 parameters on the basis of monthly averages. There could be other air quality concerns not captured by the monitoring (e.g. particulates) or specific episodic events that are infrequent enough to be 'masked' by the monthly averages.
2. The CRAZ passive air quality monitoring system will create more consistent and publicly accessible air quality data for the community. This is the first time that there has been regularly measured air quality data available for Canmore. In past years, Alberta Environment would conduct intermittent one day visits from a mobile monitoring vehicle which led to infrequent and inconsistent monitoring of air quality. The importance of this new monitoring network will only grow as the population and volume of vehicle use in the Bow Valley increases over time.



CRAZ Boundary from www.craz.ca

Water Consumption

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Environment: Canmore is a municipal leader in environmental stewardship	Total Water Production	
	Residential Water Consumption	
	ICI Water Consumption	
	Water System Losses	

Water conservation is an important practice as water is a finite resource, and water and wastewater treatment requires significant amounts of energy and expense. Canmore draws drinking water from the Spray Lakes Reservoir via the Rundle Forebay, and from a groundwater aquifer beneath the town. Each supplies approximately half of the total water for the town. Canmore's aquifer is very productive, however receding glaciers and potential reductions in snow pack and spring run-off highlight the importance of adaptive measures against climate change.

Threshold/Goal

The following water conservation targets are from the 2010 Environmental Sustainability Action Plan (ESAP) and include a combination of per capita and absolute reduction goals. The per capita goals are based on total population, including both the permanent and non-permanent residents in the community. Note: due to significant changes in the 2014 census count of non-permanent resident and total residents, multi-year comparisons of the per capita figures for total population should be treated with caution.

Water Consumption Goals	Reduction in Water Consumption from 2000 Levels*		
	2015	2020	2035
Total Water Production	30% per capita	40% per capita	50% per capita
Residential Water Consumption	30% per capita	40% per capita	50% per capita
ICI Water Consumption	10% total consumption	20% total consumption	30% total consumption
Water System Losses	Reduce losses to 10% or less	Maintain at 10% or less	Maintain at 10% or less

*Per capita targets based on Total Population (permanent + non-permanent)


Source: (Town of Canmore, 2010a)

Observations

Note: due to significant changes in the 2014 census count of non-permanent and total residents (Town of Canmore, 2014a) multi-year comparisons of the per capita figures for total population should be treated with caution.

Total Water Production


1. From 2011-2016, actual total annual water production increased by 17.4% to 2.7 million cubic meters in 2016. On a per capita basis (permanent population) this is equivalent to a 3.3% increase per person.
2. In 2016, the per capita total water production was 449 Litres per Capita per Day (LPCD), above the 2015 ESAP goal of 358 LPCD (per capita, total population). The increased water production is primarily related to an increase in ICI water consumption (Town of Canmore, 2017f).



Source: (Town of Canmore, 2017f)

Residential Water Consumption


1. Total residential water consumption has dropped by 6.6% from 2011 to 2016. On the basis of the permanent population, this is a decrease from 181 LPCD to 159 LPCD.
2. In terms of the total population, the average daily consumption in 2016 was 123 LPCD, well below the 2015 ESAP goal of 155 LPCD and below the 2020 ESAP goal of 133 LPCD (Town of Canmore, 2017f).



Source: (Town of Canmore, 2017f)

Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional (ICI) Water Consumption


1. The ICI sector includes all non-residential uses and targets are based on actual consumption, rather than per capita. ICI consumption is not affected by water requirements for the golf course watering, which primarily meet their water use needs from well water.
2. Actual total ICI consumption increased by 36.0% from 2011 to 2016. The annual ICI consumption was 146% above the 2015 ESAP goal (Town of Canmore, 2017f). ICI consumption can be directly impacted by levels of tourism visitation which result in higher occupancy rates in hotels, more water use, and an increased volume of laundry etc.



Source: (Town of Canmore, 2017f)

Water Distribution System – Water Loss or Authorized but Unmetered

1. A certain percentage of the water in any municipal system is unaccounted for or lost through leaks, illegal connections, malfunctioning controls, unmetered use and meter inaccuracies. Canmore’s geology poses a major challenge in locating water leaks as the water quickly disappears into the granular soils, rather than surfacing where it can be easily discovered. The ESAP goal is to reduce and maintain system losses to <10% by the year 2015. The Town of Canmore Public Works Department has recalculated these figures to reflect the data that is known: water sold or used within municipal facilities. The remaining balance is assumed to be water losses or uses for which there was no metering or revenue collected. This change in calculation methods results in higher values when compared to past calculations of strict water losses.
2. In 2016 the water loss or authorized but unmetered use was 31% with the following breakdown: repaired leaks during the year (8%), unidentified leaks (22%) and other (1% - including theft, sewer flushing, fire fighter training, temporary services, etc.). (Town of Canmore, 2017f).



Source: (Town of Canmore, 2017f)

Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative – Drinking Water Supply

1. Beginning in 2014, a group of Alberta municipalities started on the development of a benchmarking approach to compare the costs and efficiencies of a number of services that these municipalities provide. Nine Alberta municipalities (Airdrie, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, and Wetaskiwin, and the towns of Banff, Beaumont, Canmore, Cochrane, and Okotoks) participated in developing the drinking water supply report. This benchmarking report compares the infrastructure, services, efficiency, cost per unit for supply and treatment, and quantity of water used (Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative, 2017d).

Community Initiatives

1. The Town of Canmore provided \$60,000 in 2016 towards reducing water losses through water line repair and replacement and leak detection. As part of this program, leaks resulting in 8% (or 211,453 m³) of water loss in 2016 were detected and repaired.
2. A water meter replacement project (\$129,000) replaced a total of 271 meters (254 residential and 17 commercial). Meter upgrades are important to remove old or faulty meters and to better quantify known and unknown water uses and losses.


Interpretation

1. Total residential water consumption has been trending downwards since 2003. This may be due in part to the increased use of low flow appliances, showerheads, and toilets, and in part due to the mix of permanent and part-time residents which has changed over the last decade (it is assumed that part-time residents will, on average, use less water than permanent residents). Achieving additional reductions in residential water consumption will be increasingly challenging in the future and will most likely occur through incremental changes, such as continued individual efforts for conservation including low flow fixtures and toilets, and making conscious efforts to reduce individual water usage.
2. The increase in ICI water consumption from 2011 onwards is possibly related to several factors including new facilities, additional hotel construction, and is likely in a large part related to the increased visitation to the community over the past several years.
3. Aging water distribution infrastructure fails over time resulting in the increasing water losses. Reaching the goal of 10% or less annual water system losses will require further work in the area of leak detection and water line repair/replacement and the replacement of older water meters.

Recommendation

1. The sources of ICI water consumption are not well quantified, a better breakdown and understanding of this sector is required to direct efforts to best encourage conservation and meet the ESAP goals.

Drinking Water Quality

Strategic Plan Linkages	Trend	
Environment: Canmore is a municipal leader in environmental stewardship	Drinking Water Quality	

The Town of Canmore is supplied from two high quality water sources: a groundwater aquifer, and surface water from Spray Lakes via the Rundle Forebay. Both the aquifer and Rundle Forebay provide high quality input sources of water into the water treatment system. The treated water quality requirements are set by Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development (now Alberta Environment and Parks) and are different for both the groundwater and surface water sources (outlined in the table below). These requirements must be met or exceeded under the terms of the license, and violations or exceedances are very infrequent occurrences. Canmore’s water treatment and distribution is managed under contract by EPCOR since the year 2000.

Threshold/Goal

To meet or exceed Alberta Environment standards.

Observations

1. Average treated water quality parameters for 2017 are listed in the following table (see next page). EPCOR monitors approximately 75 water quality parameters and conducts over 5,000 water quality tests a year (EPCOR, 2015).
2. In 2013, there was a town-wide boil water advisory due to the serious flood event. Turbidity due to surface runoff and mudslides, combined with power failure during the flood created challenging conditions for the water treatment plant. After the flooding subsided, regular water service was restored and the advisory was lifted (EPCOR, 2014).
3. Fluoride is not added to Canmore’s municipal water supply, however, fluoride is naturally present in the local ground and surface waters. In 2016, naturally occurring fluoride levels averaged 0.13 mg/L (Pumphouse 1) and 0.12 mg/L (Pumphouse 2) (Town of Canmore, 2017f). Adding fluoride to the municipal water supply is not mandatory. Health Canada has set the guidelines for the maximum safe allowable concentration of fluoride in drinking water supplies at 1.5 mg/L (Health Canada, 2017).




Average Treated Water Quality (2016)			
Water Quality Parameters	Pumphouse #1 (Groundwater Aquifer)	Pumphouse #2 (Rundle Forebay)	
Chlorine Residual	0.77 mg/L	0.8976 mg/L	
Turbidity	0.04 NTU	0.06 NTU	
Total Hardness	171 mgCaCO3/L	156 mgCaCO3/L	
Fluoride	0.13 mg/L	0.12 mg/L	
Aluminium	<0.003 mg/L	0.20 mg/L	
pH	n/a	8	
Alberta Environment Approval Requirements	Greater than 0.5 mg/L Chlorine residual entering distribution system	99.9% (3log) reduction for Giardia	
	Greater than 0.1 mg/L Chlorine residual in distribution system	99.99% (4log) reduction for Viruses	
	Test for Bacteria in distribution system at 9 locations per month	Less than 5 NTU Turbidity in distribution system	
		Greater than 0.2 mg/L Chlorine residual entering distribution system	
		Greater than 0.05 mg/L Chlorine residual in distribution system	
		pH of treated water 6.5 - 8.5	
Test for Bacteria in distribution system at 12 locations per month			

Source: (Town of Canmore, 2017f)

Interpretation

1. The Town of Canmore and EPCOR operate a modern water treatment and distribution system that produces high quality drinking water that meets or exceeds provincial operating regulations. While there are occasional exceedances, such as the boil water advisory during the 2013 floods (EPCOR, 2014), water quality parameters are typically well within required parameters.

Wastewater

Strategic Plan Linkages	Trend	
Environment: Canmore is a municipal leader in environmental stewardship	Wastewater Effluent Characteristics	
	Ammonia Nitrogen Loading	
	Phosphorus Loading	

Wastewater collection and treatment are closely monitored to meet provincial standards. The treated effluent from Canmore’s wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) is discharged into the Bow River so it is important to ensure that it is reliably treated to the highest standards to maintain the health of the river and water quality for downstream users and the aquatic ecosystem.

Threshold/Goal

- To meet or exceed all regulatory requirements under the approval to operate the WWTP so as to minimize the impacts to the aquatic environment.
- To meet or exceed the Bow River Basin Council (BRBC) Water Quality Objectives

Observations

Wastewater Effluent Characteristics

1. While there are occasional exceedances and contraventions, the average annual effluent characteristics have generally been well below the approval limits set by Alberta Environment (Town of Canmore, 2017f). EPCOR conducts approximately 6,000 waste water tests a year relating to 10 parameters (EPCOR, 2014).
2. In 2016 there were 3 accidental releases (target value of 9) and 10 contraventions (target value of 6). Releases can occur due events such as equipment failure, construction issues, or the discharge of effluent that was not fully treated. Contraventions can occur due to a wide range of possible reasons including a blown fuse, missing samples, or not meeting an AEP effluent limit (EPCOR, 2017).

EPCOR Environmental Performance Plan - Canmore WWTP								
Activity	Actual Values							Target Value
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	
Releases	2	5	3	4	0	0	3	9
Contraventions	4	4	9	14	7	7	10	6
Proactive Activities	12	23	70	25	11	10	10	9
Regulatory Reporting	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%


Source: (EPCOR, 2017)

Average Annual Wastewater Effluent Characteristics									
Wastewater Characteristics	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Effluent Approval Limit
Total Suspended Solids (TSS) (mg/L)	5.0	5.5	6.7	6.5	7.9	7.6	6.1	7.6	< 20
Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD ₅) (mg/L)	7.0	7.0	9.0	10.0	11.0	11.0	8.0	10.0	< 20
Total Phosphorus (mg/L)	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	< 1.0
Total Ammonia Nitrogen (mg/L)	1.4	2.8	4.1	3.7	4.4	4.4 3.4	3.2 3.4	4.8 4.8	<10 (Oct-June) < 5.0 (July-Sept)
Biosolids Produced (Tonnes)	3,162	2,793	3,011	2,990	3,101	3,046	3,377	3,383	n/a

Source: (Town of Canmore, 2017f)

Total Phosphorus and Nitrogen Loading to the Bow River

- The total quantity of nutrients in the WWTP effluent (“loading”) can affect the aquatic health of the Bow River system, however, based on the available data the Town of Canmore is not predicting any significant environmental effects outside of the mixing zone where the effluent joins the river. The total quantity of nutrients discharged into the Bow River fluctuates on an annual basis. In 2016, the WWTP removed 89% of total phosphorus and 80% of total ammonia nitrogen.



Source: (Town of Canmore, 2017f)

- From 2011-2016 total nitrogen discharged in to the river was highly variable on an annual basis but was 13.4% higher in 2016 than in 2011. The Town of Canmore attributes this increase from 2015-2016 to a rise in visitation to the town. The quantity of phosphorus discharge into the Bow River is less variable than nitrogen loading, and was 8.0% lower in 2016 than in 2011 (Town of Canmore, 2017f).

Bow River Basin Council (BRBC) Objectives

- In 2013, a monitoring program to determine the effects of the WWTP effluent on the Bow River was started. Sampling occurred throughout the year, 100m upstream and 300m downstream of the WWTP discharge. The next round of sampling was conducted in 2016 after a major WWTP upgrade. The 2013 results were compared with the Bow River Basin Council (BRBC) Water Quality Objectives. Based on the 2013 data, the WWTP effluent is not resulting in a net environmental effect downstream on the Bow River:

2013 Parameter Comparison with Bow River Basin Council Water Quality Objectives			
Parameter	Upstream	Downstream	BRBC WQ Objective
Nitrate plus Nitrite (N) (mg/L)	0.084	0.111	0.267 mg/L
Total Ammonia (N) (mg/L)	<0.050	0.081	
Total Coliforms (No/100 mL)	92.5	90.8	
TSS (mg/L)	27.6	26.1	Not > 5 mg/L over background
Total Phosphorus (mg/L)	0.018	0.018	0.014 mg/L
Total Dissolved Solids (mg/L)	144	146	

Source: (Town of Canmore, 2015)

2016 Parameter Comparison with Bow River Basin Council Water Quality Objectives					
Parameter	500M Upstream	100M Upstream	100M Downstream	500M Downstream	BRBC Water Quality Objective
Nitrate plus Nitrite (N) (mg/L)	0.38	0.38	0.4	0.39	0.267 mg/L
Total Ammonia (N) (mg/L)	0.1	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04 mg/L
E. coli (CFU/100 mL)	1	2	3	1	No single value to exceed 400 <i>E.coli</i> /100 mL or <200 <i>E. coli</i> /100 mL
Total Phosphorus (mg/L)	0.003	0.003	0.007	0.004	0.014 mg/L
Total Organic Carbon (mg/L)	0.58	0.67	0.74	1	Should not exceed 3.0 mg/L

Source: (Town of Canmore, 2017f)

- The 2016 monitoring results were conducted in 2 additional upstream and downstream locations. The upstream and downstream sites showed no significant difference for most of the measured water

quality parameters. In 2013, Nitrate-N was slightly higher downstream of the WWTP, but in 2016 both upstream and downstream showed very similar values (Town of Canmore, 2017f).


Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative – Wastewater

1. Beginning in 2013, a group of Alberta municipalities started on the development of a benchmarking approach to compare the costs and efficiencies of a number of services that these municipalities provide. Six Alberta municipalities (Airdrie, Banff, Canmore, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat and Okotoks) participated in developing the wastewater report. Eight different comparisons were examined, in general, Canmore is roughly within the average with regards to costs on a \$ per unit basis for most of the measures. Biosolid processing costs and residential wastewater bills were the exception, in large part due to costs resulting from the higher water content in the biosolids (lower % solids). The biosolids dewatering equipment is scheduled for replacement in 2018 which will result in a higher % of solids in the final product and will lower handing costs for biosolids in the future. (Town of Canmore, 2017g, Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative, 2017b).

Key Wastewater Benchmarking Measures

- Total Wastewater System Costs (\$/ML) – by process type (collection, treatment and biosolids)
- Total Wastewater System Costs (\$/ML) – by cost type (Amortization, overhead, direct or indirect)
- Collection Costs (\$/Km of collection pipe)
- Treatment Costs (\$/ML)
- Biosolids Processing Costs (\$/dry tonne)
- Amortization Cost (\$/ML)
- Power Consumed (kWh/ML collected)
- Residential Wastewater Bill (\$/19 m3/month)


Sample Municipal Benchmarking Initiative Measure: Total Wastewater Costs - Efficiency



Source: (Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative, 2017b)

Community Initiatives





1. The program of monitoring water quality parameters above and below WWTP effluent discharge point began in 2013 and was repeated in 2016 following a major upgrade to the WWTP. This sampling helps quantify Canmore's impact on the health of the Bow River.
2. Extensive upgrades to the WWTP were completed in 2016, including a new solids handling program that will hopefully result in continuous improvement of the effluent characteristics.
3. To better educate the public on the challenges of waste water management, the Town of Canmore created the humorous Epic Poo Race education campaign. "Flush The Right Stuff" encourages residents to be mindful of what they flush down their toilets due to the difficulties many substances and items can create for the WWTP system. See the full series of cartoons at: <https://canmore.ca/residents/municipal-services/waste-management-recycling/the-epic-poo-race>.



Interpretation

1. Although there are occasional issues and exceedances, Canmore's WWTP is a modern, recently upgraded facility that continues to operate well within the approval limits set by Alberta Environment. Continued tracking of the actual quantity of nutrients (e.g. N and P) released into the Bow River system, and the Bow River monitoring program (above and below the effluent discharge) will help to better quantify the impact of Canmore's wastewater on the health of the Bow River.
2. Leakage into the system, through damaged or aged infrastructure (such as clay tiles in South Canmore) is a major contributor to the fluctuations in the quantity of wastewater that is treated and released into the Bow River. Treating this extra effluent flow requires additional energy use, and contributes to higher costs for running the WWTP facility.

Resource Conservation and Waste Management

Strategic Plan Linkages	Trend	
Environment: Canmore is a municipal leader in environmental stewardship	Total Solid Waste Landfilled	
	Residential and ICI Wastes Sent to Calgary Area Landfills	
	C&D Wastes Land Filled at Francis Cooke Landfill and Resource Recovery Centre	
	Total Waste Diversion Rate	

The Environmental Sustainability Action Plan (ESAP) set new goals and strategies for moving towards zero waste by reducing, reusing, and recycling materials. In ESAP, Total Solid Waste is comprised of the following waste streams¹¹:

- ICI – (Industrial, Commercial, Institutional) waste sent to Calgary area (Class II) landfills
- Residential waste sent to Calgary area landfills
- C&D (Construction and Demolition) waste sent to the Francis Cooke (Class III) Landfill and Regional Recovery Centre (east of Exshaw)

The Town of Canmore is a member of the Bow Valley Waste Management Commission (BVWMC). The Commission operates The Francis Cooke Regional Class III Landfill and Regional Recovery Center and works with member municipalities to achieve their waste reduction objectives.

Threshold/Goal

ESAP Goals & Targets:	Waste Landfilled (tonnes/person/year*) to:		
	2015	2020	2035
Total Solid Waste Land Filled	0.60	0.45	0.30
Residential and ICI Wastes Sent to Landfill	0.35	0.30	0.20
C&D Wastes Land Filled at Francis Cooke Landfill	0.25	0.15	0.10
*based on total population (permanent + non-permanent)			

Source: (Town of Canmore, 2010a)

The ESAP goals and targets were developed to ensure that the total volume of waste being land filled decreases over time, while accounting for population growth in the community. The per capita goals

¹¹ Alberta Environment defines 3 classes of waste streams for landfills: Class I, or hazardous waste landfill, Class II, or non-hazardous waste landfill, and Class III, or inert waste landfill

are based on total population, including both the permanent and non-permanent residents in the community.


Observations

Note: due to significant changes in the 2014 census count of non-permanent resident and total residents, multi-year comparisons of the per capita figures for total population should be treated with caution.

Note: In 2015 there was a serious fire at the Francis Cooke Landfill, some data for June to September of 2015 is not available.

Total Solid Waste Land Filled

1. The 2015 ESAP goal of reducing total solid waste landfilled to 0.60 T per person per year (on a per capita basis total population) was achieved in 2009. Total solid waste landfilled increased somewhat in 2013 and 2014, possibly due to debris and damage from the 2013 floods. By 2016, the total waste land filled per capita (total population) had trended down slightly to 0.56 T, and remains below the 2015 ESAP target (Town of Canmore, 2017f).




Source: (Town of Canmore, 2017f)

Residential and ICI Waste Sent to Landfill

1. This waste stream is largely composed of residential and pedestrian waste collected from the bear bins, and commercial (e.g. restaurant) waste collected from businesses. This includes residential waste collected by the Town of Canmore and commercial waste collected by private contractors. Currently, this waste is shipped to the West Dried Meat Lake Landfill. Prior to 2012 it was sent to


Calgary area landfills. As with the total waste landfilled, there was a spike in tonnage for 2013 through 2014. This is likely due to the aftermath of the 2013 floods. The 2015 ESAP goal is 0.35 T of waste landfilled per capita (total population). In 2016, there was 0.35 T of waste per capita (total population) sent to the landfill (Town of Canmore, 2017f).




Source: (Town of Canmore, 2017f)

C&D Waste Land Filled at Francis Cooke Landfill (Dry Waste)

1. The quantity of Construction and Demolition (C&D) waste sent to and landfilled at the Francis Cooke Class III Landfill and Resource Recovery Center (www.bvwaste.ca) is highly variable, fluctuating with the level of building and/or demolition underway in the town of Canmore. Note: this waste stream also includes materials such as scrub & brush, and the municipal large item clean-up.
2. The quantity of C&D waste landfilled at the Francis Cooke Landfill dropped off sharply in 2008-2009, closely mirroring the drop in construction activity in Canmore. The 2013 Alberta floods and increased construction activity resulted in an increased quantity of debris (clean up, demolition, renovation, etc.) in 2013 and 2014. In spite of the increased material from the flood damage, the per capita waste landfilled (total population) has remained below the 2015 ESAP goal (0.25 T) for the period from 2010 to 2016. 2016 the quantity of waste landfilled per capita (total population) was 0.19 T, (Town of Canmore, 2017f). The Francis Cooke has been able to assist Canmore in meeting their ESAP goals through the recycling and diversion efforts at the Landfill and Resource Recovery Center.



Source: (Town of Canmore, 2017f)




Source: (Town of Canmore, 2017f)

Total Waste Generation and Diversion

1. In 2001, only 18.6% of Canmore’s total waste stream was diverted from the landfill. With increased recycling and diversion efforts this proportion quickly increased to 50.4% in 2005. In 2009, there was a sudden change in the total quantity of waste and the diversion rate due to the rapid drop in C&D waste which had, in some years, accounted for half or more of Canmore’s total waste stream. The total diversion rate increased from 37.6% in 2009 to 49.4% in 2014, dropping to 37.7% in 2016 (Town of Canmore, 2017f).

Waste Characterization Study



Source: (Town of Canmore and Town of Banff, 2017b)

1. The Waste Characterization Study was undertaken by the Town of Canmore to better understand the composition of the waste stream generated by the community, and get a breakdown of materials and seasonal fluctuations. The study reviewed residential and commercial waste only (not construction materials). Seasonally, most of the waste streams did not show much variation, with the exceptions of yard waste during spring and summer and mixed paper following the Christmas season (these materials are all accepted for recycling or composting in the town and are not supposed to be disposed of in the waste bins). Only 21% of the waste analyzed was strictly ‘waste’. Organic material (not including yard waste) averaged 37%, which is similar to the provincial average for other municipalities and presents a significant opportunity to reduce waste sent to landfill via organics diversion and composting programs. The remainder of the waste stream was composed of small proportions of materials that can be recycled or diverted (including 1% hazardous waste) (Town of Canmore and Town of Banff, 2017b).


Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative – Solid Waste

- Beginning in 2013, a group of Alberta municipalities started on the development of a benchmarking approach to compare the costs and efficiencies of a number of services that these municipalities provide. Seven Alberta municipalities (Airdrie, Banff, Canmore, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Okotoks, Red Deer) participated in developing the solid waste report. Based on the community comparisons, Canmore general on the higher end with regards to costs on a \$ per unit basis. This is due to several key and unusual factors about Canmore’s solid waste management system including: animal proof waste and recycling bins providing 24/7 access for residents, 7 day a week operations to empty the animal proof bins, the new enhanced recycling service including the new Waste Management Centre and the installation of 80 Beyond Curbside recycling containers. Of the comparison communities, Canmore had the 2nd highest diversion rate, which adds an additional cost to the total system (Town of Canmore, 2017h, Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative, 2017c).

Key Solid Waste Benchmarking Measures

- Total cost to operate a Solid Waste Service Department
- Combined collection cost for garbage and recycling
- Cost for handling and marketing recyclables
- Cost for handling and disposing of garbage
- Labour costs
- Contracted services cost
- Amortization costs
- Diversion rates
- Accuracy of curbside pickups (where applicable)
- Services provided

Sample Benchmarking Measure: Solid Waste Total Costs - Efficiency



Source: (Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative, 2017c)

Community Initiatives

- The Town of Canmore adopted a Towards Zero Waste Events Policy in 2010. The policy requires that designated special events prepare a plan to divert a minimum of 70% of the waste generated at the event and document the level of success achieved (Town of Canmore, 2010b). To achieve this goal special events in Canmore often request the assistance and/or equipment from the Bow Valley Waste



Management Commission's Toward Zero Waste (TZW) service. In 2014, BVWaste received a SHIFT Sustainability Award in Jackson Hole, WY for the implementation of the TZW program (BVWMC, 2015).

2. The Towns of Canmore and Banff hosted the 2014 Alberta Winter Games. BVWaste's Toward Zero Waste (TZW) program and Canmore's Toward Zero Waste Policy were important elements in this effort. A diversion rate of 82% (2.9 T diverted) was achieved through the Games' TZW effort. More details are available in the final report published by the Games' Sustainability Advisory Committee (Alberta Winter Games Environmental Sustainability Advisory Committee, 2014)
3. The Town of Canmore is a member of, and works in partnership with, the BVWMC. In addition to any goals that an individual community may set for itself, the BVWMC promotes the following diversion goals:
 - A landfill annual diversion goal of 70% by weight for the overall waste resource stream is promoted to our member communities.
 - A Class III annual landfill diversion goal of 70% for construction waste resources is mandated (BVWMC, 2008).
4. In 2016, Council passed the Recyclables and Waste Disposal Bylaw which banned recyclables from being disposed of garbage containers. The 'Beyond Curbside Recycling Program' (Enhanced Recycling) makes recycling easier by reducing the number of collection streams from six to three and by making the collection methods as 'close to curbside' as possible. As of 2016, there are 83 newly installed Beyond Curbside collection containers and two depot facilities that provide opportunities for waste diversion and recycling. The program is designed to be convenient for residents and to increase diversion rates but it does require additional collection (7 days a week) and management by Town staff (Town of Canmore, 2017f).

Interpretation

1. The total quantity of waste materials generated is strongly affected by the quantity of C&D waste. Any increase or decrease in construction or demolition in the town changes the rate of waste generation and could overshadow small changes in residential waste and recycling. In 2008 and 2009, the slowdown in construction significantly decreased the total quantity of waste, while the floods of 2013 resulted in increased disposal of debris and new construction and renovation waste. The cooperation of the construction industry and the waste diversion efforts at the Francis Cooke Landfill and Resource Recovery Centre are key in reducing the quantity of C&D waste that is buried in the landfill.
2. Although bear proof garbage bins have been effective at reducing bear/garbage incidents, they are also commonly misused for inappropriate waste disposal. Residential garbage bins often contain lots of recyclables as well as construction or other debris. It is possible that disposing of material in the bear bin is an easy and anonymous way to get rid of it, instead of recycling materials in the appropriate fashion or properly disposing of materials (e.g. old furniture) at the Francis Cooke Landfill and Resource Recovery Centre. It is hoped that the community will appropriately use the new Beyond Curbside bins, which will help to reduce operational costs while increasing recycling and waste diversion.

Energy Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Strategic Plan Linkages	Trend	
Environment: Canmore is a municipal leader in environmental stewardship	Electricity Use	
	Natural Gas Consumption	

Threshold/Goal

The 2010 ESAP recommends the use of absolute reduction targets instead of intensity based (per capita) targets. Intensity based targets are useful for tracking improvements in energy efficiency, however they still allow overall emissions to increase, while absolute targets focus on reducing total emissions.

Target Year	ESAP Goals & Targets
2015	Stabilize community CO ₂ emissions with no further increases in absolute emissions even with population growth (tonnes CO ₂ e/yr ¹²)
2020	Reduce community CO ₂ emissions to 2007 levels (tonnes CO ₂ e/yr)
2050	Reduce community CO ₂ emissions by 50 % from 2007 levels (tonnes CO ₂ e/yr)


Source: (Town of Canmore, 2010a)

Observations


Note: The Town of Canmore is currently working on an updated energy use and emissions inventory. This inventory is compiling more detailed and comprehensive emissions data and calculations. As this project is currently underway, the only information that will be presented in the Community Monitoring Report are the two primary data sources that are currently available: electricity use and natural gas consumption. These consumption statistics will not be converted to CO₂e nor directly compared to the ESAP goals.

1. Total community electricity use from 2011 to 2016 has been fairly consistent with only a 1.4% rise in kwh consumed during the 5-year period. There was a slight spike in use in 2012, however emissions dropped again in 2013 (the reason for this 1 year spike in use is not known).
2. From 2011 to 2016 total community natural gas consumption dropped by 6.2% or almost 85,000 GJ. Natural gas consumption is highly weather dependent and variable by the season as the primary use in Canmore is for heating residences and buildings.
3. Based on the high levels of estimated emissions from occasionally occupied second homes in Aspen (Heede, 2007), it appears that there could be a need and an opportunity to engage Canmore's non-permanent residents in reducing their energy use and GHG emissions. The energy and GHG impacts of Canmore's second homes has not been quantified, but is likely to be quite substantial due to the high proportion of non-permanent residents and vacation homes.

¹² CO₂e refers to the equivalent amount of CO₂ produced and emitted.



Source: (Fortis Alberta, 2017)



Source: (Atco Gas, 2017)

Community Initiatives

1. The Town of Canmore has installed solar powered hot water systems at Elevation Place, the Recreation Centre, Fire Hall, Public Works, and the Civic Centre. A photovoltaic (PV) solar electric system is installed on the Canmore Senior’s Centre over the Biosphere Institute’s offices. The Town received the Solar Thermal Project of the Year Award from the Canadian Solar Industries Association for the installation at Elevation Place. In 2017, the Town of Canmore installed 192 solar panels on the roof of the Civic Centre, designed to offset 18% of the buildings electricity requirements. Future expansion of the project is planned for 2018.
2. Sustainable Action Canmore (SAC) is a joint program of the Biosphere Institute and the Town of Canmore. It includes specific actions that residents can take to move the community towards

sustainability (energy use, water, waste, recycling, and more). To learn more about the program please visit the Biosphere Institute's website at: http://biosphereinstitute.org/activities/#!/mg_id=549 Residents are encouraged to share their sustainable actions via the Small Steps campaign. Check out photos of locals and what Small Steps they chose at: <http://biosphereinstitute.org/small-steps/>.



3. In part due to its work on SAC, the Biosphere Institute was awarded a 2014 SHIFT Sustainability Award, which recognized the most effective, innovative conservation and sustainability initiatives currently underway in communities in North America. SAC was featured at the SHIFT Conference in Jackson Hole, Wyoming.
4. For the past three years the Town of Canmore has offered a \$1,250 Solar Incentive Program for residents installing solar systems on their homes. A total of 8 grants are available in 2017. More information on the program is available at: <https://canmore.ca/latest-articles/canmore-solar-initiative>.



Interpretation

1. Given the growth of Canmore from 2011 to 2016, the construction of additional facilities (e.g. Elevation Place) and the increase in visitation, the fairly steady rate of electricity use is encouraging as this indicates that use is holding fairly steady even though potential demands have increased. It is not clear what key increases in efficiency or conservation may have occurred to reduce demand. It is possible that a combination of education, conservation efforts, conversion to more efficient technologies and products and/or the growing popularity in solar panels may each have contributed.
2. This summary only includes direct emissions from natural gas consumption and electricity generation. Fuel consumption statistics on the community level to calculate transportation impacts are not currently available. Vehicle use has been identified as a major local source of both GHG emissions and air pollution (Alberta Environment, 2008). Developing transportation alternatives, reducing vehicle use, and reducing idling will have the combined benefits of improving air quality and reducing GHG emissions. This creates a major data gap in the GHG emissions inventory, however it would be difficult to accurately determine emissions associated with transportation.
3. There are also a number of other direct and indirect sources of GHG emissions, including landfills, manufacturing, food production etc. that are not included in this indicator. Following the 3 R's (Reduce, Reuse, Recycle) and increased composting of organic waste materials would help reduce the community's overall emissions and environmental impact.
4. The ESAP goal of stabilizing total community emissions by 2015 is a challenging target but it appears that fairly steady electricity use over the past five years and a slight decrease in natural gas consumption are both a positive direction towards meeting the ESAP goals. Additional development, population growth and increasing tourist visitation will all push emissions higher, making meeting the future targets a significant challenge.

Transportation


Strategic Plan Linkages	Trend	
Environment: Canmore is a municipal leader in environmental stewardship	Trans-Canada Highway Traffic Volume	
	Public Transit Use	

Transportation has an impact on the community's quality of life, noise and pollution levels. Transportation has strong linkages to both air quality and GHG emissions and energy use. Transportation options and alternatives are also a major component of the 'liveable community' described in the Mining the Future Vision.

Observations

Trans-Canada Highway Traffic Volume


1. Based on Alberta Transportation's traffic volume counts, for the 5-year period from 2011 to 2016, the annual average daily traffic on Highway 1 (the Trans-Canada Highway) has increased by 30.1% or 5,300 vehicles per day (17,630 to 22,930) (Alberta Transportation, 2017).



Source: (Alberta Transportation, 2017)

Public Transit

1. Regional ROAM bus service between Banff and Canmore began in December 2012. The ROAM bus is operated by the Bow Valley Regional Transit Service ([www. http://roamtransit.com/](http://roamtransit.com/)). In 2013, the first full year of operation there were 58,917 riders, which has nearly doubled to 110,441 riders in 2016 (BVRTSC, 2017).



Source: (BVRTSC, 2017)

Community Initiatives

1. Local bus transit was launched in Canmore in November, 2016 with two months of fare free travel for residents and visitors. The service is in its first year of operation and has initially averaged about 6,000 riders per month. Adjustments to routes, stops and schedules are ongoing during 2017 as the new system is being adjusted to best serve the community. To see fare information and route maps, please visit the ROAM Canmore Local Route 5 at: <http://roamtransit.com/schedules-routes/canmore-local-route-five/>.
2. As part of the Calgary Regional Partnership, a new On-It (<http://onitregionaltransit.ca/>) weekend bus service between Calgary and Canmore/Banff was launched as a pilot service in the summer of 2017 for the Canada 150 celebrations. Tickets were \$10 each way and include free transfer to the local ROAM bus service and connections to free Parks Canada shuttles.
3. The paved multi-use Rocky Mountain Legacy Trail from Banff to the Banff Park East Gate was completed in 2010. A further extension all the way to Canmore was completed in 2013. Expanded parking is available at the Travel Alberta Centre in Canmore. As of 2017 planning is underway for an extension of the Legacy Trail through the existing pathway system in Canmore and along newly configured pathways to the Canmore Nordic Centre. The Legacy Trail has proven to be very popular with residents and visitors alike. During its first 7 years the trail has been used by over 590,000 people from the Canmore trailhead. An online eco-counter of trail use is available at: <http://legacytrail.canmore2.visio-tools.com/>
4. The Town of Canmore completed an Integrated Transportation Plan (ITP) in 2014. The Plan considers the entire transportation network, including the walking and cycling network for active transportation. Town Council accepted the ITP for planning purposes in January 2015 (with amendments). The ITP envisions Canmore as Alberta's premier walking and cycling community with a goal of 30% sustainable commuting modes by 2020 (Town of Canmore and HDR Corporation, 2014). The Town of Canmore has added additional bike laneways, main street reconfiguration at Policeman's Creek, and additional on-road signage as part of the move towards a more bike friendly community.

Roam

5. The Town of Canmore also launched the Bike Canmore (<http://bikecanmore.ca/>) website in 2014. Bike Canmore creates awareness about cycling in Canmore and aims to promote Canmore as the most bicycle friendly town in Alberta. The website features information about riding in Canmore, maps & guides, recent news and a list of the bike friendly amenities in town.



Interpretation

1. Motorized vehicle use (both highway and in-town) is a major contributor to GHG emissions and air pollution in Canmore. Regional public bus service between Canmore and Banff and local bus service in the town, reduces the need to rely on private vehicles, which is a net environmental and air quality gain. It is also a significant social and economic linkage as it facilitates commuter traffic and both inter and intra-community travel for those who do not have their own vehicle.
2. Over the past few years significant upgrades have been made to the urban and inter-urban infrastructure. These paved trails have proved popular with a wide variety of non-motorized users including cyclists, roller-skiers, and pedestrians. The addition of the underpass under the highway is has greatly increase connectivity and reduced the frequency of hazardous crossings of the Trans-Canada Highway.

Aquatic Health and Fisheries

Strategic Plan Linkages	Trend	
Environment: Canmore is a municipal leader in environmental stewardship	Aquatic Health and Fisheries	In 2016 the presence of Whirling Disease was confirmed in the Bow River.

A goal of the 2006 Mining the Future document is to maintain the biodiversity and ecological integrity of the Bow Valley ecosystem. This includes maintaining aquatic health in the region. As with the surrounding forest ecosystem, the local aquatic system has been heavily influenced by human activities. These include fishing, the introduction of non-native species, the construction of hydroelectric facilities, and the discharge of wastewater facility effluent and storm water run-off into the system.

Threshold

The 2010 Environmental Sustainability Plan (ESAP) discusses potential targets relating to aquatic ecosystem health, but indicated that they would likely be difficult and/or expensive to implement. Therefore the ESAP recommended ongoing participation and collaboration with the Bow River Basin Council (BRBC). Currently, there are limited information sources available for metrics of aquatic ecosystem health.


Observations

State of the Watershed

1. The Bow River Basin Council (BRBC) maintains a State of the Watershed reporting website (<http://watershedreporting.ca/>). The website contains a wealth of descriptive information about the watershed and each sub-basin. There is limited data available for water quality and ecosystem health indicators for the Upper Bow River sub-basin, however the BRBC does report on two water quality objectives for this sub-basin:
 - River Flow Quantity Index – Within Normal (natural average flow regime can be expected to occur around 90% of the time). Note: some river reaches further downstream are rated as ‘Diminished Outside of Natural’ due to intensive water use.
 - Algae – Natural. Below the algae threshold 47 mg/m² (maximum value during open water season) for the Upper Bow River sub-basin.
2. For more information about the indicators and objectives for the Bow River, please see the Bow Basin Watershed Management Plan (<http://www.brbc.ab.ca/our-activities/bow-basin-watershed-management-plan>)

Fish and Fish Habitat

1. There are 20 species of fish in the Bow Valley, 10 of these are non-native (BRBC, 2010). Of these fish species, two are of special concern. The Westslope Cutthroat Trout are classified as 'Threatened'¹³. The Bull Trout is considered a 'Species of Special Concern'¹⁴ in Alberta (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2014). The sustainability of the Bull Trout population has been ranked by the Bull Trout Fish Sustainability Index (FSI). The historic adult density of Bull Trout in the portion of the watershed near Canmore was considered to have been of 'High' FSI, but as of 2014 is categorized as 'Very Low'. For more information about the Bull Trout FSI please visit: <http://aep.alberta.ca/fish-wildlife/fisheries-management/fish-sustainability-index/fsi-species-maps/bull-trout-fsi.aspx>
2. The primary threats to Bull Trout populations were noted as land use and urbanization, loss of riparian cover, vehicle access and sport fishing, increasing summer temperatures, and unusual weather events (floods, heat waves, droughts, etc.) which can cause local summerkills, habitat damage, and loss of flows (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2015a).
3. The Alberta Westslope Cutthroat Trout Recovery Plan identifies the following key threats to Alberta's Cutthroat Trout population: invasive species (including hybridization with non-native trout), habitat degradation, pollution, consumptive use/mortality, and climate change impacts (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2013).
4. The Southern Alberta Fisheries Habitat Enhancement and Sustainability (FISHES) Program is a 3 year program designed to restore degraded habitat following the 2013 floods and to enhance affected habitat creating greater resiliency to possible future high flow events. For more information please visit the FISHES website at: <http://aep.alberta.ca/water/programs-and-services/2013-flood-recovery-programs/southern-alberta-fisheries-habitat-enhancement-and-sustainability-program/default.aspx>



Amphibians

1. Long-Toed Salamanders are classified as Species of Special Concern¹⁴ in Alberta. The species has a limited habitat range in this region and is primarily restricted to the river valleys in the Rocky Mountains and the foothills. The species is primarily terrestrial, but depends on ponds for breeding. In 2016 the Government of Alberta released an updated Long-Toed Salamander Conservation Management Plan (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2016a). The Management Plan notes that human activity around the breeding ponds, past events such as draining water features and development around ponds have negatively impacted habitat and local populations of these salamanders. AEP biologists and volunteers are conducting on-going surveys and research in the Bow Valley and Kananaskis to better understand the distribution of the species, the effects of human activities and potential after-effects of the 2013 flood. For more information on the status of the Long Toed

¹³ Threatened – A species likely to become endangered if limiting factors are not reversed.

¹⁴ Species of Special Concern - A species of special concern because of characteristics that make it particularly sensitive to human activities or natural events.

Salamander in Alberta please visit: <http://aep.alberta.ca/fish-wildlife/wild-species/amphibians/salamanders/long-toed-salamander.aspx>.

2. The Western Toad is another local amphibian of concern in the Bow Valley (it is classified as a Sensitive species in Alberta). It is found primarily in the boreal forest in western and central Alberta and subalpine environments throughout the Rocky Mountains. Populations have been noted as being in decline elsewhere. As with the Long-Toed Salamander, AEP biologists and volunteers are conducting on-going surveys and research in the Bow Valley to better understand the local population of this species. For more information about the Western Toad and it's status in Alberta please visit: <http://aep.alberta.ca/fish-wildlife/wild-species/amphibians/toads/western-toad.aspx>


Aquatic Invasive Species

1. Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) are a growing concern in the Bow River basin and throughout Alberta. The Government of Alberta has increased monitoring, education and enforcement efforts. This includes educational signage placed at water access points throughout the Bow Valley and Kananaskis. Inspection and enforcement activities on the Trans-Canada Highway (TCH) have also been active, with a mandatory watercraft inspection station located on the TCH between Highway 40 and Cochrane. The initial focus of the province's AIS program has been on zebra mussels and quagga muscles due to their rapid expansion across North America and the significant economic and environmental impacts of the muscles. To learn more about the on-going science and research around AIS please visit: <http://www.albertaparks.ca/albertaparksca/science-research/aquatic-invasive-species/>
2. The Alberta Water Council published a report in 2016 on Recommendations to Improve Aquatic Invasive Species Management in Alberta. Key recommendations include prevention, increasing public awareness, monitoring, watercraft inspections, and enforcement (Alberta Water Council, 2016)

Whirling Disease

1. Whirling disease is an infectious disease (Myxobolus cerebralis a protozoan) affecting finfish such as trout, salmon, and whitefish. The disease is not a risk to human health, but can cause high rates of mortality (90%+) in the younger life stages of susceptible fish. The presence of Whirling disease was confirmed in Johnson Lake in Banff National Park in 2016 by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA). This is the first case of whirling disease confirmed in Canada. Parks Canada restricted access to Johnson Lake to reduce the spread of this disease. Subsequent testing through 2016 and 2017 has identified Whirling disease in the Bow River and other watersheds in southern Alberta. For more information about Whirling disease in Alberta please visit the AEP or Banff National Park websites:

- Alberta Environmental Protection: <http://aep.alberta.ca/fish-wildlife/wildlife-diseases/whirling-disease/default.aspx>
- Banff National Park: <https://www.pc.gc.ca/en/pn-np/ab/banff/info/gestion-management/enviro/aqua/lac-johnson-lake>



2. A current map of the status of Whirling Disease in Alberta (August 16, 2017) shows positive detections confirmed by the CFIA in the Bow River-Ghost Reservoir between Canmore and Cochrane. For the full map please see: <http://aep.alberta.ca/fish-wildlife/wildlife-diseases/whirling-disease/documents/Whirling-AIS-DecontaminationRiskZoneMap-Aug16-2017.pdf>
3. Alberta Environment and Parks is actively educating and informing the public about what they can do to help stop the spread of Whirling Disease. The 'Stop The Spread' program promotes best practices and provides decontamination protocols for watercraft, waders, and other equipment (<http://aep.alberta.ca/fish-wildlife/wildlife-diseases/whirling-disease/stop-the-spread.aspx>)



Community Initiatives

1. Originally founded in 2006 following the release of the Water for Life strategy, the Alberta WaterPortal (<http://albertawater.com/>) received charitable status in 2014. The WaterPortal provides research, community engagement and education to improve knowledge about water in Alberta. Their website provides a wide array of information about water uses, governance of the resource and planning for future conditions including floods and climate change impacts.
2. The Government of Alberta has produced a series of educational materials including STOP THE SPREAD and CLEAN, DRAIN, DRY detailing best practices to combat the spread of AIS and Whirling disease. For additional information please visit the AEP website at: <http://aep.alberta.ca/fish-wildlife/invasive-species/aquatic-invasive-species/default.aspx> or <http://aep.alberta.ca/fish-wildlife/wildlife-diseases/whirling-disease/stop-the-spread.aspx>.




Interpretation

1. The aquatic system of the Bow River and native fish species are sensitive to disturbances. Improving and maintaining water quality and riparian health is important to restore ecological integrity to this system. A focus on reducing the nutrient levels of effluent from Bow Valley waste water treatment facilities is helping to return the Bow River to more natural water conditions.
2. Over the past several decades aquatic invasive species (AIS) have become an increasing concern in Alberta and across North America. Compared to some more populated and heavily used water sheds the Upper Bow River Basin remains relatively free of major economic and ecological impacts from AIS. Continued, monitoring, education, watercraft inspections, and enforcement will all be important components of reducing the spread and impact of AIS in the watershed. In particular the actions of

individuals will be critical in reducing the spread of AIS. Proper cleaning and drying of fishing equipment, watercraft, OHVs and other equipment is very important to avoid transferring AIS between water bodies.

3. The discovery of Whirling disease in the Bow River watershed in 2016/17 is very concerning and has the potential for serious impacts on local trout and whitefish populations. The full extent of the infestation is not yet fully understood and, based on continued survey results, it is likely to be widespread throughout neighbouring watersheds in Southern Alberta. This is an ongoing and developing issue throughout 2016 and 2017 and it is expected that more information and strategies to deal with Whirling disease will be developing in the coming years.

Wildlife Movement Corridors and Habitat Patches

Strategic Plan Linkages	Trend	
Environment: Canmore is a municipal leader in environmental stewardship	Wildlife Corridors and Land Use	Wildlife corridor and other land use decisions in Three Sisters are pending.
	Wildlife Crossing Structure Use	

Introduction

The network of wildlife movement corridors and habitat patches in and around Canmore serve as important connectors for wildlife moving between Banff National Park and Kananaskis Country and for cross-valley movements within the Bow Valley. Corridors also allow for the optimization of local habitat utilization. The Bow Valley is a key linkage between these regional habitat areas and the greater Yellowstone to Yukon (Y2Y) region.


Threshold

That the wildlife corridors and habitat patches remain viable for multiple species of wildlife endemic to the Bow Valley. This threshold can be further defined using these guidelines for corridor functionality:

1. There is no long term decline (recognizing annual variation) in target wildlife species use of habitat within the wildlife corridor, provided those species continue to be present in the surrounding habitat patches.
2. Target wildlife species are recorded moving through the entire length of the designated along-valley wildlife corridors and through various across-valley corridors.
3. Direction of wildlife travel generally coincides with wildlife corridor orientation.
4. There is no evidence that wildlife movement within the designated wildlife corridor is significantly constrained or prevented by biophysical features.
5. There is no evidence of a "filtering" effect wherein only certain individuals use the corridor, but others do not.


(ASRD, 2008)

Wildlife Corridors and Habitat Patches in the Bow Valley – BCEAG 2012



Source: (BCEAG, 2012)

Wildlife Corridors and Habitat Patches MDP – 2012



Source: (Town of Canmore, 2016e)

Observations

The following summarizes recent changes to the wildlife corridor and habitat patch network in and around the Town of Canmore.

Corridors and Land Use

1. Guidelines for designing and maintaining functional wildlife corridors were outlined by the Bow Corridor Ecosystem Advisory Group (BCEAG) in the *Wildlife Corridor and Habitat Patch Guidelines for the Bow Valley* (BCEAG, 1999). These guidelines were reviewed and updated using the latest available science and may be found in the 2012 document: *Wildlife Corridor and Habitat Patch Guidelines for the Bow Valley* (Updated 2012) (BCEAG, 2012). The overall wildlife habitat and corridor layout is shown in the maps above from BCEAG 2012 and the 2016 MDP (Town of Canmore, 2016e).
2. The BCEAG guidelines have been extensively discussed and reviewed during recent processes of Three Sister's Mountain Village (TSMV) land use planning. Although the BCEAG guidelines do not specifically apply to TSMV lands, the science behind the guidelines was examined and discussed as part of the previous and current TSMV processes. The relevant documents, Environmental Impact Statements, and 3rd party reviews are available from the Town of Canmore website: <https://canmore.ca/residents/residents-development-planning/public-engagement-information/planning-for-three-sisters-lands>.
3. In 2009, following the global economic crisis of 2008, Three Sister's Mountain Village (TSMV) went into receivership. Under the stewardship of the receiver (PriceWaterHouseCoopers – PWC) an Area Structure Plan (ASP) was brought to Council in 2013. The ASP was withdrawn prior to the public hearing and 1st reading. The Three Sisters Lands were then subsequently purchased from the receiver in 2013 and a new planning process was initiated. The new ownership group initiated the Smith Creek Planning Process with the community and the Town of Canmore. Background materials and a timeline of the process is available from: <http://www.tsmv.ca/planning/smith-creek/about/>. A primary component of the planning process was the formation of a Community Advisory Group (CAG) (initiated in July 2015) focused on a collaborative planning process for these lands. The Smith Creek ASP was submitted to the Town of Canmore for consideration in March 2017. The process is currently ongoing and a decision about the alignment of the wildlife corridor is currently under review by the Government of Alberta. A final decision on the corridor is expected in the fall of 2017. It is expected that this planning process, if the outcomes are approved, will finalize the wildlife corridor layout in TSMV and thereby complete the network of corridors in this portion of the Bow Valley. As this planning and approval process is currently underway, there are no outcomes or land use decisions available at this time.
4. In addition to the Smith Creek Planning Process, TSMV also proposed an amendment to the Resort Area Structure Plan. TSMV proposed to remove the approved (and partially constructed) 110ha golf course development and instead create additional residential, commercial and resort development. In May 2017 a motion for first reading of this ASP amendment was defeated by Council.
5. Additional information on the past and current Three Sisters planning processes and a timeline of events are available from the Town of Canmore: <https://canmore.ca/residents/residents-development-planning/public-engagement-information/planning-for-three-sisters-lands>.
6. In April 2015, the agreement for the Stewart Creek Conservation Easement was signed by the Government of Alberta and TSMV (the 3rd easement in the Three Sisters area). The 95.9 ha easement

had been proposed and planned for more than a decade. The majority of the easement lies in the Along Valley Wildlife Corridor near Stewart Creek Golf Course. Under the terms of the easement, no additional development or recreational activity is permitted.

7. The network of wildlife corridors (and conservation easements) around Canmore were designed and designated as the major developments (Eagle Terrace, Silvertip, Three Sisters) were planned and built. Parts of the corridor network are on lands that were originally private lands as part of the developments. The Bow Valley Builders and Developers Association (BOWDA) published a concise history of conservation efforts and these private lands that were dedicated to wildlife corridors as part of the planning and development process (BOWDA, 2017).

Human Use Trails and Wildlife Corridors

1. The overarching management and designation of trails in the Bow Valley have been guided by the BCEAG guidelines (BCEAG, 1999, 1999a&b, 2001) and the subsequent recommendations of the Recreational Opportunities Working Group (ROWG) (BCEAG, 2002a&b). As a continuation of the ROWG process, a Trails Advisory Group (TAG) still meets on an annual or semi-annual basis to discuss trail issues and solutions in the Bow Valley. This is an inter-jurisdictional group with membership from the public as well as other key stakeholders. Additionally, the Kananaskis Trails Committee (an internal government committee), provides trail planning and stewardship recommendations within the Kananaskis Region.
2. In addition to a review and revision of the BCEAG Guidelines (BCEAG, 2012), a series of recommendations were drafted for the management of recreational use in the South Canmore Local Habitat Patch and the West Palliser area. The study recommended closing a number of non-designated trails and creating new trail alignments to create less disturbance for wildlife in these areas (TERA Environmental Consultants, 2012). The Town of Canmore, Alberta Parks and the Friends of Kananaskis rehabilitated trails within the Habitat Patch, and installed educational signage encouraging users to stay on the designated and marked trail network.
3. The Open Space and Trails Plan (OSTP) approved by Council for planning purposes in June 2015. The Plan is focused on working towards a well-connected trails and open space network. Additional input was gathered via the Human Use Management Review (HUMR) and Integrated Transportation Plan (ITP) engagement processes (Town of Canmore, 2015c).
4. The Human Use Management Review (HUMR) stakeholder group was established in the spring of 2014. With over 25 representatives, the group met for a series of four meetings through 2014 & 2015 to review the past 15 years of planning, management and research. Additional meetings with community members, user groups, and two open houses, and an online survey gathered feedback from 525 respondents. The guiding principle of the HUMR group was that “Trails in the Bow Valley are properly located, maintained, provide high quality recreational opportunities and offer a great user experience.” In March 2015, Council accepted the recommendations and implementation plan from the HUMR for planning purposes (Town of Canmore, 2015d). The



Town of Canmore is tracking progress on the HUMR recommendations through annual reports (Town of Canmore, 2017i).

5. The Town of Canmore and the Alberta Conservation Association (ACA) collaborated on a trail plan, trail improvements, and signage in the Eagle Terrace Conservation Easement (on the uphill slope above the Eagle Terrace).
6. The Town of Canmore also installed educational signage and trail markers at the Quarry Lake dog park, and initiated an off leash pilot project with a 1km loop trail and managed access to the 'Dog Pond'.
7. Recent years, two new trail stewardship and trail advocacy groups were formed. Both groups are committed to working collaboratively with the Town of Canmore and Alberta parks to improve and maintain the local trail network and to engage local residents in trail maintenance and stewardship activities. The Canmore and Area Mountain Bike Alliance (CAMBA) was founded in 2016 (www.camba.ca).




The Canmore and Area Mountain Bike Alliance (CAMBA) was founded in 2016 (www.camba.ca). Priorities and activities for CAMBA include advocating for mountain biking and trails in the Canmore area, and working with local land managers on trail issues and trail projects. In 2017 CAMBA is scheduled to begin work on a new mountain bike trail in the Quarry Lake area in conjunction with the Town of Canmore. The Canmore Trail Alliance (CTA) was founded as a program of the Friends of Kananaskis Country (<http://www.canmoretrailalliance.com/>). The CTA works with the Town of Canmore, Alberta Parks, and a crew of volunteers to help build and maintain trails while engaging trail users in the construction and maintenance of trails in the Canmore area. CTA projects in 2016/17 included trail construction and maintenance at the Canmore Nordic Centre in conjunction with Alberta Parks' staff assisting with the development of trails as part of their Master Plan and the construction of the Mountain Bike Nationals Race course.

Remote Camera Study

1. Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP) has been conducting an extensive two year remote camera study in the Bow Valley around Canmore. The study is part of the Human Use Management Review (HUMR) partnership between AEP and the Town of Canmore and is intended to quantify and better understand both human and wildlife use in the wildlife corridors, habitat patches, and lands adjacent to Canmore. Preliminary results presented in April 2017 showed that humans were recorded almost 20 times more often on by the cameras. This was based on an analysis of 1.5 million images, which were classified as 178,000 unique events (by eliminating multiple images of the same occurrence event). Of these events, nearly 164,000 were of people, and of those almost 98,000 were of people with their dogs (61% of the dogs were off-leash) (Rocky Mountain Outlook, 2017). The camera study was ongoing through to the summer of 2017 and will require additional image classification and extensive analysis and write up due to the large volume of data that has been gathered. This study remote will provide many insights into the levels of human and wildlife use on the trails and the interrelationship between them (results of the study are expected to be available in 2018).

Wildlife Crossing Structure Monitoring


1. To help maintain wildlife movement and connectivity across the fenced section of the Trans-Canada Highway, wildlife underpasses were constructed at Stewart Creek (October, 1999) and Dead Man's Flats (October, 2004). From 2000 to 2007, wildlife use of the underpasses was surveyed using sand track pads to count the number and species of animals using the crossing structure. In 2008, biologists began a new methodology (remote cameras) which provides a more accurate count of usage levels. Due to the change in methods, the data from 2000-2007 is included for information only, and is not directly comparable to the 2008-2016 data. Only the 2008-2016 data is presented in this report.



Source: (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2017a)

2. From 2008-2016, there were 9,030 recorded crossing events, predominantly by white tailed deer (45.8%) and elk (24.8%). Humans were the third most frequent users of the underpasses (7.0%). While less frequent, the crossing structures are also used with some regularity by large carnivores. Since 2008, there were 288 cougar, 206 black bear, 18 grizzly bear, 6 bobcat and 1 wolverine crossing events recorded (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2017a).


3. The total number of wildlife crossing events at the Wind Valley Underpass dropped from 684 in 2011 to 222 in 2014, rising to 418 in 2016. Overall, underpass uses by wildlife at this location was 38.9% lower in 2016 than in 2011. The decrease in total crossing events at the Wind Valley Underpass is primarily related to a rapid drop in the number of deer (the most crossing the underpass (from 602 in 2010 to 129 in 2014) (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2017a).



At this point in time, it is not certain if this relates specifically to deer

use of the underpass, or if it is affected by overall trends in the regional deer population numbers. It is also currently unknown to what extent the current and future development at Dead Man's Flats and adjacent Three Sisters lands may have on the functionality of the underpass and corridor.

4. At the Stewart Creek Underpass the total number of recorded wildlife crossings dropped slightly from 2010 through 2013, then rose through 2016. Underpass use by wildlife at this crossing increased 34.7% from 2011 to 2016 (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2017a).



Source: (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2017a)



Interpretation

1. Increasing recreational pressures highlight the growing need to ensure that there is an appropriately routed, signed, and sustainably designed trail network that encourages trail users to avoid environmentally sensitive areas and avoid negative impacts on wildlife. Continued collaboration between the Town of Canmore, Government of Alberta, and community stakeholders is important to ensure the development of an appropriate trail network that meets the needs of recreationalists while minimizing impacts on wildlife.
2. With multiple planning processes on the Three Sisters lands over the past 25+ years, there has been a considerable degree of uncertainty regarding the future development plans of that area and the associated wildlife corridors. A decision regarding the alignment of the wildlife corridors is expected in the fall of 2017. Careful planning of future development and management of human use will be required to maintain the effectiveness of the corridors and to maintain connectivity for the full range of species present in the Bow Valley.

Recommendations

1. A better understanding is needed of the levels of human use in wildlife corridors, their effect on wildlife populations, and what thresholds of use or linear trail density cause disturbance for various species. It is anticipated that the recent remote camera study by Alberta Parks will provide many insights into the levels of human and wildlife use on the trails and the interrelationship between them (results of the study are expected to be available in 2018). Continued mapping and monitoring of the trail networks will be important to help better understand the effects of human disturbance on the local wildlife populations.
2. With the purchase of TSMV and the possibility of new development approvals, it will be important to monitor and track changes in land use and corridors. In 2010 and earlier editions of the Canmore Community Monitoring Report an indicator Quantitative Land Use was included. In future editions of this report it would be a valuable exercise to include an updated version of this indicator.
3. No updated information is currently available for wildlife/vehicle mortality. The Alberta Government has recently developed a new reporting app for staff and contractors. It is expected that this app will enable more consistent reporting of wildlife mortalities from vehicle collisions. Combining this data with reported hunter harvests, management actions and other mortalities/removals from the ecosystem could provide valuable insight into the level of human-caused wildlife mortality by species in the Bow Valley.

Human/Wildlife Conflict

Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Environment: Canmore is a municipal leader in environmental stewardship Safety: Canmore is a safe community	Bears	
	Cougars	
	Coyotes	n/a
	Ungulates	n/a

Introduction

Residents of Canmore live in close proximity to wilderness areas and wild animals. Interactions between potentially dangerous animals and people are inevitable. The Town of Canmore has instituted a number of progressive measures to reduce the habituation of wild animals to urban areas. Animals that are deemed to be a potential hazard to public safety, however, may have to be destroyed or relocated by the Alberta Environmental Protection (AEP). It is critical to enhance community understanding of the responsibilities and trade-offs involved with living with wildlife in the Bow Valley.

These human/wildlife conflict data are for the lands within the “Canmore Area”: namely the Town of Canmore and the immediately adjacent provincial protected areas in the Bow Valley (Canmore Nordic Centre Provincial Park and Bow Valley Wildland Park) from the Banff National Park boundary east to Wind Valley.


Definition: A "Conflict" is defined as any interaction between an animal and a human where some form of physical damage as been done by an animal to a person’s property or possessions, the animal has obtained unnatural human foods, the interaction has elicited a response from the animal that heightens concern over the safety of the observer, or the interaction has occurred in a location where the presence of such animals creates a high risk to public safety. Conflict levels are rated from ‘Low to Very High’ based on a number of criteria which are species-specific. Full definitions and details of the conflict levels are available in Appendix B: Human-Wildlife Conflict Level Descriptions.

For the purposes of this report, conflicts have been grouped into three categories of severity: ‘Low-Moderate’, ‘High-Very High’ and ‘Extreme’. While all conflict occurrences are of potential concern, the ‘High-Very High’ category largely involves occurrences in and around developed areas, while the ‘Extreme’ category results in human injury or death. Due to the low number of ‘extreme’ conflicts, they are represented by a number in the following graphs rather than as a bar.

Observations


Note: the human/bear and human/cougar conflict statistics presented here reflect reported incidents up to the end of 2016. Updated statistics are not currently available for human/coyote or human/ungulate conflict. For these topics, information from the previous 2014 Canmore Community Monitoring Report is presented here.

Human/Bear Conflict




Source: (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2017b)

- The number of conflict incidents decreased substantially following the introduction of bear-proof garbage bins in May of 1999, and has shown annual fluctuations thereafter. Compared to prior years, there was a sharp rise in incidents in 2009. In 2009, 30% of the bear incidents were from four radio collared grizzly bears (due to the radio collars their movement are monitored and therefore their activities are well known to AEP staff). The increased incidents in 2009 were primarily linked to attractants within developed areas, including natural vegetation (e.g. buffaloberry, hedsyarum) and golf course grasses. Bear conflicts were unusually low in 2013 as this was the year of the major floods in Alberta, which affected both landscapes, vegetation and human recreation activities. The spatial distribution of the conflicts is variable by season, with two of the most notable patterns being related to buffaloberry season (late spring/summer) and fruit bearing trees (summer/early fall).



2. Most of these conflict incidents are of low or moderate severity and did not result in any human contact or cause any injury, however a small proportion have resulted in injury or a fatality. Of the 2,544 human conflict incidents between 1998 and 2016, there were 7 incidents in which there was contact/injury with a person ('Extreme'), one of which resulted in a fatality in 2005 (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2017b).
3. In 2017 there were a number of bear encounters and conflicts in and around Canmore (final conflict statistics for 2017 are not currently available). As in 2016, there were long standing bear warnings and closures on the south side of the valley (Canmore Nordic Centre, Quarry Lake, Three Sisters) due to many bears feeding on buffaloberries and multiple sightings/encounters with the bears. One grizzly (tagged Bear 148 a young female) was captured and relocated within her home range in Banff National Park. After a number of incidents involving bluff charges Bear 148 was captured again and relocated to a location near Kakwa Wildland Provincial Park. In a separate incident with a different (unidentified bear) a woman sustained injuries in an encounter with a bear near the Rundle Forebay.

Spatial Distribution of Human/Bear Conflicts: Ranking By Zone – Berry Season 2000-2014



Source: (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2016b)

Temporary Area Closures and Warnings – 2017

Closed Area

TEMPORARY AREA CLOSURE
 General Location Lat.: 51.077 N° Long.: 115.382W° (Area around Quarry Lake, near town of Canmore)
Numerous Bears Feeding on Berries
 Effective Date: July 28, 2017
 Closure as per Wildlife Act RSA 2000 c W-10 s81
 For more information call Kananaskis Information Line: 403-678-0760

1:30,000
 0 250 500 750 1,000 Metres

Alberta Government

©2016 Government of Alberta
 The information contained is subject to change. Reproduction by the Government of Alberta requires its written consent for reproduction, in whole or in part.

Closed Area

Warning Bear in Area


WARNING - NUMEROUS BEARS FEEDING ON BERRIES
 Effective Date: July 28, 2017 Until further notice
 For more information call Alberta Parks (403) 678-0760

1:27,630
 0 350 700 1,050 Metres


Alberta Government

Alberta Parks



4. By land use type, the majority of human/bear conflicts were in urban areas (87%). Of these, the three most common locations were residential areas (58.5%), urban green space (18.5%), and playground/facilities (10.7%). It is important to remember that, based on the definitions of conflict used, and the frequency of human activity, that bears in and around urban areas are more likely to be reported and classified as conflicts than bears in backcountry areas.



5. When other management options fail and a bear is deemed a threat to public safety it may be translocated or euthanized. Either option results in the removal of the bear from the local ecosystem, and the translocation of bears typically has mixed results and a low success rate. From 1997 to 2016, 12 grizzlies were translocated and one was euthanized. During the same time period, 67 black bears were translocated and 19 were euthanized (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2017c).



Source: (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2017c)




Source: (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2017c)

6. The number of bears and management actions per year is highly variable and dependent on individual circumstances such as the success of the berry season, other natural or non-native vegetation, the particulars of each unique encounter with the bears and the level of habituation and/or actions of a particular individual bear. On an annual basis (1997 to 2016) removals of grizzly bears from the ecosystem range between zero and three, while black bears range from two to 19 (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2017c).
7. Maintaining a long-term resident population of bears and conducting multi-year research on bear movement patterns in this part of the Bow Valley has proved problematic due to the high levels of bear mortality and bear removals. From 1997 to 2016 there were a total of 162 black bear and 20 grizzly bear translocations, euthanizations, and road/rail mortalities (AEP, 2017c). The combination of road/rail mortality, and management actions (relocation or destruction of bears following conflict with humans) creates challenges in maintaining a representative radio-collared sample of bears in the valley to monitor their movement patterns.
8. Management responses to human/grizzly bear incidents in Alberta are managed according to the Grizzly Bear Response Guide. Preventative action (e.g. close the area to public access) is the first response in most situations, if that is insufficient then the age, sex, and actions of the bear will determine the recommended response (such as relocation or euthanasia) (Alberta Environment and Parks & Fish and Wildlife, 2016). The full details of the Response Guide are available on the AEP website:
<http://aep.alberta.ca/fish-wildlife/wildlife-management/grizzly-bear-recovery-plan/documents/GrizzlyBearResponseGuide-2016.pdf>.


Human-Cougar Conflict

1. From 2000 to 2016 there were a total of 306 reported incidents of human conflict with cougars in the Canmore area. From 2000 to 2005 there were an average of 7.5 reported incidents per year. The number of reported incidents after 2006 has been much higher, ranging from 14 in 2006 to 42 in 2012. There were 20 reported conflicts in 2016. Conflict incidents are ranked from Low, Moderate, High, Very High, and Extreme. For a detailed definition of human/cougar conflict please see Appendix B: Human-Wildlife Conflict Level Descriptions.
2. This is a continuum of potential hazard that becomes increasingly more serious and concerning with 'Extreme' being a cougar that charges, injures or kills a person. The majority of all reported conflicts are classed as Low or Moderate (75%). Fortunately, there have been no Extreme incidents reported in the Canmore area from 2000-2016, and none of the human-cougar conflict occurrences involved human injury or death.




Source: (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2017b)

3. In general, the 'High & Very High' rated incidents are primarily related to cougars feeding on wildlife carcasses in developed areas. In 2013, some of the additional high conflict incidents relate to two cougars (female with young) that were hunting dogs in the Silvertip area.
4. The primary identified attractants relating to cougar conflict incidents are wildlife (29%) or wildlife carcass (31%) followed by dog (24%).
5. Reported cougar incidents from 2000-2016 in the Canmore area are most frequently in urban areas (89%), primarily in residential areas (61%) and also in urban green spaces (13%) (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2017b). It is important to note that, based on the definitions of conflict used, and the frequency of human activity, that cougars in and around urban areas are more likely to be reported and classified as conflicts than cougars in backcountry areas (Appendix B: Human-Wildlife Conflict Level Descriptions).



Source: (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2017b)

Human – Coyote Conflict





Source: (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2015b)

- Historically, there were few, if any, reported conflict incidents with coyotes. The first recorded occurrences in the database appear in 2001. The 'High-Very High' incidents are primarily related to coyotes approaching people (closing distance with no contact) and/or attacking pets, while the 'Extreme' incidents involve human contact (including injury or death). From 2001 to 2013 there were a total of 366 incidents reported (of all kinds). In 2007 and 2008 there was a sharp jump in the number of reported conflict incidents, including three 'Extreme' incidents in each year where there was aggressive contact by coyotes (fortunately there were no serious injuries). When there are serious

incidents such as this, wildlife officers cull coyotes in and around the townsite to reduce the risk of further conflict. The number of incidents dropped off in 2009 with some annual fluctuations through to 2013. In 2013, there was one Extreme incident. There have been no serious injuries or deaths from coyote attacks in Canmore (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2015b).

2. In nearly 60% of the reported conflict incidents, the primary attractant (if any) for the coyotes is unknown. Of identified attractants, dogs (44.7%) were the most frequent, followed by rabbits (17.7%) and humans (9.9%). It is important to note that this reflects reported incidents with an identified attractant. Many other low/moderate conflict occurrences probably go unreported, and the primary attractants for the coyotes in that area may not always be known at the time of the incident (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2015b).
3. The majority (68.7%) of these reported conflict incidents in the Canmore area occurred in residential areas, followed by playgrounds/playing fields (11.5%) and urban green space (9.6%). This highlights coyote/human conflict as an urban problem in Canmore as it is primarily focused on highly populated and developed areas, not the forested 'backcountry' areas and trails adjacent to the community (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2015b).



Source: (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2015b)


Human - Ungulates Conflict

1. Elk are a growing concern as they continue to utilize golf courses, playing fields, school yards, and other green spaces in the town. Every year there are reports of elk charging people within the Town of Canmore. In addition to elk posing a direct public safety concern to people, there have also been incidents where ungulates, including elk and deer, have been known to attract predators such as cougars into the town site (AESRD, 2013a).

2. Moose are fairly uncommon in and around Canmore and there have been relatively few occurrences reported. However, in 2009 there was a situation with a moose at Quarry Lake which resulted in six reported non-contact charges on people (AESRD, 2013a).

Attractant Management


1. Managing wildlife attractants is a key component of reducing human-wildlife conflict in areas of high human use. The communities and government agencies of the Bow Valley have taken a pro-active approach to minimizing and removing attractants in and around the community. Both natural (e.g. Shepherdia aka buffaloberry) and non-natural (e.g. garbage) food sources can both serve as attractants to bears and other wildlife, bringing them in to close contact with people and their pets. This creates a potentially dangerous situation for both humans and wildlife and is a major factor in managing the frequency and risk of human-wildlife conflict.
2. In May 1999, the Town of Canmore completed the installation of bear-proof garbage containers and eliminated roadside garbage pick-up. A by-law introduced in 1999 prohibits outdoor composting of food waste. Following the introduction of a bylaw prohibiting outdoor composting in 1999, there have been no compost related bear occurrences reported. A by-law was introduced in 2001 prohibiting bird feeders (prohibited period is April 1 to October 31 of each year). These actions significantly reduced the number of occurrences related to these non-natural food attractants.



3. The Bow Valley Bear Hazard Assessment (Honeyman, 2007) noted that while unnatural attractants are a concern, natural foods (e.g. buffaloberry, dogwood, chokecherry) are the predominant attractant involved in bear-human conflicts. To reduce the potential of negative bear-human encounters Alberta Environment and Parks, the Town of Canmore, and WildSmart have partnered with local residents and volunteers on a program of buffaloberry removal in high conflict areas. Each

season high priority areas for attractant removal are selected based upon known bear movement patterns, vegetation condition, and the frequency of reported sightings and conflicts in and around the community. The sample map from the Town of Canmore (see above) shows the priority Shepherdia removal areas for 2016.

4. There have been a number of occurrences involving ornamental fruit trees (e.g. crabapple or mountain ash) and bears in Canmore (AESRD, 2013a). In 2016 the Town of Canmore, in partnership with Alberta Park and WildSmart began offering a voluntary tree removal program, prioritizing neighbourhoods where bears have been known to seek out fruit and berries in past seasons. To assist residents with tree removal, home owners were eligible for free tree removal and replacement (with another, non-attractant species). Thirty-one properties participated in the program in 2016 and had their crabapple trees removed and replaced (Town of Canmore, 2017i).



5. In May 2017, Council passed the Wildlife Attractant Bylaw which consolidates some elements of previous bylaws and is designed to expand the efforts of previous bylaws and inclusively address the wide variety of attractants such as bird feeders, fruit trees, feeding wildlife etc. Under the new bylaw a 'wildlife attractant' is broadly defined as 'any substance that could be reasonably expected to attract dangerous wildlife' (Town of Canmore, 2017j).
6. Feral rabbits (descendants of domestic pets which were released in South Canmore many years ago) have spread throughout the community over the past several decades. As a non-native species and potential wildlife attractant the Town is engaged in efforts to control and reduce the population of feral rabbits with the goal of eventually eliminating them from the town. In 2011 the Town passed the Animal Control Bylaw which prohibits residents from keeping or causing feral animals (including rabbits) to be on their property (Town of Canmore, 2011d). In addition to the Bylaw, the Town of Canmore developed a Feral Rabbit Management Plan and has engaged the services of a contract trapper to trap and euthanize the rabbits. The rabbits are then used as a food source at a wildlife rehabilitation centre. Residents may contact the town to request the services of the trapper on their private property. Trapping only occurs during the winter months (typically from late November to mid-March) when the ground is covered in snow and there are not abundant food sources available. Under the Town of Canmore Hunting and Trapping Bylaw hunting, trapping and discharging a firearm are prohibited (Town of Canmore, 2011e). Peace officers and appropriately licenced, permitted trappers are excluded under the bylaw.

Community Initiatives

1. Living With Wildlife: this 2017 24 minute documentary video by filmmaker Leanne Allison was released to showcase the success stories and challenges of coexisting and living with wildlife in the Bow Valley. The video was supported by a team of partnering agencies (Bear Conflict Solutions Institute, The Calgary Foundation, Town of Canmore, Alberta Environment and Parks, Yellowstone to Yukon, Nature Conservancy of Canada, Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, and private donors). The video is available for public viewing on Vimeo: <https://vimeo.com/214597705>.
2. The WildSmart program is a proactive conservation strategy that encourages efforts by communities to reduce negative human-wildlife interactions. The program was first established in 2005 by a coalition of local interest groups including businesses, environmental groups, and public, municipal and provincial government agencies. It has since evolved into a permanent program of the Biosphere Institute of the Bow Valley. WildSmart's outreach programs include wildlife safety workshops, bear spray training, volunteer programs, community events, a speaker series, removal of buffaloberry in high conflict areas, removal of fruit from trees, a weekly bear activity report, and an annual "Bear Day" celebration. In 2014, WildSmart's efforts were recognized with a SHIFT Sustainability Award in Jackson Hole, WY.



Interpretation


1. The increase in reported wildlife conflict likely relates, in part, to greater public awareness of human-wildlife safety issues. Educational programs such as WildSmart have increased public awareness of the issue and promoted public reporting of wildlife incidents and conflicts. The consistent tracking and management of radio-collared bears can also result in the increased recording of specific conflict incidents.
2. Regarding the frequency of reporting and the severity of conflict incidents: the relative frequency of reporting is not known, however it is likely that more serious conflict incidents are reported more frequently than lower severity incidents. Therefore, lower severity human/wildlife conflicts are likely underreported and the numbers here should be treated as minimum numbers as there is likely a much higher level of occurrence (e.g. travelling through a backyard or on a deck). Higher severity conflicts are likely to be reported more frequently (e.g. charging a human). The most serious conflict occurrences (extreme) have been more consistently reported by the public and documented, as they involve direct contact, injury, or loss of human life.
3. The continued management of attractants (both natural and non-natural food sources) and avoiding human habituation of wildlife is important for both public safety and the safety of the wildlife. Unsecured garbage, bird feeders, domestic pets, feral rabbits, elk, and deer populations in the town are all potential food sources for predators and are associated with some of the reported occurrences in and around the community. Tragically, there was a human fatality in 2005 resulting from a bear encounter. Fortunately, to date, there have been no human fatalities or serious injuries from coyotes or cougars.

4. Managing attractants, human use, and minimizing conflict is critical for the long term survival of bears, especially grizzly bears, in the Bow Valley. Attractants, habituation, and a high level of bear activity in or near the community are not only potential public safety hazards, they are also a danger to the bears themselves. Avoiding habituation is very important as, bears that are deemed to be a public safety concern may be relocated or destroyed. Relocating bears is an imperfect solution with a high probability of mortality for the bears (especially if cubs are involved). With the low reproductive rate of the regional bear population, minimizing human-caused bear mortality and removals from the ecosystem is essential to the long-term sustainability of the grizzly bear population in the Bow Valley and Kananaskis.

Recommendation

1. Continued tracking of reported human-wildlife conflict incidents for all conflict species is critically important to better understand the spatial and temporal distribution of conflicts, causes, and the effectiveness of solutions such as attractant management.

Forest Health – Mountain Pine Beetle


Strategic Plan Linkages:	Trend	
Environment: Canmore is a municipal leader in environmental Stewardship	Mountain Pine Beetle Affected Trees	

The health of forests around the Town of Canmore is dependent on regional conditions that influence forest susceptibility to fire, insects and disease. Historically, these forest stands burned approximately every 50 years, with a higher fire frequency on the valley bottom, and less frequent fires further up the mountainsides. The last massive fire swept through the valley in the 1880s. Fires linked to the railroad and early settlement continued to burn the forests around Canmore after this time. However, during the period that Canmore was part of Banff National Park (1902 to 1930), fire suppression became much more effective. Forest cover has increased dramatically from 1923 to the present time (see photographs of 1923 and 2002) due to lack of burning. The result is an older age distribution of trees that increase susceptibility to insects and disease, and heavy fuel loads which increase the risk of large scale forest fires.

Mountain Pine Beetle (MPB) is a native species that is endemic to these forests, however, given current forest stand age and species composition there is the potential (as seen in BC or some areas along the border in Alberta) for significant tree kill which creates wide-ranging impacts for wildlife habitat, wildfire hazard, recreational and aesthetic values, watersheds, and for the commercial value of timber. To learn more about the history, life-cycle and current status of mountain pine beetle please visit the Parks Canada website (<http://www.pc.gc.ca/en/docs/v-g/dpp-mpb/sec4/>) or Alberta Agriculture and Forestry (<https://www.agric.gov.ab.ca/app21/forestrypage?cat1=Mountain%20Pine%20Beetle%20in%20Alberta>)

Observations

1. In 2008 in the Bow Valley near Canmore, there were 5,454 mountain pine beetle infested trees that were identified and controlled. This dropped sharply to 34 by 2011. The Bow Valley was not listed as an area of concern by the province for the winter of 2011. In 2012, the Government of Alberta continued spot checks for mountain pine beetle, but no additional control work was done due to the low levels of beetle activity. In 2014, the number of controlled trees increased to 343, and then jumped to 1,329 in 2016 as additional infested trees were located (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2017d).
2. The low numbers of beetle-attacked trees in 2011-2013 were attributed to aggressive control efforts and cold winter temperatures. However, there are still large volumes of susceptible pine trees in the Bow Valley and the potential of beetle re-infestation from British Columbia. Southwest Alberta remains a high priority for detection surveys and control work (AESRD, 2014; Alberta Agriculture and Forestry, 2016).



Source: (Alberta Environment and Parks, 2017d)

Community Initiatives

1. The Town of Canmore is an active partner with the Government of Alberta and Parks Canada in managing regional mountain pine beetle populations. On municipal and other private lands in Canmore, infested trees are felled and collected for burning to destroy the beetles. On provincial lands, forestry crews have been felling and burning infested trees on site during the winter months to slow the spread of beetles. Due to the increased number of beetle attacked trees in the Bow Valley, the Town of Canmore is engaged in survey work and has resumed beetle infested tree removal in 2017 and is expecting to continue control work in the coming year.
2. Larger, regionally high risk forest stands in Kananaskis Country and adjoining areas of Banff National Park have been identified, and are removed using either prescribed burning or logging as the situation and conditions permit.
3. The Alberta Government has developed an excellent mapping website with a detailed chronological history of mountain pine beetle infestations in Alberta, and the efforts to control its spread: <https://esrd.maps.arcgis.com/apps/Cascade/index.html?appid=b81dbef8d02344e6bb734087669626db>

Interpretation

1. Forests with long-term fire suppression are generally more susceptible to disease, insects, and large-scale fires, and have lower habitat diversity. Frequent fires create broad areas of young forest that are relatively resistant to hot crown fires, and to attack from insects such as mountain pine beetle. However, 80 years of forest fire suppression has created a broad age-class “bulge” of forests around 100 to 140 years old. These forests tend to burn with very high intensity due to high organic matter accumulations over time, and have become increasing susceptible to mountain pine beetle attack.
2. A combination of extreme temperature fluctuations over the past few winters and consistent surveying and control actions had led to a dramatic (but temporary) drop in mountain pine beetle

infested trees in the region. While this is a significant reduction from the peak beetle populations from 2008-2010, it has not eliminated the long term beetle concern, as the same age structure and forest health conditions still exist in the region. A significant increase in beetle populations was observed in 2016 and extensive control efforts were resumed.

References

AESRD. 2013a. Wildlife Conflict Database. Unpublished. Preliminary queries from the wildlife conflict data from Alberta Government ENFOR and Kananaskis Emergency Services databases. Alberta Sustainable Resource Development: Canmore, AB.

AESRD. 2013b. Wildlife Conflict Definitions. Unpublished spreadsheet. Adapted from WRBI Bear Conflict Level Indices (2003). Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development: Canmore, AB.

AESRD. 2014. Beetle survival success varies within, across regions. Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development: Edmonton, AB. <http://esrd.alberta.ca/lands-forests/mountain-pine-beetle/documents/BeetleSurvivalVaries-Jun17-2014.pdf>

Alberta Agriculture and Forestry. 2017. 2017 Mountain Pine Beetle Spring Population Forecast Survey Results. Alberta Government: Edmonton, AB. [http://www1.agric.gov.ab.ca/\\$department/deptdocs.nsf/all/formain15802/\\$FILE/r-value%20survey%20results%20-%20spring%202017%20web%20update.pdf](http://www1.agric.gov.ab.ca/$department/deptdocs.nsf/all/formain15802/$FILE/r-value%20survey%20results%20-%20spring%202017%20web%20update.pdf)

Alberta Culture and Tourism. 2016a. A Summary of 2014 Visitor Numbers, Expenditures and Characteristics July 2016. Alberta Government: Edmonton, AB. <https://www.culturetourism.alberta.ca/tourism/research-and-statistics/statistics/tourism-region-statistics/>

Alberta Culture and Tourism. 2016b. A Summary of 2013 Visitor Numbers, Expenditures and Characteristics September 2016. Alberta Government: Edmonton, AB. <https://www.culturetourism.alberta.ca/tourism/research-and-statistics/statistics/tourism-region-statistics/>

Alberta Culture and Tourism. 2016c. Alberta Tourism Market Monitor 2015 Edition. May 19, 2016. Alberta Government: Edmonton, AB. <http://www.culturetourism.alberta.ca/tourism/research-and-statistics/statistics/alberta-tourism-market-monitor/>

Alberta Education. 2017. 2016/2017 School Enrolment Data - Preliminary. Alberta Education: Edmonton, AB. <https://education.alberta.ca/alberta-education/student-population/everyone/school-authority-enrolment-data/>

Alberta Environment and Parks. 2013. Alberta Westslope Cutthroat Trout Recovery plan 2012-2017. Alberta Environment and Parks: Edmonton, AB. <http://aep.alberta.ca/fish-wildlife/species-at-risk/species-at-risk-publications-web-resources/fish/documents/SAR-WestslopeCutthroatTrout-RecoveryPlan-A-Mar2013.pdf>

Alberta Environment and Parks. 2014. Endangered, Threatened, Special Concern and Data Deficient Species in Alberta - Alberta Species at Risk. Alberta Environment and Parks: Edmonton, AB. <http://aep.alberta.ca/fish-wildlife/species-at-risk/documents/SpeciesAssessedConservation-2014a.pdf>

Alberta Environment and Parks. 2015a. Bull Trout FSI. Alberta Environment and Parks: Edmonton, AB. <http://aep.alberta.ca/fish-wildlife/fisheries-management/fish-sustainability-index/fsi-species-maps/bull-trout-fsi.aspx>

Alberta Environment and Parks. 2015b. Wildlife Conflict Database. Unpublished. Preliminary queries from the wildlife conflict data from Alberta Government ENFOR and Kananaskis Emergency Services databases. Jay Honeyman, Human Wildlife Conflict Biologist. Alberta Environment and Parks: Canmore, AB.

Alberta Environment and Parks. 2015c. Flood Hazard Map. Website Accessed September 23, 2017. Alberta Environment and Parks: Edmonton, AB. <http://maps.srd.alberta.ca/FloodHazard/>

Alberta Environment and Parks. 2016. Long-toed Salamander Conservation Management Plan. Alberta Species at Risk Conservation Management Plan No. 1. Government of Alberta: Edmonton, AB. <http://aep.alberta.ca/fish-wildlife/species-at-risk/species-at-risk-publications-web-resources/amphibians/documents/SAR-LongToedSalamander-ConsManPlan-Jan2016.pdf>

Alberta Environment and Parks. 2016b. Human Bear Conflict Ranking By Zone Berry Season 2000 - 2014. Map. Alberta Environment and Parks: Calgary, AB.

Alberta Environment and Parks. 2017a. Wildlife Underpass Crossings Data. Custom data request: unpublished spreadsheet. Alberta Environment and Parks: Canmore, AB.

Alberta Environment and Parks. 2017b. Wildlife Conflict Database. Unpublished. Preliminary queries from the wildlife conflict database from Alberta Government ENFOR and Kananaskis Emergency Services databases. Jay Honeyman, Human Wildlife Conflict Biologist. Alberta Environment and Parks: Canmore, AB.

Alberta Environment and Parks. 2017c. Bear management removals. Custom data request. Alberta Environment and Parks: Canmore, AB.

Alberta Environment and Parks. 2017d. Mountain pine beetle control numbers. Custom data request. Alberta Environment and Parks: Calgary, AB.

Alberta Environment and Parks, and Alberta Agriculture and Forestry. 2016. Evan-Thomas 10-year vegetation management strategy 2016-2025. Alberta Environment and Parks, Parks Division, Canmore, Alberta. https://www.albertaparks.ca/media/6493439/etvms_notification_strategy_august29_2016.pdf

Alberta Environment and Parks & Fish and Wildlife. 2016. Grizzly Bear Response Guide 2016 No. 1. April 1, 2016. Alberta Government. Edmonton, AB. <http://aep.alberta.ca/fish-wildlife/wildlife-management/grizzly-bear-recovery-plan/documents/GrizzlyBearResponseGuide-2016.pdf>

Alberta Government. 2014. Bow Valley EMap Early Childhood Mapping Project Alberta. Alberta Government: Edmonton, AB. http://www.ecmap.ca/assetReports/2014/BowVly_CommunityProfile_Spring2014_F.pdf

Alberta Government. 2016. 2016 Alberta Spatial Price Survey A Place-to-Place Price Comparison Survey. Treasury Board and Finance, Office of Statistics and Information: Edmonton, AB. <https://open.alberta.ca/publications/4128534>

Alberta Health Services. 2017. Canmore Hospital Statistics. Custom Data Request. Alberta Health Services: Canmore, AB.

Alberta Labour. 2016. Minimum Wage. Website accessed July 13, 2017. <https://work.alberta.ca/employment-standards/minimum-wage.html>

Alberta Municipal Affairs. 2016. Public Library Statistics 2015. Alberta Municipal Affairs, Public Library Services Branch: Edmonton, AB. http://www.municipalaffairs.alberta.ca/plsb_statistics

Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative. 2017a. Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative – DRAFT report, Police RCMP, April 2017. <https://canmore.ca/documents/benchmarking-documents-reports>

Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative. 2017b. Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative – Wastewater. April 2017. <https://canmore.ca/documents/benchmarking-documents-reports>

Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative. 2017c. Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative – Solid Waste. April 2017. <https://canmore.ca/documents/benchmarking-documents-reports>

Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative. 2017d. Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative – Drinking Water Supply. April 2017. <https://canmore.ca/documents/benchmarking-documents-reports>

Alberta Tourism. 2017. Alberta Tourism Market Monitor. Multiple monthly editions. Alberta Tourism: Edmonton, AB. <https://www.culturetourism.alberta.ca/tourism/research-and-statistics/alberta-tourism-market-monitor/>

Alberta Tourism, Parks, and Recreation. 2014. Tourism in Canadian Rockies Tourism Region 2012. Alberta Tourism, Parks, and Recreation. Edmonton, AB. <https://www.culturetourism.alberta.ca/tourism/research-and-statistics/statistics/tourism-region-statistics/>

Alberta Transportation. 2017. Alberta Highways 1 to 986 Traffic Volume History (1962-2016). Alberta Transportation: Edmonton, AB. <http://www.transportation.alberta.ca/2639.htm>

Alberta Water Council. 2016. Recommendations to Improve Aquatic Invasive Species Management in Alberta. Alberta Water Council: Edmonton, AB.

<http://www.awchome.ca/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=uDJLNTSUIlo%3d&tabid=59>

Alberta Winter Games Environmental Sustainability Advisory Committee. 2014. Final Report March 2014. http://www.canmore.ca/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=4817

ASRD. 2008. Corridor functionality measures. Unpublished. Source: Jon Jorgenson, Senior Wildlife Biologist. Alberta Sustainable Resource Development: Canmore, AB.

Atco Gas. 2017. Community Natural Gas Consumption Statistics. Unpublished Data. Atco Gas: Calgary, AB. Obtained by the Town of Canmore.

Banff-Canmore Community Foundation. 2017. Vital Focus Sport and Belonging in the Bow Valley: Workbook Fall 2016. Banff-Canmore Community Foundation: Banff, AB.

<http://www.banffcanmorecf.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Web-March2017-Vital-Focus-workbook-FINAL-w-marks.pdf>

BCEAG. 1999. Wildlife Corridor and Habitat Patch Guidelines for the Bow Valley. Bow Corridor Ecosystem Advisory Group.

BCEAG. 1999b. Education and Implementation Recommendations for Managing Human Use Within Wildlife Corridors and Habitat Patches in the Bow Valley (Banff National Park to Seebe). Bow Corridor Ecosystem Advisory Group.

BCEAG. 1999c. Guidelines for Human Use Within Wildlife Corridors and Habitat Patches in the Bow Valley (Banff National Park to Seebe).

BCEAG. 2002a. BCEAG Draft Recommendations: Recreational Opportunities Working Group. BCEAG: Canmore, AB.

BCEAG. 2002b. Appendices: Draft Recommendations: Recreational Opportunities Working Group. BCEAG: Canmore, AB.

BCEAG. 2012. Wildlife Corridor and Habitat Patch Guidelines for the Bow Valley Updated 2012 (DRAFT). Review by TERA Environmental Consultants. Bow Corridor Ecosystem Advisory Group: Canmore, AB.

Biggings, Shawn. 2014. 2014 Local Market Report. Commercial Real Estate Services: Canmore, AB.

Biggings, Shawn. 2016. 2016 Local Market Report. Commercial Real Estate Services: Canmore, AB.

<http://www.canmorecommercialrealestate.com/leasing.php>

Biosphere Institute of the Bow Valley. 2013. 2012 Canmore Community Monitoring Report. Prepared for the Town of Canmore. Biosphere Institute of the Bow Valley: Canmore, AB.

Biosphere Institute of the Bow Valley. 2015. 2014 Canmore Community Monitoring Report. Prepared for the Town of Canmore. Biosphere Institute of the Bow Valley: Canmore, AB.

Bow Valley Christmas Spirit Campaign. 2017. Christmas hampers: custom data request. Bow Valley Christmas Spirit Campaign: Canmore, AB.

Bow Valley Food Bank. 2017. Hamper Count April 1, 2016 - March 31, 2017. Bow Valley Food Bank: Canmore, AB.

Bow Valley Primary Care Network. 2015. Website accessed March 3, 2015.
<http://www.bowvalleypcn.ca/>

BOWDA. 2017. Bow Valley Developers Support Wildlife Corridors. Bow Valley Builders and Developers Association: Canmore, AB. http://www.bowda.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/WildlifeCorridorFactSheet.BOWDA_Final.pdf

Brunnen, Ben (2012) Alberta Tourism Communities: Definition and Revenue Sources. Brunnen Policy and Research.

Brunnen, Ben. 2013. A Property Tax Policy Framework for the Town of Canmore: Analysis and Recommendations. Prepared for the Town of Canmore Property Tax Taskforce, March 2013.

BVECDC. 2016. Strategic Plan 2016. Bow Valley Early Childhood Development Coalition, Canmore/Banff, AB.

BVRTSC. 2017. Banff-Canmore ROAM Ridership Statistics. Bow Valley Regional Transit Services Commission: Banff, AB.

BVVSA. 2017. Bow Valley Victim Services Association Year End Report April 16, 2016 — April 15, 2017. Bow Valley Victim's Services Association: Canmore, AB.

BVWMC. 2008. Bow Valley Waste Management Commission Vision Statement 2008-2013. Bow Valley Waste Management Commission: Exshaw, AB.

BVWMC, 2015. Bow Valley Waste information update. Special data request to Peter Duck. Bow Valley Waste Management Commission: Exshaw, AB.

CBT. 2015. 2015-2020 Strategic Plan. Canmore Business & Tourism: Canmore, AB.

CCHC. 2015a. 2014 Canmore Housing Affordability Gap Analysis May 2015. Canmore Community Housing Corporation: Canmore, AB.

CCHC. 2015b. Accessory Suites in Canmore Issues and Opportunities. Canmore Community Housing Corporation: Canmore, AB.

CCHC. 2017a. Canmore Community Housing Corporation: Rental Survey. Data request from CCHC. Canmore Community Housing Corporation: Canmore, AB.

CMHC. 2014. Canadian Housing Observer 2014. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation: Ottawa: ON. <https://www03.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/catalog/productDetail.cfm?lang=en&cat=122&itm=27&fr=1431101021966>

CMHC. 2016a. Housing Market Outlook Canada Edition Fourth Quarter 2016. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation: Ottawa: ON. https://www.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/odpub/esub/61500/61500_2016_B02.pdf

CMHC. 2016b. Housing Market Outlook Prairie Region Highlights Fourth Quarter 2016. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation: Ottawa: ON. https://www.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/odpub/esub/65438/65438_2016_B02.pdf

CMHC. 2017a. Housing Market Information Portal. Historical Starts by Dwelling Type Accessed April 18, 2017. CMHC: Ottawa, ON. <https://www03.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/hmiportal/en/#TableMapChart/7124/3/Canmore>

CMHC. 2017b. About Affordable Housing in Canada. Accessed July 5, 2017. CMHC: Ottawa, ON. https://www.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/en/inpr/afhoce/afhoce_021.cfm

CRA. 2017. Charities Listing. Canada Revenue Agency: Ottawa, ON. Accessed January 17, 2017. <http://www.cra-arc.gc.ca/ebsi/haip/srch/advancedsearch-eng.action>

CPSA. 2017. College of Physicians & Surgeons of Alberta. Physician Search. Website Accessed January 30, 2017. <http://www.cpsa.ab.ca/>

CRPS. 2017a. 2016-2017 Enrollment at Sep 30-16 Canadian Rockies Public Schools; Canadian Rockies Public Schools: Canmore, AB. <http://crps.ca/documents/general/CRPS%20Enroll%20by%20school%20by%20grade%20Sep%2030-16.pdf>

CRPS. 2017b. Canadian Rockies Public Schools Annual Education Results Report 2015-2016 Three Year Education Plan 2016-2019. Canadian Rockies Public Schools: Canmore, AB. <http://crps.ca/documents/general/Combined%203%20Year%20Education%20Plan%20and%20AERR%202016-19.pdf>

Canmore Public Library Board. 2017. Alberta Public Library Survey. Canmore Public Library: Canmore, AB. <http://www.canmorelibrary.ab.ca/content/reports>

CRPS. 2013. Food For Learning Program Statistics. Unpublished data. Canadian Rockies Public Schools: Canmore, AB.

CRAZ. 2017. Continuous and Passive Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Program Calgary Region Airshed Zone Ambient Monitoring Stations Annual Report 2016. Calgary Region Airshed Zone: Calgary, AB.

www.craz.ca

Demographia. 2017. Demographia International Affordability Survey. Demographia: Bellville, Illinois & Performance Urban Planning: Christchurch, NZ. <http://www.demographia.com/dhi.pdf>

Econometric Research Limited. 2014. The Economic Impact of Tourism in Canmore, 2012. Submitted to Alberta Tourism, Parks and Recreation.

Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC). 2017. Number of temporary foreign worker (TFW) positions on positive Labour Market Impact Assessments (LMIAs) by urban area and province/territory. http://www.edsc-esdc.gc.ca/ouvert-open/bca-seb/ae-ei/TFWP2016_Annual_Table_02_e.csv

EPCOR. 2014. 2013 Annual Performance Report Town of Canmore Water & Wastewater Systems. EPCOR: Canmore, AB. <http://www.epcor.com/water/wq/wq-canmore-2013.pdf>

EPCOR. 2015. 2014 Performance Report Town of Canmore Water & Wastewater Systems. 2014 Performance Highlights. EPCOR: Canmore, AB. <https://www.epcor.com/products-services/water/water-quality/water-quality-reports-usa/wqreports/wq-canmore-2014.pdf>

Fortis Alberta. 2017. Electricity Consumption Statistics for Canmore. Unpublished data. Fortis Alberta: Calgary, AB. Obtained by the Town of Canmore.

Globe and Mail. 2017a. Unfounded: Will the Police Believe You? February 3, 2017. Globe and Mail: Toronto, ON. <https://beta.theglobeandmail.com/news/investigations/compare-unfounded-sex-assault-rates-across-canada/article33855643/?ref=http://www.theglobeandmail.com&>

Globe and Mail. 2017b. Statistics Canada to resume tracking of unfounded sex-assault cases. April 25, 2017. Globe and Mail: Toronto, ON. <https://beta.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/statistics-canada-to-resume-tracking-of-unfounded-sex-assault-cases/article34815946/?ref=http://www.theglobeandmail.com&>

Golder & Associates. 2012. Proposed Wildlife Movement Corridors and the Three Sisters Mountain Village Properties in the Bow Valley: An Evaluation. Golder & Associates: Calgary, AB. Submitted to: Pricewaterhouse Coopers. <https://canmore.ca/residents/residents-development-planning/public-engagement-information/planning-for-three-sisters-lands>

Golder & Associates. 2013. Environmental Impact Statement: Three Sisters Mountain Village Development Properties-Resort Center, Stewart Creek and Sites 7/8 and 9. Golder & Associates: Calgary,

AB. Submitted to: Town of Canmore. <https://canmore.ca/residents/residents-development-planning/public-engagement-information/planning-for-three-sisters-lands>

Grant Thornton, WMC and Econometric Research Limited. 2016. Banff, Jasper and Canmore Tourism Economic Impact Study. Grant Thornton: Vancouver, BC.

<https://canmore.ca/documents/benchmarking-documents-reports/975-tourism-economic-impact-study-2016>

HarGroup Management Consultants. 2008. Town of Canmore Sense of Community Survey. October 2008. Submitted to Town of Canmore, Community Enrichment Service Area.

HarGroup Management Consultants. 2013. Town of Canmore Sense of Community Survey. April 2013. Submitted to Town of Canmore, Community Enrichment Service Area.

Headwater Group. 2015. Alberta Tourism Communities Benchmarking and Competitiveness Review. Sponsored by: Town of Canmore, Town of Banff, Town of Jasper.

<https://canmore.ca/documents/benchmarking-documents-reports/974-alberta-tourism-communities-benchmarking-and-competitiveness-review-2015>

Health Canada. 2017. Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water Quality – Summary Table. February 2017.

Health Canada: Ottawa, ON. http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/ewh-semt/pubs/water-eau/sum_guide-res_recom/index-eng.php

Heede, Richard. 2007. Anybody Home? Energy Consumption and Carbon Emissions from Second Homes in Aspen. Aspen Second Homes Energy Study (ASHES). Preliminary Report. Climate Mitigation Services: Snowmass, CO. <http://www.climate.mitigation.com/publications/ASHESrptSep07.pdf>

Honeyman, Jay. 2007. Bow Valley Bear Hazard Assessment. (bear incident data from Alberta Government ENFOR and Kananaskis Emergency Services databases. Karelian Bear Shepherding Institute of Canada: Canmore, AB.

IRCC. 2017. IRCC Temporary Residents July 2017 Data. Custom data request. Data request tracking number: CR-17-0200. Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada: Ottawa, ON.

Ipsos Reid. 2012. 2012 Citizen Satisfaction Survey - Draft Topline Report - Town of Canmore. Ipsos Reid: Calgary, AB.

Ipsos Reid. 2014. 2014 Citizen Satisfaction Survey – Results Presentation - Town of Canmore. Ipsos Reid: Calgary, AB.

Ipsos Reid. 2017. The Town of Canmore 2017 Citizen Satisfaction Survey. Ipsos Reid: Calgary, AB.

Jevons, S. 2015. Historical Fire frequency of the Bow Valley, Alberta, Canada. Alberta Environment and Parks: Canmore, AB.

Job Resource Centre. 2017. Bow Valley Labour Market Review. Spring 2017. Job Resource Centre: Canmore, AB.

Living Wage Canada. 2013a. What is a Living Wage? Accessed August 24, 2015.

<http://livingwagecanada.ca/index.php/about-living-wage/>

Living Wage Canada. 2013b. Canadian Living Wage Framework – A National Methodology for Calculating the Living Wage in Your Community. Accessed August 24, 2015.

<http://livingwagecanada.ca/index.php/about-living-wage/about-canadian-living-wage-framework/>

Living Wage Canada. 2017. Living Wage Communities. Accessed July 13, 2017.

<http://livingwagecanada.ca/index.php/living-wage-communities/>

M. Haener Consulting Services. 2015. Town of Canmore 2015 Living Wage. Prepared for the Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB

McMillan, D.W., & Chavis, D.M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 14(1), 6-23.

MSES. 2013. Final Review of the Three Sisters Mountain Village Environmental Impact Statement for a Comprehensive Area Structure Plan, Land Use Zoning and Block Subdivision. Prepared for Town of Canmore. Management and Solutions in Environmental Science: Calgary, AB.

<https://canmore.ca/residents/residents-development-planning/public-engagement-information/planning-for-three-sisters-lands>

Parks Canada. 2016. Parks Canada Attendance 2011-12 to 2015-16. Parks Canada: Ottawa, ON.

RE/MAX Alpine Realty. 2017. Resale House and Condo Prices. Custom data request provided by Jessica Stoner. RE/MAX Alpine Realty: Canmore, AB.

Rocky Mountain Outlook. 2016a. ERS targets morning meal with nutrition funds. November 17, 2016.

Article by Tanya Faubert. Rocky Mountain Outlook: Canmore, AB.

<http://www.rmoutlook.com/article/ERS-targets-morning-meal-with-nutrition-funds-20161117>

Rocky Mountain Outlook. 2016b. Canmore Business and Tourism ceasing operations. Article by Tanya Faubert. July 15, 2016. Rocky Mountain Outlook: Canmore, AB.

<http://www.rmoutlook.com/article/Canmore-Business-and-Tourism-ceasing-operations-20160715>

Rocky Mountain Outlook. 2016c. Hotels take over tourism group in Canmore. Article by Tanya Faubert.

Rocky Mountain Outlook: Canmore, AB. <http://www.rmoutlook.com/article/Hotels-takeover-tourism-group-in-Canmore-20161201>

<http://www.rmoutlook.com/article/Hotels-takeover-tourism-group-in-Canmore-20161201>

Rocky Mountain Outlook. 2017. Cameras show extensive human use of corridors. Article by Cathy Ellis. Rocky Mountain Outlook: Canmore, AB. April 17, 2017.

<http://www.rmoutlook.com/article/Cameras-show-extensive-human-use-of-corridors-20170406>

RCMP. 2017. Municipal Detachments-Overall CSI. K-Division Operations Strategy Branch CSI Report, 2017/07/24. RCMP K-Division: Edmonton, AB.

Rollo & Reurbanist. 2015a. Commercial Needs Study Final Report. Prepared for: Town of Canmore. February 2015.

Rollo & Reurbanist. 2015b. Tourist Accommodation Study. Prepared for: Town of Canmore. April 2015.

Service Alberta: Registry Services. 2016. Births, Marriages and Deaths by Municipality and Year – Open Data. Alberta Government: Edmonton, AB. <https://open.alberta.ca/opendata/births-marriages-and-deaths-by-municipality-and-year>

Statistics Canada. 2009. Criminal victimization in Canada, 2009. General Societal Survey. GSS. Statistics Canada: Ottawa, ON. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2010002/article/11340-eng.htm>

Statistics Canada. 2010. Healthy People, Healthy Places. Housing Affordability. Updated September 28, 2016. Statistics Canada: Ottawa, ON. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/82-229-x/2009001/envir/hax-eng.htm>

Statistics Canada. 2012a. Measuring Crime in Canada: Introducing the Crime Severity Index and Improvements to the Uniform Crime Reporting Survey. Accessed February 3, 2015. Statistics Canada: Ottawa, ON. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-004-x/2009001/part-partie1-eng.htm>

Statistics Canada. 2013. Table 282-0055 - Labour force survey estimates (LFS), by provinces, territories and economic regions based on 2006 Census boundaries, annual. Statistics Canada: Ottawa, ON.

Statistics Canada. 2015. Table 111-0025 - Economic dependency profile, by sex, taxfilers and income, and source of income, annual. Statistics Canada: Ottawa, ON.

Statistics Canada. 2017a. Census Profile, 2016 Census. Accessed September 13, 2017. Statistics Canada: Ottawa, ON. <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/index.cfm?Lang=E>

Statistics Canada. 2017b. Table 252-0080 - Incident-based crime statistics, by detailed violations and police services. Accessed September 13, 2017. Statistics Canada: Ottawa, ON. <http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&id=2520080>

Statistics Canada. 2017c. Table 252-0051 Incident-based crime statistics, by detailed violations. Accessed September 13, 2017. Statistics Canada: Ottawa, ON. <http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&id=2520051>

Statistics Canada. 2017d. Table 252-0052 - Crime severity index and weighted clearance rates, annual. Statistics Canada: Ottawa, ON. <http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/pick-choisir?lang=eng&id=02520052&p2=33>

Statistics Canada. 2017e. Table 252-0088- Crime severity index and weighted clearance rates, by police service, Alberta annual. Statistics Canada: Ottawa, ON. <http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&id=2520088>

Statistics Canada. 2017f. Family violence in Canada: A statistical profile, 2015. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. Statistics Canada: Ottawa, ON. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2017001/article/14698-eng.htm>

Statistics Canada. 2017g. Self-reported sexual assault in Canada, 2014. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. Statistics Canada: Ottawa, ON. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2017001/article/14842-eng.htm>

Statistics Canada. 2017h. Labour force estimates for economic region 4840-Banff-Jasper-Rocky Mountain House Annual averages 2013 to 2016. Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, custom tabulation. Statistics Canada: Ottawa, ON.

Statistics Canada. 2017i. Table 111-0007 - Neighbourhood income and demographics, taxfilers and dependents with income, by source of income, annual. Statistics Canada: Ottawa, ON. <http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&retrLang=eng&id=1110007>

Statistics Canada. 2017j. Table 111-0008 - Characteristics of individuals, taxfilers and dependents with income by total income, sex and age groups, annual. Statistics Canada: Ottawa, ON. <http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/pick-choisir?lang=eng&p2=33&id=1110008>

Statistics Canada. 2017k. Table 111-0042 - Canadian capital gains, by characteristics of taxfilers with capital gains, annual. Statistics Canada: Ottawa, ON. <http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&retrLang=eng&id=1110042>

Statistics Canada. 2017l. Table 111-0025 - Characteristics of individuals, economic dependency profile of individuals, annual. Statistics Canada: Ottawa, ON. <http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&retrLang=eng&id=1110025&&pattern=&stByVal=1&p1=1&p2=31&tabMode=dataTable&csid=>

Statistics Canada. 2017m. Table 111-0009 - Family characteristics, summary, annual. Statistics Canada: Ottawa, ON. <http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&retrLang=eng&id=1110009&&pattern=&stByVal=1&p1=1&p2=37&tabMode=dataTable&csid=>

TERA Environmental Consultants. 2012. Recommendations for Trails and Management of Recreational Use for the Town of Canmore: South Canmore and West Palliser. Prepared for the Town of Canmore. TERA Environmental Consultants: Calgary, AB

Town of Canmore. 1998. Town of Canmore Municipal Development Plan. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 1999. Canmore Growth Management Strategy; Thresholds and Monitoring Program 1999 Report. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB

Town of Canmore. 2006. Mining the Future: A Vision for Canmore. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB. <https://canmore.ca/documents/planning-building-development/mining-the-future/285-mining-the-future-final-report>

Town of Canmore. 2010a. Town of Canmore Environmental Sustainability Action Plan (ESAP). Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB. <https://canmore.ca/documents/planning-building-development/signposts-to-sustainability/1016-environmental-sustainability-action-plan>

Town of Canmore. 2010b. Towards Zero Waste Events Policy. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB. <http://bvwaste.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Canmore-Towards-Zero-Waste-Events-Policy-348-2010-August-17-2010.pdf>

Town of Canmore. 2010c. Signposts to Sustainability (S2S) Strategic Directions from the Citizens of Canmore to Town Council. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB. <https://canmore.ca/documents/286-signposts-to-sustainability-final-report>

Town of Canmore. 2011a. 2011 Canmore Census. Project Managed by Big Shoes Social Enterprise. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 2011b. Bow Valley Trail Area Redevelopment Plan: Commercial Space and Vacancy Summary. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 2011c. Comprehensive Housing Action Plan (CHAP). Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB. <http://www.canmore.ca/Municipal-Sustainability/Social/Comprehensive-Housing-Action-Plan.html>

Town of Canmore. 2011d. Animal Control Bylaw. TOWN OF CANMORE BYLAW 10-2011 CONSOLIDATED 2016-07-15 PROVINCE OF ALBERTA. Town of Canmore. Canmore, AB. <http://canmore.ca/documents/bylaws/1077-animal-control-bylaw-2011-10>

Town of Canmore. 2011e. Hunting and Trapping Bylaw. TOWN OF CANMORE BYLAW 19-2011 PROVINCE OF ALBERTA. Town of Canmore. Canmore, AB. <http://canmore.ca/documents/bylaws/48-hunting-and-trapping-bylaw-2011-19>

Town of Canmore. 2014a. 2014 Canmore Census. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 2015a. Town of Canmore Recreation Services Operating Policy. September 1, 2015.
Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB. <https://canmore.ca/town-hall/community-statistics/census>

Town of Canmore. 2015b. Competitor Statistics 2014. Spreadsheet from Katherine Van Keimpema.
Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 2015c. Open Space and Trails Plan. Town of Canmore; Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 2015d. Human Use Management Review (HUMR): Public Consultation Summary and Final Reporting of Recommendations Report to Stakeholder Group. Town of Canmore; Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 2015e. 2014 Census Update. Committee of the Whole Briefing February 10, 2015.
Submitted by Cheryl Hyde, Municipal Clerk. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 2016a. Town of Canmore Recreation Master Plan. Town of Canmore, Planvision Consulting, Dialog, HSG, PERC, RC Strategies. <https://canmore.ca/residents/livable-canmore/strong-social-connections/recreation-master-plan>

Town of Canmore. 2016b. Town of Canmore State of Recreation. Town of Canmore, Planvision Consulting, Dialog, HSG, PERC, RC Strategies. <https://canmore.ca/residents/livable-canmore/strong-social-connections/recreation-master-plan>

Town of Canmore. 2016c. Bylaw 2016-06. A bylaw in the Town of Canmore in the Province of Alberta, to impose a tax in respect of the property in the Town of Canmore in the year 2016. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 2016d. Town of Canmore Steep Creek Hazard and Risk Policy. Council Resolution 239-2016. September 20, 2016. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.
<https://canmore.ca/documents/municipal-development-plan/1021-steep-creek-hazard-and-risk-policy-2016>

Town of Canmore. 2016e. Canmore Municipal Development Plan (MDP). Bylaw 2016-3. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB. <https://canmore.ca/documents/municipal-development-plan/1022-canmore-municipal-development-plan-2016>

Town of Canmore. 2016f. Town of Canmore 2016-2018 Strategic Plan. Approved on April 17, 2012 resolution #145-2012. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB. <https://canmore.ca/documents/262-toc-strategic-plan>

Town of Canmore. 2017a. Town of Canmore Recreation Program and Facility Use Statistics. Unpublished, special data request from the Town of Canmore Recreation Department. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 2017b. Meals on Wheels program statistics. Custom data request. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 2017c. Bow Valley FireSmart Fuels Reduction April/2017. Map. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 2017d. Business License Registry. Custom data request. Town of Canmore; Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 2017e. Town of Canmore - Annual Building Permit Report 10 Year Stat Report. Planning and Engineering Services. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 2017f. Town of Canmore Public Works Department 2016 Annual Report. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 2017g. Municipal Benchmarking Initiative – Wastewater. Council Committee of the Whole Briefing Agenda #: D-1. May 9, 2017. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 2017h. Municipal Benchmarking Initiative – Solid Waste. Council Committee of the Whole Briefing Agenda #: D-2. May 9, 2017. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 2017i. 2016 Human Use Management Review Implementation Summary (HUMR). Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 2017j. Wildlife Attractant Bylaw. BYLAW 2017-10. A BYLAW OF THE TOWN OF CANMORE, IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA, TO REGULATE WILDLIFE ATTRACTANTS. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.

Town of Canmore. 2017k. Mountain Creek Hazard Mitigation. Website accessed September 15, 2017. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB. <https://canmore.ca/residents/mountain-creek-hazard-mitigation>

Town of Canmore. 2017l. Affordable Services Program. Website accessed September 4, 2017. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB. <https://canmore.ca/residents/affordability-assistance/affordability-services-program>

Town of Canmore and HDR Corporation. 2014. Canmore Integrated Transportation Plan. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB and HDR Corporation: Calgary, AB.

Town of Canmore and Town of Banff. 2015. Status Report 2015 A Snapshot of BV Non-profits & Community Groups. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB. <https://canmore.ca/documents/fcss/668-status-report-2015/file>

Town of Canmore and Town of Banff. 2017a. Bow Valley Community Resource Directory. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB and Town of Banff: Banff, AB. Accessed March 17, 2017.
<https://banff.ca/resourcedirectory>.

Town of Canmore and Town of Banff. 2017b. Regional Waste Characterization Study. Prepared for the Town of Canmore and the Town of Banff by Hankins Environmental Consulting Inc.

Town of Canmore/RCMP. 2017. Protective Services Year End Reports. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.

Travel Alberta. 2012. Tourism statistics. Presentation to BOWDA by Cameron Spence from Travel Alberta. Summarized in the Rocky Mountain Outlook.
<http://www.airdriecityview.com/article/20120419/RMO0801/304199996/0/ACV>

Travel Alberta. 2016. Canmore Business & Tourism Ceases Operations. Posted July 15, 2016. Travel Alberta: Edmonton, AB.
<http://industry.travelalberta.com/news/9d63410bdf204e1db2fdb9e6b8bda2df/canmore-business-tourism-ceases-operations>

Wachsmuth, D. et al. 2017. Short-term cities Airbnb's impact on Canadian housing markets. Urban Politics and Governance research group, School of Urban Planning. McGill University: Montreal, PQ.
<http://upgo.lab.mcgill.ca/airbnb/Short-term%20Cities%202017-08-10.pdf>

Walkinshaw, S. 2002. Town of Canmore Wildland/Urban Interface Plan. Montane Forest Management Ltd: Canmore, AB.

Walkinshaw, S. 2010. Town of Canmore FireSmart Mitigation Strategy. Prepared for the Town of Canmore by Montane Forest Management Ltd. Town of Canmore: Canmore, AB.
<https://canmore.ca/documents/municipal...plan/995-firesmart-mitigation-strategy-final>

Appendix A: Archived/Inactive Indicators

These indicators were included in the previous editions of this report, but have been excluded from this edition due to a lack of updated information. It is intended that monitoring of these indicators will resume in future editions of this report when data becomes available. To see these indicators in more detail, please refer to the 2014 edition of the Community Monitoring Report.

Previous Indicator	Status
Alcohol and Drug Use - Treatment	Alberta Health Services is revising their measures and databases. It is anticipated that this indicator will return in an expanded format for the next edition of this report.
Quantitative Land Uses	Due to the drop off in development following the market crash in 2008, there have been no substantial changes to land use or zoning. A planning and land use approvals process for the Three Sisters Property was underway but was discontinued in mid-2012. The property has since been purchased (September, 2013) and a new planning process for the Three Sisters lands has just begun and could result in significant land use decisions. Additionally, recent proposals to rezone lands in the Town could also affect the amount of urban green space and residential lands. The Town of Canmore Planning Department maintains current zoning maps so this indicator can be recalculated when there are significant changes to land use patterns in Canmore.
Tenancy Status of Dwelling Units	Not available due to changes to the 2014 Canmore Census.
Transportation Corridors and Wildlife	No updated information is available for wildlife/vehicle mortality. The Alberta Government has developed a new reporting app for staff and contractors. It is expected that this app will enable more consistent reporting of wildlife mortalities from vehicle collisions.
Bear Attractants	No new updates or information were available for this section.
Population Length of Residency, Migration, Rate of Change	Some information was not available due to changes to the 2014 Canmore Census.
Voter Participation	No updates available until after the next municipal election in October 2017.
Civic Engagement	Many opportunities for civic engagement are provided during planning processes, Council meetings, community consultations and via other avenues. The past edition of this report primarily contained a summary listing of major opportunities for civic engagement, however this does not help to evaluate or quantify the effectiveness of this engagement or the outcomes resulting from it.
Reporting and Monitoring Process	Not included as a goal in the 2016-2018 Strategic Plan. This indicator was simply a top line summary of the various reporting and monitoring process. It is mostly covered by the information contained in the other sections of the report.
Energy Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	As of 2017 the Town of Canmore is working with consultants to develop a more comprehensive inventory of greenhouse gas emissions and energy use. Therefore this indicator will not be updated until the next edition of the Canmore Community Monitoring Report when the results of this inventory are available.

Appendix B: Human-Wildlife Conflict Level Descriptions

Human Bear Conflict

No Conflict

Bears feeding on natural foods in non-developed areas including backcountry trails, train tracks or travelling in non-developed areas (i.e. trails) or developed areas such as day use areas, golf courses, campgrounds (frontcountry, backcountry or random);

Feeding on carcasses in non-developed areas (b/c, railway, roadside).

Low Conflict

Bears feeding on natural foods (except carcasses) in or adjacent to unoccupied developed areas (trailheads, campgrounds, picnic areas, barns), golf courses during the day; feeding/ travelling in urban green space, facility/ playfield; feeding on unnatural food in non-developed areas or travelling through residential properties (backyards), travelling frequently through campgrounds or repeated sightings on trails.

Moderate

Bears feeding on unnatural/ natural foods (except carcasses) not secured at or adjacent to occupied developed area (trailheads, campgrounds, picnic areas, playfield, barns, residences), golf courses during the day; predating on domestic animals in non-developed areas; makes physical contact with manmade structures (decks, dumpster, pickup beds); standing ground

High

Bears feeding on lightly secured non-natural foods (coolers, non bear proof garbage cans) in or adjacent to developed area; partially enters 2 or 3 sided structure, minor property damage, closing distance (non-aggressive) to people for food or non food related closing distance incidents Close distance roadside

Very High

Bears depredating (i.e. hunt, chase, harass) on wild or domestic animals (livestock, dogs, cats, rabbits) or feeding on carcasses in or adjacent to developed areas including trails, major property damage, enters 4 sided structure ; charges people (no contact) including surprise encounters, defence of young or defending carcass.

Extreme

Bear injures or kills people

Not Applicable

Does not apply

Source: (AESRD, 2013b)

Coyote-Human Conflict

No Conflict

Coyote feeding on natural foods in non-developed areas or travelling in non-developed areas or campgrounds irregularly (frontcountry, backcountry or random), golf courses

Low Conflict

Coyote feeding/ depredating on natural foods (including carcasses) near or in developed areas (trailheads, campgrounds, picnic areas, barns, residences, golf courses, trails); predating on domestic animals in non-developed areas (trails); travelling through residential properties, facility / playgrounds(backyards), repeated non developed sightings on trails.

Moderate Conflict

Coyote depredating on domestic animals (livestock, dogs, cats, rabbits) near or in developed area, feeding on non-natural foods, not secured/ lightly secured at or near occupied developed area; no or partial body commitment into 2 or 3 sided structure, minor property damage; partial body commitment into manmade structures (decks, dumpster, pickup beds, corrals); stands ground.

High Conflict

Coyote approaches people (including approaching pets on leash).

Very High

Coyote enters 4 sided occupied or unoccupied structures for food; major property damage.

Extreme

Coyote injures or kills people

Not Applicable

Does not apply

Source: (AESRD, 2013b)

Cougar-Human Conflict

No Conflict

Cougar feeding on natural foods (including carcasses) in on developed areas or travelling in non-developed areas or campgrounds irregularly (frontcountry, backcountry or random)and general sightings in the backcountry

Low Conflict

Cougar feeding on natural foods (including carcasses) near or in unoccupied developed areas (closed trailheads, campgrounds, picnic areas, barns, residences, golf courses); travelling through facilities/ playgrounds, golf courses, residential properties (backyards), repeated non developed sightings on trails

Moderate

Cougar feeding on non-natural foods not secured at or near occupied developed area; predating on domestic animals (livestock, dogs, cats) in non-developed areas; partial body commitment into manmade structures (decks, dumpster, pickup beds, corrals)

High

Cougar feeding on lightly secured non-natural foods in or near unoccupied or occupied developed area; feeding on natural foods (including carcasses) or depredating on natural prey near or in developed areas (including trails); no or partial body commitment into 2 or 3 sided structure, minor property damage, passive or non-aggressive approach to people for food or non food related closing distance/ standing ground

Very High

Cougar depredating on domestic animals (livestock, dogs, cats) in developed areas, entering 4 sided occupied or unoccupied structures for food; major property damage,

Extreme

Cougar charges, injures or kills people

Not Applicable

Does not apply

Source: (AESRD, 2013b)

Appendix C: 2014 Census Update

(This update is provided in its entirety from the February 10, 2015 Council Agenda).



DATE OF MEETING: February 10, 2015 **Agenda #:** D-2

To: Committee of the Whole

SUBJECT: 2014 Census Update

SUBMITTED BY: Cheryl Hyde, Municipal Clerk

PURPOSE: To provide council with data on dwelling types and the count of the non-permanent population.

BACKGROUND/HISTORY

The Town carried out a municipal census between May 21 and August 30, 2014. In September 2014, administration presented council with the results of the permanent population count. This briefing provides additional information on the number and types of dwellings counted during the census, occupancy rates, and a count of the non-permanent population.

DISCUSSION

Dwelling Types

In 2014, 8,248 dwellings were identified in the census. This is 55 fewer than the 8,303 dwellings counted in 2011. There are two reasons we've identified for the lower count:

1. With the manual census system in use in 2011 and before, enumerators went into the field with maps of their areas and recorded addresses manually as they found them. The addressing data collected was never compared to the information in the Town's tax roll or planning files. In 2014, the Town provided enumerators with electronic lists of addresses compiled from a combination of the tax roll and 2011 census data. Ultimately, we were unable to find 98 addresses that were identified in 2011. They do not appear in the tax roll. While some were identified as accessory dwellings, which in 2014 were either no longer in existence or were not reported by the homeowner during enumeration, most appear to be a result of input error in 2011.
2. In 2011, 45 dwellings were counted as residential when in fact they were visitor accommodation units, therefore commercial properties.

If we take in account the 143 addresses not found or found to be commercial properties, we actually counted 88 more dwellings in 2014. This is illustrated in Table 4.

Occupancy rates have stayed virtually the same. 13,077 permanent residents were counted in 5,529 dwellings in 2014, giving us an overall occupancy rate of 2.36. In 2011, there were 12,317 residents counted in 5154 dwellings, which resulted in a 2.38 occupancy rate.

Tables 1 and 2 below illustrate the breakdown of dwelling types in 2011 and 2014.

Table 1: Dwelling Types 2014

Dwelling Type	Permanent	Non-Perm	Vacant Home	Tourist Home	Under Construction	No Response	Total
Apartment	1101	384		230		23	1738
Duplex	446	200		8		8	662
Institution	3						3
Mobile home	159	3				6	168
Other	130	36					166
Secondary suite	199	11		3		21	234
Single detached house	2474	334		31		23	2862
Townhouse	1017	526		48		19	1610
Unknown*			447		124	234	805
Total	5529	1494	447	320	124	334	8248

*The on-line census software didn't allow for dwelling types to be entered for vacant homes, homes under construction, and uncounted homes. Administration is adding this data manually based on planning records and it will be available later in the month.

Table 2: Dwelling Types 2011

Dwelling Type	Permanent	Non-Perm	Vacant Home	Tourist Home	Under Construction	No Response	Total
Apartment	945	526	210	194	16	76	1967
Duplex	415	387	17	3	19	6	847
Institution	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Mobile home	128	11	10	0	0	4	153
Other	62	8	6	0	0	9	85
Secondary suite	198	13	111	1	1	10	334
Single detached house	2426	609	66	13	23	40	384
Townhouse	969	579	51	11	37	47	1693
Unknown	8	2	6	23	3	0	44
Total	5154	2135	477	245	99	193	8303

Table 3: Non-Permanent Residents

Non-permanent residents were counted during the census as follows:

	Number of People	Number of Residences	Occupancy Rate
Completed on-line	1490	570	2.6
Completed by Enumerator	1433	552	2.6
Completed by a third party	764	372	2
Total	3687	1494	

Results received on-line and through enumeration were provided by the non-permanent residents themselves. Since those counts both came in with an occupancy rate of 2.6 people per dwelling, administration recommends using that occupancy rate to calculate the population of the homes where the information was collected from a third party. This would give us a non-permanent population of 3,884, which is 2,098 fewer than in 2011 when 5,982 non-permanent residents were counted in 2,135 dwellings. The reduction likely results from a combination of two factors:

1. The non-permanent occupancy rate in 2011 was calculated to be 2.8. Data was not supplied on how much information was gathered directly and how much from third parties. It could be that more information was supplied directly by our non-permanent residents in 2014 because of the on-line option, resulting in a more accurate count. If, in fact, the occupancy rate in 2011 was 2.6, the number of non-permanent residents would have been reduced by 431.
2. The number of homes identified as occupied by non-permanent residents dropped by 641. Calculated at a 2.6 occupancy rate this would account for 1,666 people.

To put the non-permanent count in perspective, the following table shows a comparison of dwellings counted in 2014 and 2011.

Table 4: Dwelling Type Comparison

Dwelling Type	Permanent	Non-Permanent	Vacant Home	Tourist Home	Under Construction	No Response	Total
2014	5529	1494	447	320	124	334	8248
2011	5154	2135	477	245	99	193	8303
Difference in 2014	+375	-641	-30	+75	+25	+141	-55
	Account for commercial properties mistakenly counted in 2011						+45
	Account for addresses not in tax roll that weren't found in 2014						+98
	Actual difference in addresses counted						+88

FINANCIAL IMPACTS

None

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Census information collected in 2011 and prior wasn't provided in a format that could be compared to data in the Town's tax roll or planning files. Because the 2014 census was completed electronically, it can be linked to and used to verify existing information maintained by financial services and planning and development.

We will be able to build a more accurate address list for the next census, which should allow for more consistently comparable census results in the future. This will benefit all the internal and external stakeholders who rely on the data.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

N/A

ATTACHMENTS

None

AUTHORIZATION

Submitted by: Cheryl Hyde
Municipal Clerk

Date: January 30, 2015

Approved by: Lorrie O'Brien
GM of Municipal Services

Date: February 5, 2015

Approved by: Lisa de Soto, P.Eng.
Administrative Officer

Date: February 5, 2015

(Source: Town of Canmore, 2015e)

Appendix D: Previous (2014) Recommendations

In 2009/10, the VisionKeepers Group (VKG) undertook a review of the Community Monitoring Report and how the report could be improved to facilitate tracking of the Town’s progress towards the Vision. Several recommendations were made by the VKG regarding the recommendations in this report, including:

- “There appears to be no tracking of the implementation of recommendations and the subsequent impact, and therefore their usefulness is problematic”
- “Limit recommendation of the Community Monitoring Report to those related to the collection of data or to indicators”

The following tables provide updates to track the status of the recommendations from the 2012 Community Monitoring Report. As per the recommendations of the VKG, only recommendations which relate to data collection or indicators are included in these tables.

2014 Recommendations	Status/Action
Continue to track, compile, and refine program and facility use statistics to monitor the use of Town facilities and programs over time. Collection of information on the use of Elevation Place by out of town visitors would help determine its role in attracting and serving tourists.	The Town of Canmore is monitoring program and facility use and this information is provided in this edition of the report.
The RCMP have changed their reporting system to flag incidents of domestic violence. This is important information as it will reflect actual reported incidents, not only BVVSA caseloads. This information should be included in future editions of this report when it becomes available.	RCMP flag incidents of spousal abuse for reporting and further follow up. This information is included in this edition of the report.
By using a standard methodology (Canadian Living Wage Framework) is possible to compare and benchmark Canmore against other communities. Continuing to calculate and track this indicator over time will permit continued comparison against a growing number of Canadian communities using this framework.	The Town of Canmore and other municipalities are collaborating and working towards a more standardized Living Wage calculation.
(Commercial Vacancy and Lease Rates) This indicator provides valuable insights into the local economy. Collecting this information in a standardized and consistent format would help to better understand changes in the market over time.	There is no formal collection methodology with the Town of Canmore. Updated information is gathered from summary reports produced by industry professionals.

<p>A better quantitative understanding of Canmore’s tourism industry is important. Information such as retail traffic and spending, special events attendance and spending, etc. would help to create a more detailed picture of the impacts and importance of Canmore’s tourism industry. It is hoped that the newly developed Business Performance Index will achieve substantial buy in and participation from the local business community.</p>	<p>The Town of Canmore commissioned retail and accommodations analysis. This information is included in this edition of the report.</p> <p>CBT ceased operations and then resumed operations under a new structure. Information on the Business Performance Index is not available.</p>
<p>Under the 2015-2020 Canmore Business and Tourism Strategic Plan, CBT has been developing a suite of economic targets and measures. As these measures are implemented, it would be appropriate to align future editions of this report, where relevant, to CBT’s economic targets, measures and indices.</p>	<p>CBT ceased operations and then resumed operations under a new structure. This information is not available.</p>
<p>The sources of ICI water consumption are not well quantified, a better breakdown and understanding of this sector is required to direct efforts to best encourage conservation and meet the ESAP goals.</p>	<p>ICI consumption continues to rise and a better breakdown and understanding of this sector would be valuable in helping to determine what conservation efforts would be most effective.</p>
<p>A better understanding is needed of the levels of human use in wildlife corridors, their effect on wildlife populations, and what thresholds of use or linear trail density cause disturbance for various species. Continued mapping and monitoring of the trail networks will be important to help better understand the effects of human disturbance on the local wildlife populations.</p>	<p>As part of the Human Use Management Review, Alberta Environment and Parks has conducted an extensive 2 year remote camera study of human and wildlife activity. This information is currently being analyzed and final results are expected in 2018.</p>
<p>With the purchase of TSMV and the possibility of new development approvals, it will be important to monitor and track changes in land use and corridors. In 2010 and earlier editions of the Canmore Community Monitoring Report an indicator Quantitative Land Use was included. In future editions of this report it would be a valuable exercise to include an updated version of this indicator.</p>	<p>This recommendation should be carried forward to the next edition of this report. A new planning process for the Three Sisters lands is still ongoing and could result in significant land use decisions. Additionally, recent proposals to rezone lands in the Town could also affect the amount of urban green space and residential lands.</p>
<p>There is a need to continue monitoring the effectiveness of highway fencing and the associated crossing structures. Improving</p>	<p>The Alberta Government has developed a new wildlife mortality reporting app. Hopefully this will improve the detail and</p>

<p>data collection and monitoring of WVC's would reduce the historical underestimation of collisions on this section of highway. Consistent data collection would help improve our understanding of the exact nature of the problem in ecological, financial, and public safety terms.</p>	<p>locational accuracy of WVCs and other human caused mortalities. Hopefully updated information will be available for the next edition of this report.</p>
<p>As a popular regional and international tourist destination, Canmore often has an effectively higher daily population, especially during weekends or popular summer months. Developing an estimated population figure based on permanent residents, non-permanent residents, and visitors could help provide greater context to a variety of indicators including water and energy use, criminal offences, etc.</p>	<p>The Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative developed a method for estimating effective population. Similar but different approaches have also been used by other initiatives and consultants. Census numbers are available for the permanent population for 2016, but data on the non-permanent population has not been updated since the 2014 municipal census. Additionally more standardized reporting of hotel occupancy rates is now available from Travel Alberta. A standardized approach that could be used in this report and all aspects of Town of Canmore operations and studies is recommended.</p>
<p>Changes in data collection and categorization for many questions in the 2014 Canmore Census prevent comparisons to previous years of census data. It is recommended that future editions of the Census share consistency of collection and categorization to previous editions so as to allow comparisons between data from different census years.</p>	<p>There has been no update scheduled yet for the municipal census.</p>
<p>Two of the most important 'length of residence' categories in the municipal census are the < 1 year and > 10 year categories. The < 1 year category is needed to help estimate annual population turnover and migration rates. For 2011 and prior census years, the > 10 year category showed significant trends towards an increasing population of longer term residents in Canmore. In future editions of the census it is recommended that both these categories, and categories compatible with previous census efforts be reinstated.</p>	<p>There has been no update scheduled yet for the municipal census.</p>