Appendix D
Stakeholder Feedback

D.1 Summary Table - Feedback Received in Response to the Draft Approach Presented in June 2015

Servicing Agreement Fee and Development Levy Policy Review & Final Phasing and Financing Plan

WHAT WE HEARD	CITY'S CONSIDERATIONS	RECOMMENDATION
Extend Model to a 30-year Model or Amortize Large Projects Over a Longer Period		
Projects in the model will take the city beyond a population of 300K (310K with the special study areas) and/or amortize large projects over a longer time period.	The model time period has been extended from 20-year to 25-year, as per Working Group feedback in December 2014. The longer that the model is extended, the larger the risk to the City. While it may look better in short term, it catches up and creates more issues in the longer term as new projects for the 300K+ are required. 30 years is the maximum that the City can finance projects.	Maintain 25-year model recommendation. The City maintains that the projects in the model are required for a population of 310K (current growth plan, including special study areas). The model has been developed as a 25-year model to be consistent with the growth projections for 300K by 2040 in the OCP – if it was a 30-year model, additional projects would need to be added to accommodate more growth over the longer time frame and the rate would not be expected to decrease.
Tolerance for Deficit in the SAF Reserve		
Want an increase in tolerance for deficit from -$20M proposed in June to at least -$50M which was discussed previously and used in the Interim Plan. The City's debt capacity has not kept up with pace of growth. It is overly risk averse and results in a reduced quality of life for residents due to transportation delays and reduced housing affordability due the high rate.	In 2008, the City increased its tolerance for deficit in the SAF reserves; previous to that (and going back 20 years) the reserves did not go below $0.5M for half the year. Most communities do not prefer (and others are not allowed) to go into a deficit. Increased deficit creates increased risk of debt for the City. This would impact use of that debt capacity for other things, such as addressing the infrastructure deficit or other costs associated with growth that cannot be charged through SAFs. In short, it takes away options and flexibility. An option considered was taking debt to support earlier advancement of transportation projects, thereby improving the level of service. Costs to finance this debt would be added to the SAF, which would	With the updated hectares, the rate goes down (to about $410K/ha) but SAF reserve balance decreases (to ~-$50M, with a dip to ~-$100M). Direction is still to work towards as low of a deficit as possible.

	increase the rate; the risk to the City increases - if growth slowed and the SAF-debt could not be paid by SAFs, payments would have to come from taxes.	
Differential Rates for Greenfield, Industrial, and Infill		
Transparent approach appreciated. Not in favour of current industrial rate – may stifle the market and risks pushing industrial development to areas outside of Regina, impacting the City's tax base and long-term financial viability. Inclusion of an infill rate acknowledges that infill development has an impact on the capacity of the City's infrastructure. Any subsidies to incentivize infill should be open and transparent and not hidden in SAFs. The infill rate also seems to indicate opportunity and optimism for downtown development.	Project costs were assigned based on what they were required for – either servicing multiple land uses or "only" industrial or infill. Considered moving industrial "only" projects to overall SAF list and maintain industrial rate. Delaying implementation of the infill charges until 2017 to allow broader consultation and development of the methodology for calculation of the rate was considered.	Combine industrial projects with greenfield SAF projects to result in single greenfield SAF rate given that the parks portion is so small, and greenfield industrial and greenfield residential require the same package of services for growth. RROC to conduct some additional research with industrial developers to better understand the barriers to industrial development and the level of impact that the City's SAF rate has in the region. This will inform consideration of an industrial development subsidy. Infill will have its own rate, to be determined following further engagement of the infill development community and development of the methodology for determining the rate and processes for implementation in 2016. Further input sought at the September Working Group session.
Community Benefits from Growth		
Jobs and increased standard of living result from growth therefore investment in growth needs to be rethought and tax/utility payers should contribute to project costs. Change conversation about growth from a risk/cost to a community benefit; use changes to the SAF policy to support this.	While growth can be considered a benefit to the community, the infrastructure required to support growth benefits growth areas specifically; OCP policy states that the City ensures growth pays for growth. Other funding sources such as taxes and utilities are used to fund operations and maintenance of existing services and the new growth-related infrastructure once it is built. As well as costs of growth not covered by SAFs (e.g. fire stations, transit, police, and libraries). If taxes and utilities are used to pay for growth-related infrastructure, it compromises the City's ability to address the existing infrastructure deficit re: services or its ability to seek tax or utility rate increases to improve / maintain existing services.	In the context of this policy review, maintain policy that growth pays for growth as set out in the OCP as the benefit (capacity) from the infrastructure projects is provided to service growth.

	Preliminary analyses demonstrates that the amount of tax or utility increase that would be required to impact the SAF rate would be significant.	
Cost Allocation for Projects		
Consider revisiting the projects to allocate costs based on who benefits (versus whether they would be built if growth was occurring or not). The result would be an increase in taxpayer contributions. There are projects in the model that address existing infrastructure deficiencies – therefore taxpayers should pay their portion. Major water and wastewater upgrades are too large for growth that will service all "ready" neighbourhoods, enabled only by degrading city-wide transportation network. Options are to either increase debt, increase taxpayer contribution, or strategically add population where infrastructure capacity exists.	Growth pays for growth approach is used, therefore if a project would only be built by the City to support growth, it has been 100% allocated to be paid for by growth. To date, projects identified as 100% SAF are considered to only be built if growth continues and if they are required for 300K. There are a few interchanges that are the exception, and they have been identified as such in the model (i.e. only 70% of the total cost is allocated to this model/time horizon). Where projects would be built to improve service for the existing community whether growth was occurring or not, the costs have been allocated to the City (taxes or utility). Water and wastewater projects are required generally wherever growth is occurring. We are in a new threshold of growth by which previously built infrastructure is at capacity; as such major investments are required in all systems regardless of the location of growth. Their objective is not to allow growth to happen everywhere concurrently (see proposed phasing plan).	Maintain current criteria regarding projects identified and their cost allocations. Clearly identify cost allocation policies, to be set out in a cost allocation table, for each infrastructure service.
Moving projects from being funded by the SAF to being funded directly by developers.		
Concern that there is a lack of consistency in how projects are identified to be funded by SAFs or directly by developers. Making projects development-specific reduces amount of debt required by the City and artificially minimizes the SAF rate but it increases the cost of development, and the cost of lots. Increased developer risk puts the city's competitiveness at risk. Keep 'capacity-building' projects in the model. Concern about drainage projects that are now identified as developer- specific. The success of the previous SAF model relied on including projects that built future	The project lists have been reviewed for consistency. This direction is aligned with the proposed recommendation to use SAFs for system improvements versus for projects that serve a single development. An Endeavour to Assist policy is being drafted to help current developers recoup costs for projects that serve future developments. Moving projects back into the SAF results in an increased SAF rate. Moving projects to being paid directly by the developers evens out overall system upgrade costs (generally the same across the board). Cost differences between areas would now be seen in project-costs by area for developer-specific projects.	Maintain policy direction that developers directly pay for projects that serve their specific areas and that SAFs are used to fund system improvements that are required for growth. This is consistent with approaches used in other communities; and it will improve the balance of the SAF reserve and the City's ability to fund system upgrades - something the previous approach to SAF's had been preventing.

growth capacity and ensured developers were receiving the same benefits while paying the same rate. The City's deficit buffered costs of oversizing projects and removed burden of future growth from current growth. This helped affordability, decreased developer risk, and encouraged growth. The changes in direction creates uneven benefit and is bad for small developers		
When transportation projects were delayed in the model, were the new dates arbitrary or were they based on some new/revised trigger that related to level of service level or population threshold?		
Recognition that population triggers are difficult to establish for every project but for the larger projects, it is the fairest way of determining project timing. Would like to see sensitivity analysis with respect to different growth population rates and how it affects the rate.	The delay of transportation projects was developed in consideration of which projects could actually be delayed. Delayed projects were funded when the revenues/funding allowed it, versus in response to some service level or population threshold. All projects are subject to the overall budget process; the model is not a capital project planning tool.	Maintain current transportation project timing and allocation of costs as determined to date.
Transparency of development cost increases		
Concern about how the increase in costs are described – communication needs to reference cost increases to the SAF program and the costs that are being passed on directly to the developer.	To date the SAF rate has largely been the focus of communication, with reference to developer-specific projects. Modelling considerations and communication with administration and Council has identified the cost being passed on directly to the developer.	Communication going forward will highlight development costs for both SAF and the change in developer-specific projects.
Phasing of Neighbourhoods		
Comments vary widely across Working Group members. For example: ● Support of phasing presented at June WG Workshop ● Prefer free market approach using area-specific rates to encourage development	With changes in how SAF is used (i.e. ***from*** being something to pay for the work required to plug new areas into the system ***to*** focusing on keeping the broader system functioning) phasing becomes less important to the City from a capital project perspective. However, there are considerations from an operations and maintenance and complete neighbourhoods perspective.	Phasing of residential lands: Phase 1: - All 235K neighbourhoods - Phase 1, Westerra - Coopertown: Rosewood Park & School Site area and a Portion Elmbridge

to proceed when feasible. ● If a flat rate is used, need tight phasing to guide development of most affordable lands. ● Three areas are manageable at once. ● Percent of subdivision (i.e. 70-80%) should be used to trigger the start of a new development. ● The market will sort it out during periods of growth. When growth is not occurring at a sufficient rate, phasing should be staggered based on reaching pre-determined thresholds. ● Growth should be defined by community, not by neighbourhood (so that a neighbourhood that is not as desirable does not hold up overall development). ● Desire for there to be certainty in phasing plans going forward.	Various options were considered including: ● Maintaining the Interim Plan approach and only phasing for short periods of time (i.e.define phasing for the next 5 years) ● Defining a specific phasing plan ● Allowing all neighbourhoods to proceed as they can meet servicing OCP Policy 14.19 (policy to guide development of a phasing and financing plan) was used to inform the development of a phasing plan.	Phase 2: - Rest of Westerra - Coopertown: Rest of Elmbridge and The Village - Westbrook - North of Dewdney (Keeseekoose) Phase 3: - Towns North - Coopertown: Rest of Rosewood Park - McCarthy North (including Skywood) - West Harbour Landing Phasing of employment lands: - Generally triggered by zoning approval, as per servicing, developer-readiness, and compatibility. t As such, all corridors could proceed, land north of the GTH could proceed following build out of the bypass and completion of the east pressure zone solution, and the first phase of the Fleet Street Business Park could advance. - Commercial lands within residential subdivisions should proceed as those areas build out
Phase in SAF fees over 2-3 years		
Phase-in requested	To date, the focus has been on developing a rate for full implementation in 2016 as it has been recognized that delaying this increase will just cause rates in the future to be even higher. Phase-in options under consideration: - Not phasing in any charges - Phasing-in infill charges - Phasing-in rates for industrial - Phasing in Greenfield SAF charge	Seek further input at the September Working Group session. Base rate has been calculated without phase-in.
SAF Rate for Greenfield		
Rate is too high – there should be an increase to the taxpayer contribution to reduce the rate; this could be accomplished by changing the conversation to focus more on the benefit of growth to the community	The rate has been based on: ● the cost of projects to service 300K (310K with the special study areas); ● the number of hectares to be developed, updated since June;	Seek further input at the September Working Group session. Greenfield SAF rate has dropped due to revisions in the growth projections to reflect more recent and

(and thereby the benefit to existing taxpayers). Utility projects should be paid by the Utility, which will reduce the rate. If there is a flat rate (i.e. not area-specific) a tight phasing plan is needed. Increased SAFs will erode housing affordability and put the city's competitiveness and growth at risk.	• delaying transportation projects to prioritize water and wastewater projects; • maintaining a relatively narrow SAF reserve balance; • limiting the City's risk; and • the proposed recommendation that SAFs are to fund system improvements	accurate figures along with other refinements to the modeling. Additional growth has resulted in more units which has decreased the cost from about $488K/ha to about $410K/ha.
Differential Rate for 235K and 300K Neighbourhoods		
Comments vary widely between WG members. For example: Support for a single rate (reasonable and less risk). Support for a differential rate for 235K and 300K neighbourhoods. Supports exploration of having a staggered rate to understand costs.	The Interim Plan phased the rate in for the 235K lands. Projects in the lists benefit a combination of both 235K and 300K neighbourhoods, as per the shift in having SAFs pay to improve service of the entire systems. Allowing the 235K neighbourhoods to have a lower rate will increase the 300K rate.	Maintain recommendation for a single rate including both 235K and 300K lands.
Area-Specific Rates		
Develop area-specific rates to maintain affordability and motivate developers to find innovative and cost effective servicing solutions.	The differences in development costs are now more apparent via the development-specific projects. Areas that are more efficient to develop will have lower costs paid directly by the developer, rather than through area specific SAFs. Developing area-specific rates would involve intensive consultation and agreement on the approach may be difficult given the subjectivity.	Maintain approach of having a single Greenfield SAF rate.

D. 2: Summary of Responses to Draft Recommended Approach Presented in September 2015

Draft approach was shared on September 4, 2015 and presented at the Working Group Session on September 10, 2015

PHASING

Proposed Recommendation (as of Sept 4, 2015)	What aspects work well?	What suggestions would you make to improve the approach?	Response to Feedback / Recommendation Going Forward
Phasing of residential land development is divided into three phases that considers continued population growth and serviceability Development of employment lands will be triggered by zoning approval with specific consideration given to servicing, developer-readiness and compatibility. This approach generally meets stakeholder interests, provides market choice, is lower risk to the City, and promotes faster build-out of neighbourhoods which fosters quicker achievement of complete neighbourhoods and generation of taxes to support operational costs.	Understanding sequencing of development is improved. There is a clearer picture of growth areas and when new areas will start. The phasing plan is logical and makes sense. Generally support the approach, but the policy seems too prescriptive.	Provide better clarification on the 75% build-out – is city-wide or by quadrant Development should not be reliant on the completion of one area in order for another to advance to the next phase. It should be up to the developer, who under the proposed policy needs to be more investments, to determine if development should proceed or not. There should be no constraints on the consumer. This will provide market choice and may foster more affordable new housing. There must be a way for the City to allow developer to go if they are ready. Suggest that as new information is received, the City should be open to potential amendments to the policy and phasing plan. Therefore, there should be flexibility. Reconsider phasing of development in the northwest and southwest. Phasing of the 235K neighbourhoods has become irrelevant; phasing should distinguish between the existing neighbourhoods that have been developing since 2007 and those that have not commenced. Recommend re-evaluating 235K neighbourhoods, and moving those unlikely to develop immediately out of Phase 1 - the model should reflect a realistic time frame for when fees will be collected More clearly describe criteria and rationale for phasing plan. Make the areas identified as phase 1, 2, and 3 more fuzzy to better recognize that more information is to come.	Provide more clarity on what 75% build-out means– this includes considering triggering moving from phase to phase on a quadrant basis. Round the shapes for the phases to better illustrate that more information is required in order to draw specific lines around development. Review phasing policy language. Consider refinements to northwest neighbourhoods.

SHIFT IN PROJECTS BEING FUNDED BY SAF TO BEING FUNDED DIRECTLY BY DEVELOPERS

Proposed Recommendation (as of Sept 4, 2015)	What aspects work well?	What suggestions would you make to improve the approach?	Response to Feedback / Recommendation Going Forward
Developer-Specific Projects (those within a single development area or that are outside the area but primarily serve one area) have been identified as 100% developer-funded. This approach is consistent with other municipalities, helps keep the overall SAF rate low, and provides developers more flexibility in managing projects for their specific developments. SAF is used to fund city-wide infrastructure.	This allows developers to move forward without waiting for City investment. It clearly identifies which projects qualify This works well if consistently applied. The description of what the SAF pays for is somewhat understandable; however, it is anticipated that a lot of discussion will be had on specific infrastructure items.	For this to work, the Endeavour to Assist policy needs to be flawless. This is a good idea, though some refinements may be needed when it comes to shared areas and the distribution of costs. The criteria are too subjective and could lead to challenges from the development industry. Provide rationale used to make the decisions as the provision of the infrastructure list alone is not sufficient. Change the policy so that developers only pay directly for projects that are within the boundaries of their specific areas (i.e. not off-site). There should be a balance of risk taken between the City and developers.	Maintain proposed approach Improve clarity in project lists for why projects are SAF/DL or directly developer-funded.

COST ALLOCATIONS FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS LISTS

Proposed Recommendation (as of Sept 4, 2015)	What aspects work well	What suggestions would you make to improve the approach?	Response to Feedback / Recommendation Going Forward
Growth-Related Capital Projects Lists form a core basis for the SAF model. These projects are required to service the 300K (310K, with Special Study Areas) population; this includes, greenfield, infill and industrial development. All growth-related capital SAF projects are built by the end of the period (2040) Cost allocations between the City, SAF and developers are outlined in the DRAFT fee policy and appendices.	Agree that growth should pay for growth; however capital projects should be partially funded by taxpayers as they will share the benefit from projects. This is a good idea as part of the whole package. This is well thought-out If consistently applied, and the criteria are clear, this approach could work well.	Developers, taxpayers and utilities should pay a portion of projects. Criteria remain too subjective. There is lack of clarity around the definition that a project is SAF-funded provided it is "not intended to service one or more contiguous new developments, but is required to accommodate overall growth". Disappointed in cost allocation for interchanges -change interchange and grade-separation projects from being 100% SAF funded to 50-50 (SAF-City) This is where we should have spent most of our time during this project since it is the main input into the rate calculation.	Maintain proposed approach Provide option for Council to consider funding interchanges 50% through SAFs and 50% through taxpayers; recommendation will be to fund interchanges 100% through SAFs.

		Feel we need the master servicing plans as a key input to drive timing, cost allocation, and developer funding. This policy results in an SAF rate that is very different and developers are not clear on what they have to pay for and when. Concern that due to the complexity of the model, Servicing Agreements will take a long time to prepare and reach agreement on, which will add time and cost to the process.	

ENDEAVOUR TO ASSIST DRAFT POLICY

Proposed Recommendation (as of Sept 4, 2015)	What aspects work well?	What suggestions would you make to improve the approach?	Response to Feedback / Recommendation Going Forward
Endeavour to Assist policy be used to help developers manage projects they need to fund directly that help service future growth areas.	This is a useful tool when there are a limited number of parties involved. This looks like it should work as long as the original developer is not waiting a long time to recoup funds. Criteria is needed to decide what infrastructure serves multiple areas. Pleased that City recognizes Endeavour to Assist in Servicing Agreements. Separate cost sharing agreements are important. A developer who is first in needs a level of assurance that they can collect from a future developer; the interest on title helps bring that assurance.	It will be a challenge to distribute the costs evenly if there are a lot of parties. The policy needs to be extended to 25 years to match the model and OCP. This policy should be solely taken on by the City to administer, manage and enforce. The City will always be there; developers may not. The City should bear some of the risk and initiative to pay for infrastructure that benefit lands other than land being developed and can collect funds from new developers directly. Concern is raised that a developer can have an interest registered on title due to an Endeavour to Assist for which they have not been a part. The City needs to be involved to provide the backing to the first developer while at the same time, provide a level of fairness to subsequent developers. Determine how to allocate costs fairly - this may require the development of a guiding document to help parties agree.	Maintain proposed approach Consider extending term of Endeavour to Assist to 15 years, plus an option for renewal.

APPROACH FOR GREENFIELD SAF RATE

Proposed Recommendation (as of Sept 4, 2015)	What aspects work well?	What suggestions would you make to improve the approach?	Response to Feedback / Recommendation Going Forward
Greenfield SAF/DL Rate: ~$410k/ha This includes a blend of all required greenfield projects (for industrial, commercial and residential growth).	With current policy of growth paying for growth, it allows GF areas to proceed with investment. It is clearly defined. It offers transparency. Believe the City made every effort to come up with the lowest rate possible.	Better cost-sharing of growth paying for growth. Include all areas to be developed in the future. This would not improve the approach to the rate, but clarity would be improved to understand the rate without the industrial projects. The rates for industrial and commercial development must remain affordable. One rate may work but industrial development requires more study. This work is complicated but could be simplified as follows: SAF = infrastructure divided by area. Existing neighbourhoods under development should pay a lower rate than the new neighbourhoods; the infrastructure for existing neighbourhoods is mostly in place. Preference for area-specific rates. Concern that development could be approved before the end of the year that could have a lower SAF rate than existing neighbourhoods that have been under development since 2007.	Maintain proposed approach For information, provide the SAF rate without the industrial only projects included.

APPROACH TO INFILL

Proposed Recommendation (Sept 4)	Do you support removing the exempt area	Response to Feedback / Recommendation Going Forward
Maintain exempt area and delay implementation of infill charges to allow for industry consultation and process development in 2016. In 2017, the intention is to apply 100% of the infill charge. Subsidies for infill development may be considered.	Generally, yes from all respondents. If there is anything being added to the system, then there should be a charge in most cases. Need more information on the impact to infill developers, and non-profits. A development levy is a fair mechanism to generate necessary revenue to cover infrastructure costs for infill development. Concerns about how this would be done, and therefore support more research.	Maintain proposed approach

	Suggestion for private home builders/home owners who self-build to be exempt to ensure affordability. Support consultation process to be undertaken in 2016	

PHASE-IN OF THE RATE

Proposed Recommendation (as of Sept 4, 2015)	Do you support phase in of the rate?	If a phase in was preferable, over what time period should it be phased in - over 2 or 3 years?	Response to Feedback / Recommendation Going Forward
100% of Greenfield SAF Rate implemented in 2016	Generally yes, from all respondents: phasing-in of the fees would help alleviate the initial impact and strain on the slower market	Phasing in over 3 years was preferred by most respondents.	Recommend phasing-in the rate over 3 years

OVERALL SAF & DL DRAFT POLICY

Proposed Recommendation (as of Sept 4, 2015)	What aspects work well?	What suggestions would you make to improve the approach?	Response to Feedback / Recommendation Going Forward
DRAFT SAF and DL Policy and appendices were provided.	There is a better understanding of current key issues and importance of continued rate review. Overall, the policy is l – okay. There was good consultation with industry and clear definition of issues. Appreciate consultation process in working through the issue with the development community.	Monitor and measure how the new policy is performing and how it is being applied over time. Believe that what has been developed is a model to fund infrastructure over time but the process has failed to plan for growth. Suggest that there should have been consideration of the question: "If we implement this plan to pay for infrastructure, will we be able to grow the city to 300K over the next 25 years?" Include taxpayers and effects of affordability into the policy. Concern that if the policy is implemented as drafted (i.e. bringing on too much land at one time), there will be immediate, negative effects on growth that will take a long time to recover from.	Continue to refine policy using the proposed approach. Consider development of monitoring and measurement component to include in the policy.

OTHER COMMENTS

- Policy should include financial involvement by utilities and tax payers.
- There are still outstanding issues – suggest that the City compile these and clear them up through an issues paper or table them for the next SAF/DL policy review
- Appreciate being involved in the process
- Feel City provided ample opportunity for input from the industry and the consultant did a good job of presenting the information in a clear and concise fashion.
- Understand the financial pressures that the City is facing, as the development industry is now experiencing similar circumstances due to the softer market.
- Look forward to continued collaborative working relationship in the development and review of neighbourhood and concept plans to fulfill the vision of the OCP.
- Concern about affordability of this approach.
- The City of Regina has the responsibility to address the specific items of feedback in a manner that encourages the sustainable growth, both economically and physically of our community, while ensuring our City has a competitive advantage to attract investment and growth to our community. One of Regina's long standing competitive advantages is the affordability and attainability of our housing. This must be part of any equation, if the City of Regina sees its mandate more than its corporate accountabilities, but improving the standard of living for Regina Citizens. This means removing barriers, not adding barriers for the development industry.
- Refer to comments provided in January and July - they are still relevant.
- It is very important that the SAF and DL Policy is structured to allow growth to occur in a sustainable manner rather than impede the growth of the city.

From Producer to the World

AGT FOODS
A Division of Alliance Pulse Processors Inc.

6200 E. Primrose Green Dr.
Regina, SK CANADA S4V 3L7
www.agtfoods.com

Phone: (306) 525-4490
Fax: (306) 525-4463

Diana L. Hawryluk, MCIP, RPP

Executive Director, City Planning and Development

City of Regina

October-6-15

Re: Designation of Lands within the Phasing Plan Draft Maps

Dear Ms. Hawryluk:

As per our recent discussions regarding the South East lands owned by Long Lake Investments (LLIC) and AGT Foods (AGT) located to the east of Tower Road, I reference the draft map for Phasing that outlines the current proposed phasing plan for Regina city lands.

I draw your attention to the numerous discussions I have had with Administration prior to and since the annexation of these lands from the Rm of Sherwood and rely on the discussions where it was agreed that these lands needed to be studied further along with the phasing and financing discussions to ensure that they were dealt appropriately in the development of the SE Neighborhood Planning process. As you are aware, LLIC is a major funder of the current collaborative work that is being completed by the consortium of landowners, of which the City is one.

It is as a result of these previous discussions and the genuine intent of all parties to examine our lands and how they will fit in to Phase 1,2 and/or 3 lands that we formally request that the draft Maps be amended to outline the lands to the west and east of the new Regina Bypass to be outlined as “Special Study Area.” This designation will reflect the reality of its current status. The current draft leaves these lands entirely out of classification and I do not believe this is the intent. Please do confirm to us that your team will facilitate this change in the Draft Phasing Plan that I understand will go to Council this month.

Yours sincerely,

Murad Al-Katib

Cc: LLIC Ownership Group