Demographic Trends and Implications for the City of Calgary

Merrill Cooper

Research Report F|55
Family Network

April 2006
Demographic Trends and Implications for the City of Calgary

By
Merrill Cooper

April 2006

© Canadian Policy Research Networks Inc.
# Contents

Executive Summary .......................................................................................................................... iii

1.0 Introduction ................................................................................................................................. 1

2.0 Population Growth and Demography ......................................................................................... 2
  2.1 The Greying of the Population ................................................................................................. 2
  2.2 Migrants to Calgary .................................................................................................................. 3
  2.3 Aboriginal Peoples .................................................................................................................. 6

3.0 Projected Impacts: Challenges and Opportunities ................................................................. 9
  3.1 Economic Development ......................................................................................................... 9
    3.1.1 Population Aging and the Economy ................................................................................. 9
    3.1.2 Other Labour Force Drivers .............................................................................................. 10
    3.1.3 Vulnerable Workers .......................................................................................................... 11
  3.2 Social Development .............................................................................................................. 12
    3.2.1 Social Exclusion .............................................................................................................. 13
    3.2.2 Family Structure .............................................................................................................. 16
    3.2.3 Health ............................................................................................................................... 17
    3.2.4 Education .......................................................................................................................... 19
    3.2.5 Crime ................................................................................................................................. 22
    3.2.6 Social Services .................................................................................................................. 24
  3.3 Built Environment ................................................................................................................... 25
    3.3.1 Neighbourhood Development and Urban Sprawl ......................................................... 26
    3.3.2 Transportation .................................................................................................................. 28
    3.3.3 Affordable Housing ......................................................................................................... 29
  3.4 Natural Environment ............................................................................................................... 30
    3.4.1 Threats to the Environment .............................................................................................. 31
    3.4.2 Environmental Protection ................................................................................................ 31
    3.4.3 Ongoing Concerns ........................................................................................................... 32
  3.5 Governance ............................................................................................................................ 33
    3.5.1 Urban Expansion and Representation ............................................................................. 33
    3.5.2 Civic Engagement ............................................................................................................ 33
    3.5.3 Tax Base and Financing ................................................................................................... 34

4.0 Case Studies ............................................................................................................................... 36
  4.1 Case Study 1: Governance and Civic Engagement in Toronto ............................................. 36
  4.2 Case Study 2: Supporting Urban Aboriginal Youth in Winnipeg .......................................... 37

5.0 Summary and Conclusions ....................................................................................................... 38

Bibliography ....................................................................................................................................... 41
Our Support ........................................................................................................................................ 57
Appendices

Appendix 1. Demographic Trends – Key Findings ........................................................... 52

Boxes and Tables

Box 1. Rogue Variables ............................................................................................ 8

Table 1. Total Projected Population by Age, Calgary ................................................ 3

Table 2. Visible Minority Ethnocultural Characteristics Projections, Calgary CMA 4

Table 3. Projected Immigrant Population by Age and as a Percentage of the
Population, Calgary ....................................................................................... 5

Table 4. Projected Visible Minority Population by Age and as a Percentage of the
Population, Calgary ....................................................................................... 5

Table 5. Projected Aboriginal Population, Calgary, Four Scenarios ......................... 7

Table 6. Population Reporting an Aboriginal Identity, Calgary CMA, 2001 ............. 7

Table 7. Employment and Labour Force Projections, Calgary .............................. 10

Table 8. Actual and Projected Families by Family Type, Calgary ............................ 17

Table 9. Person and Property Crimes, Calgary ....................................................... 22
**Executive Summary**

Calgary’s population is expected to reach at least 1.1 million by 2014 and 1.23 million by 2033. Most of this growth will occur over the next two decades, primarily due to in-migration, and then slow as a result of stable birth rates and higher death rates among the aging population. Growth projections are, of course, speculative and subject to a wide range of fluid variables, but it is certain that, over the next 30 years, the city will be home to significantly more people.

Calgary’s population will also change demographically. Although population policies and trends can shift over time, the historical evidence suggests that current patterns will continue to be a useful barometer of future possibilities. Calgary is likely to continue to be one of the major Canadian destinations of choice for immigrants who come from a wide spectrum of countries, and bring with them a rich variety of cultures, languages, and backgrounds. Likewise, Calgary will be home to more Aboriginal peoples and, particularly, Aboriginal children, youth, and young adults. In addition, although Calgary may still feature a slightly younger population than the rest of the country, the average age of Calgarians will rise. By 2033, over 40% of the population will be middle-aged and older, while the absolute number of children and youth will be almost static.

These and other changes will influence both the nature and dimensions of human needs in Calgary and the ways in which effective and sustainable systems are devised and delivered to anticipate and address those needs. The dynamics of population growth and change will bring both challenges and opportunities in planning for the city’s future as a vibrant and thriving metropolis, affecting quality of life and the environment, services and infrastructure, economic development, and the ways in which Calgarians live, work, and play together.

The “greying” of Calgary’s population carries with it a broad range of implications for each of the five systems. While much has been made of the potentially ruinous effects of a population dominated by seniors on the economy, such concerns, while not to be dismissed, are probably overblown. Increases in longevity in conjunction with healthier aging, extended workforce participation, and accumulations of wealth among a significant portion of Calgary seniors are likely to mitigate many of the possible problems associated with growth within older age cohorts. At the same time, however, there will be more seniors, many with diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, who require a range of publicly-provided health and social service supports, over a longer time frame, to remain healthy and socially engaged. In addition, an older population will likely prompt changes in infrastructure requirements, as demand shifts from schools and playgrounds, large, low-density housing, and family-friendly amenities to services and facilities addressing the health, social, housing, and mobility needs of mature adults, whose children have long left the nest. The need for public transportation that is accessible on all dimensions will likely rise, and it is possible that demand for higher-density housing, located close to amenities, may eventually spark an exodus from the suburban communities which are currently in or planned for development.
Calgary’s continued economic growth and social vibrancy will, to a great extent, depend upon the city’s ability to attract and integrate skilled workers from elsewhere in Canada and around the world. Increased immigration also has the potential to boost Calgary’s “cultural capital” and help the city to evolve into a truly cosmopolitan and world-class metropolis. Because global competition for educated immigrants is on the rise, Calgary’s success in maintaining a productive workforce will hinge on its continued “livability” – affordability, amenities, environmental health, safety, economic security, and social cohesion – along with the extent to which immigrants’ social and economic integration can be facilitated via improvements in recognition of foreign credentials, provision of English-language instruction and other social and educational supports, and respect for religious and cultural diversity. If, however, the current trajectory of increasing poverty among immigrants continues, the city will not only fail to entice and retain global talent, it will perpetuate and heighten social exclusion among a significant proportion of the population, perhaps even creating a disenfranchised immigrant underclass, with profound negative social implications.

Likewise, Calgary’s future is intricately connected to the well-being of the Aboriginal population. The imminent surge in the number of young Aboriginal peoples in Calgary presents both challenges and opportunities. Calgary’s continued economic growth and positive social climate will require ongoing efforts to bolster the social inclusion of Aboriginal peoples and to ensure that young Aboriginal people are afforded education and employment opportunities to allow them to fully participate in the workforce and all other aspects of society. This will require careful planning to create welcoming and supportive environments to nurture the growth of professional, political, and business leaders within and beyond the Aboriginal community. Failure to do so may threaten Calgary’s social and economic sustainability over the long-term.

Although Calgary boasts one of the strongest economies among all Canadian cities, the population is increasingly divided into “haves” and “have-nots.” In the past few years, child poverty rates have almost doubled, such that 20% (about 43,000) of Calgary’s children now live below Low-Income Cut-Off (LICO). Almost one in five parents in Calgary reports that they do not have enough money to buy food all of the time. Poverty rates and unemployment rates are much higher for immigrants and Aboriginal peoples than among the rest of the population. Aboriginal peoples continue to suffer a broad range of health, social, and economic problems at rates vastly exceeding those of other Calgarians. Calgary’s long-term social sustainability depends on the city’s ability to address all of the factors which contribute to the social exclusion of a growing proportion of the population. Continued economic growth alone will be insufficient to reverse current trends, as the labour market may be increasingly polarized between high-skill, high-wage-jobs and low-wage, low-skill jobs. Along with evolution in the demographic composition of the population, changes in family structure and the education system may mean that more workers will be subject both to conditions that restrict their capacity to participate in the labour market and to discrimination and disadvantage at work. Depending on policy and planning decisions made now, there is a very real danger that many of Calgary’s workers will be left behind in the new economy, with escalating numbers of “working poor” Calgarians at risk of social exclusion on all its dimensions.
Calgary’s growing population also carries with it increased demand for housing and infrastructure development. Current municipal plans lay the foundation for ongoing expansion of Calgary’s urban footprint, with extensive residential development creeping outward into agricultural lands to the north, northeast, northwest, south, southeast, and southwest of the city over the next decade. While public transit will expand over time, residents of these new suburbs will generally rely on private vehicles for mobility, contributing to higher greenhouse gas emissions and probably, over time, to increased traffic congestion. Outward suburban development requires extensive and expensive new infrastructure, and continued population growth and urban sprawl in conjunction with global warming seriously threaten Calgary’s water ecosystems, along with all other aspects of the natural environment in and around the city. It is not clear that current recycling and water conservation plans will be sufficient to slow, let alone halt, the environmental tolls of expansion. The consequences for all aspects of life in Calgary may be profound.

The City of Calgary is already challenged by the costs associated with current infrastructure development and maintenance. Much of Calgary’s infrastructure is over 50 years old and will soon require expensive upgrades, yet the city is fiscally constrained by its limited autonomy in the taxation field. Proposed development levies and user fees may offset infrastructure costs in new subdivisions, but alternate revenue sources will be required to prevent imminent deterioration of existing road, water, and other systems, and to support the demands of the burgeoning population within Calgary, along with people living in its environs who commute to the city. In addition, due to downloading from higher levels of government, the city will be increasingly pressured to provide a broader range of social services to growing numbers of people. The sustainability of Calgary’s built and social infrastructure will, therefore, greatly depend on the city’s success in negotiating new funding arrangements with the federal and provincial governments.

Finally, over the next three decades, Calgary will be challenged by changing demographics, along with shifting attitudes toward and expectations of government, to explore new approaches to representing and engaging citizens. The city will need to open new avenues to participation for growing segments of the population – particularly immigrant and Aboriginal peoples – who have traditionally been denied access to decision-making power in order to foster social inclusion and social cohesion, with a view to sustaining broad social well-being among Calgarians over time.

In 30 years, Calgary may be strikingly different than it is today. The city may or may not succeed in retaining and further cultivating economic growth and prosperity, strong infrastructure and services, a green and flourishing natural environment, thriving neighbourhoods, and a healthy and harmonious population. All of these facets of urban life will be shaped by Calgary’s growing and evolving population, and the ways and extent to which demographic change is anticipated, embraced, and accommodated with a view to ensuring the city’s long-term sustainability on all dimensions.
Demographic Trends and Implications for the City of Calgary

1.0 Introduction

Calgary’s population is expected to reach at least 1.1 million by 2014 and 1.23 million by 2033. Most of this growth will occur over the next two decades, primarily due to in-migration, and then slow as a result of stable birth rates and higher death rates among the aging population. Growth projections are, of course, speculative and subject to a wide range of fluid variables, but it is certain that, over the next 30 years, the city will be home to significantly more people.

Calgary’s population will also change demographically. Although population policies and trends can shift over time, the historical evidence suggests that current patterns will continue to be a useful barometer of future possibilities. Calgary is likely to continue to be one of the major Canadian destinations of choice for immigrants who come from a wide spectrum of countries, and bring with them a rich variety of cultures, languages, and backgrounds. Likewise, Calgary will be home to more Aboriginal peoples and, particularly, Aboriginal children, youth, and young adults. In addition, although Calgary may still feature a slightly younger population than the rest of the country, the average age of Calgarians will rise. By 2033, over 40% of the population will be middle-aged and older, while the absolute number of children and youth will be almost static.

These and other changes will influence both the nature and dimensions of human needs in Calgary and the ways in which effective and sustainable systems are devised and delivered to anticipate and address those needs. In 30 years, Calgary may be strikingly different than it is today. The dynamics of population growth and change will bring both challenges and opportunities in planning for the city’s future as a vibrant and thriving metropolis, affecting quality of life and the environment, services and infrastructure, economic development, and the ways in which Calgarians live, work, and play together. Decisions made now will permanently affect all aspects of life in this city over the coming decades.

This paper provides an overview of projected key demographic trends in this city over the next 30 years, and the ways in which these trends may interrelate with and influence change within the five key urban systems – social, economic, built environment and infrastructure, natural environment, and governance – which, together, shape the well-being and quality of life of Calgarians. It must be stressed that the relationships among demographics and each of these systems, individually and collectively, are complex and multidirectional.

The paper begins with a review of Calgary’s current and projected demography. Each subsequent section explores the possible implications of these demographic changes for various dimensions of one of the five systems described above over the next 30 years and, in some cases, beyond. Included in the discussion are a few unpredictable, or “rogue,” variables at the local, provincial, national, and international levels which could influence demographic projections and the evolution of the five urban systems. The paper also presents two selected case studies exemplifying the ways in which some of the opportunities and challenges arising from demographic changes have been addressed by other cities, and concludes with a synopsis of highlights and key issues.
2.0 Population Growth and Demography

Calgary is poised to become one of Canada’s largest and most influential cities. Following 10 years of phenomenal growth, the city’s population is currently on the cusp of 1 million and is conservatively projected to rise to 1.23 million in 2033. Most of this growth will occur at a rate of about 1% each year over the next two decades, and then decelerate between 2026 and 2033.1

Over the next 30 years, Calgary’s size and demographic profile will be most influenced by three trends: population aging, immigration, and the growth of the urban Aboriginal population, which individually and collectively bear on all aspects of life in the city.

2.1 The Greying of the Population

Although Calgary may still feature a slightly younger population than the rest of the country, the average age of Calgarians will soon begin to escalate. Over the next 30 years, population growth will be concentrated among adults over the age of 44 years. The percentage of adults aged 45 to 64 years will increase from 23% in 2006 to 28% in 2033, for a total of 126,000 additional people in this age cohort; the percentage of adults aged 65 years or more will rise from 9.8% in 2006 to 15.4% in 2033, a total of 94,000 additional seniors (City of Calgary, 2003b).

Many of these seniors will be elderly. From 2001 to 2011, adults aged 85 years and over are expected to increase by almost 50%, from 8,000 to 12,000 people. Over the following 10 years, from 2011 to 2021, the 65 to 74-year-old cohort will increase by 51%, from 55,000 to 83,000 people. Between 2021 and 2031, the baby boom generation will move into the 75 to 84 year age cohort, increasing the size of this group by 46%, from 41,000 to 61,000. Because the 45 to 64 year age cohort will be so large in 2033, the dominance of seniors in the population will continue for many years beyond. This will perpetuate low birth rates unless there is an influx of immigrants in their childbearing years (City of Calgary, 2003b).

Over the next 30 years, the greying of Calgary’s population will be somewhat offset by births among immigrants and Aboriginal peoples who are, on average, younger than the rest of the population. Until 2011, the percentage of youth aged 15 to 24 years will decline slightly, while the number of preschool children (aged 0 to 4 years) is expected to continue to increase. Between 2011 and 2021, the numbers of school-aged children (aged 5 to 14 years) and youth (aged 15 to 24 years) are expected to increase, while the number of preschool children is expected to decline. Between 2021 and 2031, the population aged 0 to 24 years is projected to rise negligibly, although the number and proportion of school-aged children is expected to decline (City of Calgary, 2003b). Overall, the percentage of children aged 0 to 14 years will peak in 2016, and then begin to decline; the percentage of youth aged 15 to 24 years has already begun to decline. In 2033, there will be only about 24,000 more children and 3,000 more youth in Calgary than there were in 2006 (City of Calgary, 2003b).

---

1 This figure is 1.55 million for the Calgary Economic Region as a whole. See City of Calgary (2003b).
Table 1. Total Projected Population by Age, Calgary²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>2033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>173,000</td>
<td>188,000</td>
<td>201,000</td>
<td>202,000</td>
<td>199,000</td>
<td>196,000</td>
<td>197,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17.9%)</td>
<td>(18.3%)</td>
<td>(18.8%)</td>
<td>(17.8%)</td>
<td>(16.8%)</td>
<td>(16.1%)</td>
<td>(16.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>133,000</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>149,000</td>
<td>148,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15.0%)</td>
<td>(13.0%)</td>
<td>(11.6%)</td>
<td>(12.8%)</td>
<td>(13.0%)</td>
<td>(12.2%)</td>
<td>(12.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>332,000</td>
<td>357,000</td>
<td>370,000</td>
<td>367,000</td>
<td>361,000</td>
<td>352,000</td>
<td>351,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(34.4%)</td>
<td>(34.8%)</td>
<td>(34.6%)</td>
<td>(32.4%)</td>
<td>(30.4%)</td>
<td>(28.9%)</td>
<td>(28.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>257,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>309,000</td>
<td>338,000</td>
<td>346,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22.8%)</td>
<td>(23.9%)</td>
<td>(24.0%)</td>
<td>(24.7%)</td>
<td>(26.0%)</td>
<td>(27.7%)</td>
<td>(28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=65</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>103,000</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>164,000</td>
<td>184,000</td>
<td>189,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.8%)</td>
<td>(10.0%)</td>
<td>(11.0%)</td>
<td>(12.3%)</td>
<td>(13.8%)</td>
<td>(15.1%)</td>
<td>(15.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>965,000</td>
<td>1,026,000</td>
<td>1,070,000</td>
<td>1,134,000</td>
<td>1,188,000</td>
<td>1,219,000</td>
<td>1,231,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Migrants to Calgary

Calgary’s growth has been and will continue to be highly dependent upon net migration, the difference between the number of people coming to the city and the number leaving. Because net migration is sensitive to fluctuating factors including economic conditions and immigration policies, Calgary’s population forecasts are always somewhat speculative. During Calgary’s boom and bust economic cycle in the 1980s, for example, net migration dramatically spiked and dipped in the space of a few years. Since then, however, Calgary has been one of the few Canadian municipalities that consistently attracts more people than it loses annually (Heisz, LaRochelle-Côté, Bordt and Das, 2005). In recent years, Calgary’s net migration has averaged about 13,000 people per year,³ but may decline to between 6,000 and 9,000 people per year over the next decade (City of Calgary, 2005b). This may still exceed population growth due to natural increase, the difference between births and deaths, which was about 8,400 in 2003, and is expected to decline to about 1,000 per year by 2033 (City of Calgary, 2003b).

People who migrate to Calgary (in-migrants) include Canadian-born residents of other Canadian cities, immigrants who have landed in other cities and then move to Calgary, and immigrants who land in Calgary from other countries (4.1% of national immigration in 2001) (Schellenberg, 2004). Most in-migrants from within Canada come from Vancouver, Winnipeg, Edmonton, Montreal, Regina, Saskatoon, and Toronto (see Heisz et al., 2005).

² Table reproduced with format modifications from City of Calgary (2003b).
Calgary is likely to continue to be a destination of choice for immigrants who come to Canada from a wide spectrum of countries. Recent immigrants (those who arrived in the preceding five years) select their destination city for several reasons, including the presence of a spouse, partner or family member in the area (cited by 41% of immigrants surveyed), the presence of friends (18%), prospects (14%), education prospects (5%), lifestyle factors (5%), and housing (4%) (Schellenberg, 2004). Clearly, familial and social networks are primary considerations in the decision of where to live, suggesting that settlement in Calgary may be a self-perpetuating trend.

In 2001, immigrants comprised about 20% of Calgary’s population; recent immigrants numbered 68,800 and accounted for 7.4% of Calgarians. The proportion of Calgarians who are immigrants has changed little over the past two decades and is expected to rise by only about three percentage points (an additional 91,000 people) by 2026. However, the places from which immigrants come have shifted over time from European countries to an impressive array of countries circling the globe. More than 40% of Calgary’s immigrants are from China, the Philippines, India, Hong Kong, and Vietnam (Schellenberg, 2004) but recent immigrants represent over 140 countries of origin (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2003). This rich tapestry of backgrounds, cultures, and languages will continue over the next 30 years, barring drastic reversals in immigration policy. Correspondingly, by 2016 (the latest year for which such projections are available), members of visible minority groups are expected to account for 25% of Calgary’s total population and 33% of children and youth aged 0 to 14 years, up from 19% and 25% respectively in 2001 (City of Calgary, 2003b). The proportion of Calgarians who are members of visible minority groups will almost certainly continue to grow over the following 20 years and beyond. Of course, this will be accompanied by more intercultural marriages and “fuzzy ethnic boundaries.” As succinctly summarized by Guimond, “[w]here the ‘mixed’ children hang their ‘ethnic hat’ when they become adults will have a significant impact on the ethnic make-up of our cities” (Guimond, 2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visible Minorities</th>
<th>Immigrants</th>
<th>Non-Christian Religions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165.8</td>
<td>295.2</td>
<td>202.8</td>
<td>288.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excluding those responding “no religion.”

---

4 See also Alberta Learning (2002).
5 See Belanger and Malenfant (2005). Selections from Table 12. Population (in thousands) of the ten CMAs with the largest number of visible minority by ethnocultural characteristics, Canada, 2001 and 2017, reference scenario.
### Table 3. Projected Immigrant Population by Age and as a Percentage of the Population, Calgary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>11,693</td>
<td>12,347</td>
<td>13,348</td>
<td>13,930</td>
<td>14,361</td>
<td>14,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.0%)</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
<td>(6.9%)</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
<td>(7.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>17,412</td>
<td>19,661</td>
<td>22,509</td>
<td>23,368</td>
<td>24,607</td>
<td>25,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.6%)</td>
<td>(13.6%)</td>
<td>(16.9%)</td>
<td>(18.8%)</td>
<td>(17.0%)</td>
<td>(16.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-64</td>
<td>121,366</td>
<td>136,337</td>
<td>147,861</td>
<td>161,576</td>
<td>173,596</td>
<td>184,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24.8%)</td>
<td>(24.7%)</td>
<td>(24.6%)</td>
<td>(25.8%)</td>
<td>(26.8%)</td>
<td>(27.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>28,538</td>
<td>31,097</td>
<td>35,076</td>
<td>38,172</td>
<td>41,629</td>
<td>45,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(34.4%)</td>
<td>(34.7%)</td>
<td>(34.1%)</td>
<td>(33.3%)</td>
<td>(29.7%)</td>
<td>(27.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>179,008</td>
<td>199,442</td>
<td>218,793</td>
<td>237,045</td>
<td>254,193</td>
<td>270,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20.4%)</td>
<td>(20.7%)</td>
<td>(21.3%)</td>
<td>(22.2%)</td>
<td>(22.4%)</td>
<td>(22.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Table modified from City of Calgary (2003b).

### Table 4. Projected Visible Minority Population by Age and as a Percentage of the Population, Calgary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 14</td>
<td>41,242</td>
<td>49,653</td>
<td>57,954</td>
<td>66,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24.8%)</td>
<td>(28.7%)</td>
<td>(30.8%)</td>
<td>(32.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 24</td>
<td>27,504</td>
<td>33,113</td>
<td>38,649</td>
<td>44,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19.9%)</td>
<td>(22.8%)</td>
<td>(29.1%)</td>
<td>(35.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>28,586</td>
<td>34,415</td>
<td>40,170</td>
<td>45,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18.3%)</td>
<td>(18.5%)</td>
<td>(20.5%)</td>
<td>(25.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>31,059</td>
<td>37,393</td>
<td>43,645</td>
<td>49,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20.4%)</td>
<td>(25.6%)</td>
<td>(27.1%)</td>
<td>(26.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54</td>
<td>19,290</td>
<td>23,224</td>
<td>27,107</td>
<td>30,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16.2%)</td>
<td>(16.6%)</td>
<td>(18.7%)</td>
<td>(22.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
<td>10,774</td>
<td>12,972</td>
<td>15,140</td>
<td>17,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17.1%)</td>
<td>(16.2%)</td>
<td>(15.1%)</td>
<td>(14.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 75</td>
<td>7,051</td>
<td>8,489</td>
<td>9,908</td>
<td>11,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14.4%)</td>
<td>(16.3%)</td>
<td>(18.0%)</td>
<td>(16.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>3,394</td>
<td>4,086</td>
<td>4,770</td>
<td>5,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10.0%)</td>
<td>(9.5%)</td>
<td>(9.9%)</td>
<td>(10.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168,901</td>
<td>203,344</td>
<td>237,343</td>
<td>270,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19.3%)</td>
<td>(21.1%)</td>
<td>(23.1%)</td>
<td>(25.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Table modified from City of Calgary (2003b).
2.3 Aboriginal Peoples

Projected increases in Calgary’s Aboriginal population will contribute to the city’s flourishing cultural diversity. The number of Aboriginal people in the city doubled from about 1.2% in 1981 to 2.3% (about 20,000 people) in 2001 due to high birth rates, declining mortality rates, migration from reserves, improved enumeration, and “ethnic mobility” – increased reporting of Aboriginal identity – particularly among individuals aged 30 years and older and those with post-secondary levels of schooling (Siggner and Costa, 2005). In fact, ethnic mobility or “drift” may account for half of the increase to date (Siggner and Costa, 2005) and, based on American experience, we can expect this to continue to contribute significantly to the growth of the Aboriginal population in Canada for several years to come (Guimond, 2003).

Accurate forecasts for urban Aboriginal population growth are complicated by non-demographic factors such as ethnic mobility and high rates of migration back and forth between cities and reserves, especially among young adults (Norris and Clatworthy, 2003). Migration between Calgary and reserves may be especially high given the proximity of the Siksika and Morley (Stoney Nation) reserves and, especially, the Tsuu T’ina reserve, the eastern boundary of which borders Calgary’s western edge. In addition, it is estimated that census data under-represent the Aboriginal population by 20% to 40% (Hanselman, 2001). Although such factors preclude confident predictions for population growth specific to Calgary (City of Calgary, 2003b), we do know that the Aboriginal population in Alberta as a whole is expected to grow by 39%, bringing the total number of Aboriginal peoples in the province to 232,600 by 2017. In fact, by that time, Alberta may overtake British Columbia to become the province with the largest Aboriginal population, second to Ontario. Much of this population growth will be concentrated on reserves, however, it is conservatively estimated that Calgary’s Aboriginal population could increase by at least 7,000 from 2001 to 2017.10

Children and youth are the fastest growing segment of the Aboriginal population, and Aboriginal children and youth are the fastest growing segment of Calgary’s child and youth population. In 2001, about half of the Aboriginal people in Calgary were aged 24 years or younger; 31% were aged 14 years or younger, compared to 35% and 19% of Calgarians as a whole. Also, the Tsuu T’ina population increased by 31% between 1996 and 2001, some of which is attributable to births (Statistics Canada, 2003a). Although recent figures are not available, the Royal Commission reported in 1996 that 49% of Aboriginal women had a child under the age of 15 years, compared with 29% of non-Aboriginal women (Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 1996).

---

8 “Aboriginal” is an inclusive term referring to Inuit, Métis and North American Indian.
9 In 2001, the Aboriginal birth rate was 1.5 times that of the non-Aboriginal birth rates, down from 2.7 a decade earlier. Birth rates among Aboriginal peoples are gradually declining, however. See Statistics Canada (2003a).
10 This estimate has been roughly calculated using an estimate suggested by Statistics Canada that about 25% of the population will reside in large municipalities, from which it is inferred that about 12.5% of the increase will occur in Calgary and 12.5% in Edmonton. See Statistics Canada (2005c).
Table 5. Projected Aboriginal Population, Calgary, Four Scenarios\(^{11}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>15,195</td>
<td>21,915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Med</td>
<td>24,322</td>
<td>26,576</td>
<td>29,180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC High</td>
<td>24,473</td>
<td>26,945</td>
<td>29,828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase of 1,343/Year (Based on 1996-2001 Actuals)</td>
<td>28,625</td>
<td>35,340</td>
<td>42,055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase of 44%/5 Years (Based on 1996-2001 Actuals)</td>
<td>31,550</td>
<td>45,432</td>
<td>65,422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Population Reporting an Aboriginal Identity, Calgary CMA, 2001\(^{12}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4 Years</td>
<td>2,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 9 Years</td>
<td>2,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 14 Years</td>
<td>2,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 19 Years</td>
<td>1,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 24 Years</td>
<td>2,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34 Years</td>
<td>4,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 44 Years</td>
<td>3,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 54 Years</td>
<td>2,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 64 Years</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 64 Years</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21,915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{11}\) Statistics Canada figures have been calculated based on the growth percentages used to project scenarios for the two large Alberta CMAs. Statistics Canada provides five possible scenarios reflecting different assumptions about fertility, mortality and migration. See Statistics Canada (2005c).

\(^{12}\) Statistics Canada, 2001 Census. Note that it is estimated that census data under-represent the Aboriginal population by 20% to 40%.
Box 1. Rogue Variables

Calgary’s long-range population forecast and demographic projections may be influenced by any number of unpredictable, or “rogue,” variables at the local, provincial, national, and international levels. While a thorough exploration of every possible contingency is well beyond the scope of this paper, a few possibilities merit mention here.

Advances in disease prevention and health care may extend lifespans well beyond today’s averages, and increase quality of life among Calgary’s seniors. Also, changes in reproductive technologies allowing, for example, post-menopausal pregnancies, parthenogenesis, and cloning, could dramatically alter conventional notions of the family, along with population projections.

Immigration could be a wild card. The United Nations predicts that, in 20 years, two-thirds of the world’s population will face chronic water shortages, which will be accompanied by natural disasters, famine, and disease. The ravages of AIDS in Africa will leave millions of orphans and Canada may be pressured to respond by accepting large numbers of refugees from devastated nations, which would have extensive social and economic implications. Likewise, global conflict could evolve in any number of directions, with multiple negative spinoff effects.

Canada has implemented a variety of legislative measures, including the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, along with many policies and programs, including the Multiculturalism Program of the Department of Canadian Heritage, to protect and foster respect for the rights of ethnocultural minorities and other diverse groups. That being said, the possibility of threats to racial and religious equality, such as those which lurk in countries such as France and Australia, cannot be ignored in this country. While it is remote, Canadians cannot afford to be complacent about the chance that similar problems could develop here.

Due to a combination of factors including urban expansion and global warming, Calgary’s natural environment may deteriorate to the point where it is no longer a drawing card for the in-migrants from elsewhere in Canada and around the world that the city requires to maintain its economic prosperity. Likewise, if southern Alberta becomes increasingly arid and barren over time, migrants may choose to settle in Alberta’s northern cities.

Finally, technological advances could alter virtually any and all aspects of life in Calgary and elsewhere in the world. Identity theft could become one of the most common and threatening forms of crime. Global strife could hasten the development of alternative energy sources, reducing demand for Alberta’s oil. Biomedical engineering and genetic modification could transform food production, for better or for worse.

While some of these possibilities may seem far-fetched, they are, in fact, well within the range of possibility within the next three decades.
3.0 Projected Impacts: Challenges and Opportunities

3.1 Economic Development

For the past decade, Calgary has boasted one of the strongest economies among all Canadian cities. Largely due to investment in Alberta’s energy sector, along with a steady influx of immigrants, which spurred the housing, construction, and retail sectors, the city has enjoyed exceptional growth as measured by gross domestic product, goods and services production, personal income, and employment, among other indicators. Over the next 30 years, Calgary’s continued economic stability will hinge in part on its ability to negotiate new revenue-sharing strategies with the federal and provincial governments and ongoing economic growth in the province, along with a wide range of other exogenous factors. In addition, it will be influenced by local, provincial, and national policy responses to the effects of demographic change on the labour force, which could perpetuate, exacerbate, or mitigate wealth disparities between rich and poor Calgarians.

3.1.1 Population Aging and the Economy

The effects of population aging on economic growth are often predicted to be catastrophic, largely due to projections about decreased labour force participation and increased dependency on the state via, for instance, drawing down on the Canada Pension Plan and increased use of health care services. Closer inspection suggests that such concerns may be exaggerated (Gee, 2000). This is partly because predicting the economic effects of aging is a tricky business, and must take into account innumerable shifting variables and possible scenarios. For example, the declining proportion of people in the workforce could lead to decreased workforce productivity; alternatively, the relative scarcity of labour resulting from aging could exert an upward pressure on wages, increase the capital-labour ratio, and increase labour productivity (Mérette, 2002). Likewise, many economists worry that population aging will lead, for example, to a sharp reduction in savings rates and in real per capita output, having a negative impact on economic growth. On the other hand, aging could increase incentives for future generations to invest in more human capital, spurring economic growth. A reduction in savings may simply reflect a lower need for savings because demand for physical capital has declined and, in any case, this reduction may be partially offset by partial public funding of the Canada Pension Plan and changes in wealth arising from RRSP and other sheltered asset savings; that is, if more people draw on RSPs, then tax revenues will go up, not down. Another concern is increasing health care costs associated with an aging population, but we do not know the extent to which increased health costs will be offset by decreased expenditures on education (Fougère and Mérette, 2003). Likewise, projected decreases in overall productivity due to the growth of one low productivity service industry – health services – may be largely offset by the reduced share of another low productivity services industry – education (LaFortune, 2005). In other words, the economic outcomes of population aging depend on a combination of indeterminate factors and on governments’ policy responses to such things as mandatory retirement, and it is by no means certain that the economic outcomes will be overwhelmingly negative.
Many of these factors are arguably more important at the provincial and national levels than at the municipal level, with the exception of the labour market. Over the next 30 years in Calgary, employment and labour force growth are expected to begin to slow, particularly after 2011 when the first of the baby boomers reach retirement age. The labour force participation rate is expected to begin to decline from 73.5% in 2011 to 68.5% in 2033, escalating current labour supply challenges (City of Calgary, 2003b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Employment and Labour Force Projections, Calgary 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labour Force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.2 Other Labour Force Drivers

The aging workforce is only one driver of current and future labour shortages. In Calgary, along with many other Canadian cities, additional determinants will include international competition for skilled workers, the geographic mobility of workers, growth rates in specific industries, wage levels, workforce education and training policies, 14 and a variety of deficiencies in the provision of post-secondary education. 15 Responding to some of these factors falls beyond the purview of a municipality, but some policy responses are squarely within the city’s control. Calgary’s continued prosperity requires that we enhance the ability of all Calgarians to participate in the labour force, maintain the city as an attractive place to live and work, and reduce barriers to employment (Government of Alberta, 2001: 15). To these ends, efforts must be made to increase high school and post-secondary completion rates and attract new workers via in-migration and immigration, and to implement special strategies to address existing barriers to participation for immigrants and Aboriginal peoples, along with youth, older workers, and persons with disabilities (Government of Alberta, 2001).

At present, Calgary is falling short in strategies to integrate Aboriginal and immigrant workers into the labour force; failure to turn this around may mean economic disaster in the future. In 2001 in Calgary, the unemployment rate among Aboriginal workers was double that of Calgarians as a whole and average earnings among full-time, full-year workers were only 70% of those of other workers, a ratio that has not changed significantly in 20 years. 16 Many reasons, including lower educational attainment and a wide range of barriers, contribute to Aboriginal workers’ poor labour market performance overall. Aboriginal people can reach employment levels on par with their non-Aboriginal counterparts when they have completed higher levels of schooling: in Calgary in 2001, employment rates among Aboriginal people with a university degree equalled those among non-Aboriginal people with the same educational qualifications.

---

13 Table modified from City of Calgary (2003b).
16 Statistics Canada. Selected Cultural and Labour Force Characteristics (58), Age Groups (5A), Sex (3) and Visible Minority Groups (15) for Population 15 Years and Over, for Canada, Provinces, Territories and Census Metropolitan Areas.
(Siggner & Costa, 2005). Over the next decade, a large number of young Aboriginal adults will reach working age and, if they receive sufficient education, training, and other supports, they will serve to cushion the impact of labour force aging.

The economic imperative to integrate immigrants into the local labour force is even greater. Immigrants who arrived in the 1990s have not fared as well as previous cohorts of immigrants in terms of earnings and employment. Although Calgary compares favourably with other Canadian cities, immigrants and, particularly, immigrant women, continue to experience higher unemployment rates and lower wages, and employment in low-skilled occupations, than people born in Canada. Historically, new immigrants have earned less than the average native-born Canadian upon arrival, but their earnings have caught up to or surpassed the Canadian average after 10 to 14 years and, among immigrants selected on the basis of education and skills, as soon as one year after arrival. Over the past decade, however, employment rates among recent immigrants have declined markedly and earnings have been significantly lower than native-born residents and previous cohorts of immigrants, despite the fact that most of these people are better educated than previous cohorts. For example, in Calgary in 2001, recent immigrants in the 25 to 54 year age cohort with a university education were more than twice as likely as their Canadian-born counterparts to be employed in moderate- or low-skilled occupations (19% as compared to 9.5%), and to be earning less than $20,000 per year (23% compared to 10%).

In addition, the earnings of visible minority immigrants are significantly lower than non-visible minority immigrants and native-born Canadians (Thompson, 2000). However, as noted by Picot (2004: 43), “some (perhaps as much as one-third) of the decline in aggregate earnings among entry-level immigrants is related to the shift in language skills and source regions.”

Calgary’s ability to attract and retain immigrant and Canadian-born workers from elsewhere in Canada will be increasingly challenged by both local living and working conditions, as discussed in the following section. Minic (2004) observes that, over the next 30 years, the proportion of the population over the age of 60 years will double in all OECD countries. All of these countries will be seeking to maintain their labour forces, escalating the war for global talent.

### 3.1.3 Vulnerable Workers

It should be stressed that the benefits of Calgary’s economic growth have not been shared by all citizens. Rises in income have been increasingly concentrated among the wealthiest echelons of Calgarians, escalating the disparity of incomes between rich and poor. In both 1980 and 2000 in Calgary, the 10% of families with the lowest income accounted for 1.8% of the wealth in the city; the 10% of families with the highest income accounted for 25.2% of the wealth in 1980 and 29.7% in 2000, an increase of 4.5%. In addition, as discussed in the following section, low-income rates in Calgary have increased in the past few years. In short, the rich got richer and, while some slight improvements were realized, the poor stayed poor.

---

19 Frenette, Green, and Picot (2004) note that “survey and tax data vary in their estimates of the extent to which inequality rose during the recovery of the 1990s. This variation was largely due to the fact that after-tax income at the bottom of the distribution fell substantially according to tax data, while in survey data it simply failed to increase at the same pace as at the top of the distribution.”
Over the next 30 years and probably beyond, job growth in Calgary will increasingly shift from construction and manufacturing to health, professional services, and food and accommodation services, partly due to population aging. In other words, the labour market may be increasingly polarized between high-skill, high-wage jobs and low-wage, low-skill jobs (City of Calgary, 2003b). Although demand for workers may contribute to higher wages and better working conditions in low-skill jobs, it is highly unlikely that these changes will be sufficient to keep low-skilled workers out of poverty. Along with evolution in the demographic composition of the population, changes in family structure and the education system may mean that more workers will be subject both to conditions that restrict their capacity to participate in the labour market and to discrimination and disadvantage at work (Maxwell, 2002; Cranford, Vosko and Zukewich, 2003). Consistent with the experiences of many other countries (Minic, 2004), if workers do not have a solid knowledge and skills base with opportunities for lifelong learning, there is a very real danger that many of Calgary’s workers will be left behind in the new economy, with escalating numbers of “working poor” Calgarians at risk of social exclusion on all its dimensions. In addition, in a world economy that affords talented workers the option to move to desirable jobs all over the globe, Calgary will be stretched to entice highly-qualified foreign workers if they are unable to secure jobs that recognize, match, and reward their qualifications.

3.2 Social Development

In recent years, the City of Calgary, like other municipalities, has been increasingly pressured to plan for and provide services in response to existing and emerging social issues. The need to build and sustain “social infrastructure,” in conjunction with physical infrastructure, will continue to surge in the coming decades. As pointed out by Bradford (2004), among others, for almost 20 years, federal and provincial governments have been passing down responsibility to municipal authorities for significant aspects of the country’s physical infrastructure and social services. Many argue that this gradual “downloading,” in the absence of concurrent increases in fiscal support, has placed cities in an untenable position. The Canada West Foundation submits that cities should fight the trend and refuse to accept yet more accountability in the social realm. Yet, even in a relatively wealthy city such as Calgary, interventions to prevent the urban decay which now plagues many American cities are urgently required. The Cities Alliance observes that “[t]wo alternative scenarios are emerging: one of cities characterized by increasing poverty, social exclusion and decline; the other of inclusive cities characterized by equitable and sustainable growth” (Cities Alliance, n.d.). The prevailing view among social researchers is that, given their proximity to the issues, municipalities must find ways to cultivate the latter scenario.

---

20 See, for example, Vander Ploeg (2001; 2002).
21 See, for example, Federation of Canadian Municipalities (2003).
3.2.1 Social Exclusion

Of paramount concern in Calgary are threats to the city’s sustainability posed by the prospect of increasing social exclusion among particular demographic groups over time. “Social exclusion” is defined in many ways but, in general, it refers to social disaffiliation, deprivation of financial resources, and limited access to basic social goods and services. At risk of oversimplification, social exclusion is manifested by poverty, a low sense of community, lack of employment, low levels of education, and crime. It is fuelled by: neighbourhood isolation and stigmatization; poor quality and lack of access to community resources and services; underdeveloped community capacity; and low personal and positive social capital (Cooper and Bartlett, 2005). Some of these problems appear to be on the rise in Calgary, and may escalate in relation to interrelated social and demographic changes, as discussed further below. Failure to ensure that Calgary is and remains an inclusive city may jeopardize the collective social health and civic vibrancy in which Calgarians take such pride.

Poverty in Calgary

As noted earlier, Calgary’s recent economic prosperity has not been shared by all citizens. According to the City of Calgary, the number of people in households living below Statistics Canada’s Low-Income Cut-Off (LICO) increased in 2003 for the second consecutive year, following five years of decline. In 2003, there were approximately 161,000 Calgarians living in poor households, a 25% increase from 2002, and a 27% increase over the previous five years. In addition, the poverty rate (the proportion of the population living below LICO) increased to 17.2% in 2003 from 13.7% in 2002 and 13.1% in 2001. The city reports that this was the sixth highest poverty rate among Census Metropolitan Areas in Canada. Moreover, Calgary’s child poverty rate almost doubled from 11.3% in 2000 to 20.4% in 2003, which amounts to an estimated 43,000 children living in poor households (City of Calgary, 2005b). According to the Calgary Health Region, 19% of parents with children aged 2 to 9 years and 16% of those with children aged 10 to 17 years did not have money to buy enough food for their family all the time in 2003. In Calgary, like elsewhere in Canada, poverty rates are higher among: persons with disabilities; at least twice as high among children in lone-parent families headed by women; unattached individuals, especially seniors; and the immigrant and Aboriginal population as they are in the general population.

The proportion of low-income individuals receiving provincial or federal income support (Income Support (welfare), Assured Income for Severely Handicapped (AISH), or the Guaranteed Income Supplement (GIS)) declined from 39.1% in 2000 to 29.8% in 2003, consistent with data showing that more people have joined the ranks of the working poor. On the other hand, the number and proportion of seniors in Calgary receiving the GIS have grown more quickly than seniors in Calgary’s population as a whole (City of Calgary, 2005b), suggesting increasing poverty within this age cohort. A total of 113,000 low-income Calgarians received no income support in 2003 (City of Calgary, 2005b).

---

22 Calgary Health Region figures cited by the City of Calgary (2005b).
The City of Calgary predicts that, over the next few years, “persons relying on fixed incomes such as Income Supports, AISH, and GIS will face challenges as their incomes are eroded by inflation. …Growing income challenges are expected to place increasing strain on community support services, particularly those that provide assistance with basic needs, such as the Food Bank.”

**Neighbourhoods and Social Exclusion**

At last report, Calgary had 16 neighbourhoods that were identified as “highly vulnerable” based on the City of Calgary’s Indices of Community Well-Being (City of Calgary, 2005e). In addition, the most recently available census tract data show that Calgary has 13 neighbourhoods in which at least 30% of residents live below LICO (Heisz and McLeod, 2004). Residents of these neighbourhoods include high proportions of people with no market income, low educational attainment, low school enrolment among adolescents and young adults, and a high share of income from transfers. The effects of these variables are more profound when they exist in combination. In addition, many of these neighbourhoods feature high concentrations of population groups who face many social and economic barriers and are at high risk of living in poverty, including recent immigrants, Aboriginal peoples, unattached adults, and single-parent families (Heisz and McLeod, 2004). Low-income neighbourhoods often feature one or more of several undesirable conditions such as: poor quality housing and neighbourhood design; environmental hazards or less than optimal environmental conditions; higher than average crime rates; lack of access to affordable, accessible and high quality services, supports, and recreational facilities; poor or undesirable economic development; and low social capital, social inclusion, community capacity, sense of community, and civic engagement. The immediate and cumulative health, developmental, and economic consequences for children, families, and individuals living in these conditions can be negative and acute. As summarized by Bradford (2002: 35), “the poor… not only live in poverty but among other people who are also poor and separated from those who are not, signaling the absence of social networks linking to opportunity, or even information about where potential opportunities might exist. This leads to place-specific ‘neighbourhood effects,’ whereby social exclusion, perhaps originating in individual human capital deficiencies or unemployment, is compounded by features of the locality itself.”

Also, the income gap between Calgary’s richer and poorer neighbourhoods has grown over the past 15 years. This is largely because income growth in the 1990s was concentrated among high-income families but, in Calgary, economic spatial segregation, where residents “sort themselves” into “like” neighbourhoods, has also played an important role. The greater the inequalities among neighbourhoods, the poorer the health and quality of life for those living at the bottom and, due to spinoff effects, the broader community. And, given the host of problems associated with spatially-concentrated poverty, the added dimension of economic spatial segregation in Calgary, suggesting a trend toward increasing neighbourhood segregation and isolation, may be cause for additional concern (Cooper and Bartlett, 2005).

---

23 See City of Calgary (2003a: 67). It should be noted, however, that, over the past three years, food bank usage in Calgary has declined. This is attributed to recent decreases in in-migration. See City of Calgary (2005b).
25 See Myles, Picot and Piper (2000).
In Calgary, there is a high concentration of visible minorities in east, far northwest, and downtown neighbourhoods, particularly Chinatown (City of Calgary, 2004b). While it is not clear that immigrants who live in “minority” neighbourhoods in Canada are poorer than those living in “non-minority” neighbourhoods (Hou and Picot, 2003: 25; Hou, 2004), many of these Calgary neighbourhoods are, in fact, low-income. Future immigration is likely to increase the number of visible minority residents in these communities. As explained by Papillon (2002: 12), immigrants, most of whom are members of visible minority groups, understandably “have a tendency to settle in neighbourhoods where it will be easier to establish their social networks and maintain the cultural identity of their country of origin.” In addition, many immigrants have limited financial means and seek lower-cost housing, which is typically located in low-income communities. However, increasing concentrations of low-income immigrants in particular residential areas in conjunction with spatially-concentrated poverty generate concern about the possible growth of an immigrant “underclass” over time, which could spawn a wide range of associated social problems. Social sustainability is inextricably linked to how well economic and socio-cultural differences can coexist (Séguin and Germain, 2000).

**Combating Social Exclusion**

The connections between poverty, social exclusion, and a wide range of health and social problems are well established. It is widely recognized that increases in the proportion of Calgarians who are living in poverty could tatter Calgary’s social fabric and threaten the city’s long-term sustainability and the quality of life for all residents.

While many of the factors influencing income levels are beyond the purview of a municipality, local strategies and interventions to combat social exclusion are currently underway or in the planning stages. These include, but are by no means limited to, the United Way of Calgary and Area’s neighbourhood investment strategy, the City of Calgary’s Centre City Social Plan, and the city’s social inclusion policy. Local strategies tend to focus on neighbourhood as a vehicle for increasing social inclusion, social capital, and community capacity to improve neighbourhood conditions and sustainability and thus improve the life chances of children, families, and individuals, and to provide initiatives to support and strengthen individuals and families, such as programs to foster positive child development, initiatives to increase affordable housing, and strategies to enhance community economic development. However, the primary source of poverty generally lies outside poor neighbourhoods (Séguin and Divay, 2002). Sustained governmental intervention is needed to reduce individual and family poverty by ensuring a basic quality of life via adequate health care, education, income, and social services which, concurrently, foster social and residential mobility and reduce and prevent spatially-concentrated poverty (Séguin and Divay, 2002). Such interventions currently fall beyond the purview of municipal governments, suggesting that Calgary’s long-term success in controlling individual and spatially-based social exclusion will depend to a great extent on federal and provincial policy agendas, along with the city’s success in coordinating local initiatives with those of the other levels of government. In addition, as discussed later in this paper, the city will be challenged by changing demographics and other social trends to revisit its own governance and program and services operations to reflect a social inclusion approach (Clutterbuck and Novick, 2003).
3.2.2 Family Structure

The number of households in Calgary is expected to increase by 68%, from 396,000 in 2001 to 586,000 in 2031, at which time growth is projected to decelerate. Over the same time frame, household size will decline from 2.6 people to 2.4 people. In 2001, about 32% of Calgary households consisted of families with children. The percentage of such households is expected to peak at 34% in 2016, and then decline steadily over the next 20 years and beyond. The proportion of these families that are headed by lone parents is expected to increase slightly, from 15% in 2001 to 16% in 2016 (City of Calgary, 2003b). Most of these families will continue to be headed by mothers. This projected increase may be quite conservative because the incidence of lone-mother families in the Aboriginal population is much higher than among non-Aboriginal families, although it tends to be much lower among immigrant than non-immigrant families (Kobayashi, Moore and Rosenberg, 1998).

Projections about families beyond 2016 are complicated by shifting family compositions and definitions. Family structure will be shaped by increasing (or, at least, more visible) numbers of same-sex families, with and without children. Immigrant and Aboriginal families have been more likely to include and, in some cases to be headed by, members of extended family, such as grandparents (although this may be less common among urban Aboriginal families). The size of recent immigrant families appears to have declined over the past decade, and it is difficult to be certain about future trends in the sponsorship of parents and grandparents, which is highly dependent on country of origin and immigration policy (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2005; Castellano, 2002). Likewise, the continued prominence of grandparents in many Aboriginal families is unclear, partly because the generation which preceded the residential schools crisis, and has been able to provide child-rearing support, is becoming quite elderly.

The projected increase in the number of lone-parent families headed by women has broad implications. Changes in family structure may affect labour standards, pensions, taxation, child care benefits, and services to children (Government of Alberta, 2000). Children living with single parents are at high risk of poverty. Both poverty and lone-parenting, individually and in combination, increase the risk of health and developmental problems for young people, particularly in early childhood. High numbers of low-income families may increase demand for social housing which, if unmet, may contribute to other health and developmental problems and homelessness among families with young children. All of these problems may become even more prevalent among Aboriginal families than they are at present.
Table 8. Actual and Projected Families by Family Type, Calgary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families in Private</td>
<td>187,025</td>
<td>204,230</td>
<td>268,970</td>
<td>274,700</td>
<td>258,199</td>
<td>277,855</td>
<td>293,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband-Wife Families</td>
<td>162,270</td>
<td>176,280</td>
<td>230,890</td>
<td>235,010</td>
<td>218,170</td>
<td>233,811</td>
<td>246,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(86.8%)</td>
<td>(86.3%)</td>
<td>(85.8%)</td>
<td>(85.6%)</td>
<td>(84.5%)</td>
<td>(84.1%)</td>
<td>(84.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone-Parent Families</td>
<td>24,750</td>
<td>27,950</td>
<td>38,080</td>
<td>39,690</td>
<td>40,029</td>
<td>44,044</td>
<td>47,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.2%)</td>
<td>(13.7%)</td>
<td>(14.2%)</td>
<td>(14.4%)</td>
<td>(15.5%)</td>
<td>(15.9%)</td>
<td>(16.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.3 Health

Each of the three primary trends shaping Calgary’s demographic makeup has implications for health and health care in the city.

Population Aging

As the population ages, seniors’ health issues will assume increasing prominence. Life expectancy in Calgary is currently 78.7 years for men and 83.2 years for women (Calgary Health Region, 2005). Advances in medicine may further extend the average lifespan such that people, especially upper-income and educated people, live well beyond this age, but they are unlikely to fully address the illnesses and disabilities that generally accompany old age. Seniors’ health will also become more of a social concern. For example, the fact that women are having children later in life adds to family pressures, as they struggle to care for both their children and their aging parents. In some Calgary communities, up to 69% of seniors are living alone (Calgary Health Region, 2005). This trend is expected to continue indefinitely among the Canadian-born population although, in some ethno-cultural groups, it is more common for extended families to live together. Demand for supported living and long-term care facilities for seniors with varied cultural backgrounds and levels of English-language proficiency is, however, likely to rise over time.

Aboriginal Peoples

Calgary’s growing Aboriginal population will also have health and health care implications. Aboriginal people tend to experience higher suicide rates, alcohol and drug addictions, and physical and sexual abuse, and children in Aboriginal communities have higher rates of accidental death and injury (Calgary Health Region, 2004). Fetal alcohol spectrum disorder (FASD) is an issue of concern within some Aboriginal communities. Although there has been no conclusive research completed for Calgary, some case studies have reported FASD rates as high as 72 per 1,000 children in some Aboriginal communities, compared to an estimated nine per 1,000

---

26 Table modified from City of Calgary (2003b) and updated with 2001 and 2003 data from Statistics Canada – Annual Estimates for Families and Individuals (T1 Family File) – 4105, Table 111-0010.

children in Canada as a whole. It should be stressed that, to date, no valid comparison of the prevalence rates among Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal populations in Canada has been completed (MacMillan et al., n.d.). The lifetime costs for one person with FASD in Canada for additional education, disability payments, and health care have been estimated as being between $844,066 and $1.5 million (US).

While young Aboriginal people report similar levels of health status to the total Canadian youth population, in general, the health status of Aboriginal people declines more quickly than the total population with each successive age cohort. As a result, the gap between the health status of Aboriginal people and the total Canadian population widens in older age groups. For every age cohort between 25 and 64 years, the proportion of Aboriginal people reporting fair or poor health is about double that of the total population. This health differential is even higher among Aboriginal women. In addition, almost half of all Aboriginal people aged 15 years and over have one or more chronic health condition (O’Donnell and Tait, 2003). These health issues are not confined to reserves; in fact, the Calgary Health Region has noted that the health of urban Aboriginal people is comparable to, and may be poorer than, that of those living on reserves (Calgary Health Region, 2004).

**Immigrants**

Although immigrants to Calgary are generally in good health, some specific health risks (such as elevated tuberculosis rates) have been observed in groups from some countries, and more vulnerable sub-populations of immigrants, such as refugees, have been identified. The key factors that affect immigrant health include the immigration experience itself, the length of time the new Canadian has lived in Canada, factors from their country and culture of origin, and socio-economic factors in Canada, such as income, education, marital status, social support and official language skills. Access to health services may also be reduced among immigrants due to a wide range of barriers including language, culture, and unfamiliarity with the Canadian health care system. Confident predictions about the long-term health status of immigrants in Calgary are not possible, due to the instability of or eroding conditions in many countries of origin and the shifting socio-economic conditions of immigrants in the city.

**Other Health Concerns**

Additional health trends of concern in Calgary include the high or recently increasing prevalence of adult and childhood obesity, low birth weight, and infant mortality. These and most other health problems are more common among lower-income people, even in a rich city such as Calgary (Calgary Health Region, 2005). Barring a dramatic reversal of the trend toward increasing wealth disparities between rich and poor in this city, it is expected that the health status of lower-income adults and children will continue to be worse than that of other Calgarians over the next 30 years. Moves toward privatization of health care may perpetuate and, possibly, exacerbate, existing problems.

---

28 See Alberta Children’s Services (2005).
30 See Alberta Children’s Services (2005).
31 See, for example, Chui (T. 2003).
Collectively, all of these factors indicate that we may expect increases in health problems and associated health care costs over the next 30 years. It is possible that new federal investments in Aboriginal health, along with other social and economic conditions, may serve to mitigate or even address some of the health problems experienced by Calgary’s Aboriginal peoples. In addition, Aboriginal health conditions are likely to improve significantly if their economic conditions improve in accordance with changing labour market demands, as discussed earlier.

3.2.4 Education

Schism between the Well- and Poorly-Educated

Overall, Calgary boasts one of the most highly-educated populations of any city in Canada. This is partially due to the in-migration of skilled workers from other provinces and countries, rather than the education levels of people born or raised in Calgary (Heisz et al., 2005). Only 71.5% of students in Calgary’s public school system graduate from high school within four years of starting grade 10, although a number of additional students do complete high school by their mid-20s (Calgary Herald, 2005c: B1). Also, according to the 2003 International Adult Literacy Survey, about 40% of adult Albertans do not have the minimum levels of literacy, and almost half lack the basic numeracy skills, required to fully participate in today’s economy (Statistics Canada, 2005b). Literacy and a high school diploma are minimal educational requirements for access to the labour market, and even those young people with a diploma and no post-secondary education face a difficult transition from school to work. It is anticipated that, over the next four to five years, between 60% and 79% of jobs in Alberta will require post-secondary education. In addition, adult and lifelong learning have assumed increased importance in recent years, and this is expected to continue indefinitely, contributing to growing demand for post-secondary education among eligible adults of all ages. Whether Alberta’s post-secondary institutions will grow sufficiently to accommodate the large volumes of people who will require ongoing education is unclear at this point. In addition, escalating tuition fees and student debt loads may limit access to some students from low-income households.

The possibility of a deeper schism between highly- and poorly-educated Calgarians looms. Continued lack of educational success among a high proportion of Calgary’s youth may foster the growth of a chronically low-income underclass in the city, along with all of the problems this entails. However, recent efforts by Calgary’s school boards to introduce new workforce and post-secondary education transition programs in high schools offer hope that this bleak projection will not materialize.

32 See Alberta Human Resources and Employment (2005b). As defined in this document, “natural and applied sciences includes physical science professionals (e.g. physicists and astronomers, chemists, geologists, meteorologists); life science professionals (e.g. biologists, forestry professionals, agricultural representatives); civil, mechanical, electrical and chemical engineers; architects, urban planners and land surveyors; mathematicians, statisticians and actuaries; and computer and information systems professionals.”

33 See Human Resources Development Canada (2002).

34 This refers to the Career Pathways initiative of the Calgary Board of Education. More information is available at www.cbe.ab.ca.
Education and Demographic Challenges

Additional challenges faced by the education system are posed by the declining proportion and changing demographic composition of children and youth in Calgary, which will influence the structure, curricula, and delivery of both public and private education at all levels.

First, competition for public dollars may be dominated by seniors who place greater priority on issues such as health care than on education. Second, growth in the number of lone-parent families has implications for children’s educational success, as children growing up in these families tend to have poorer educational outcomes than children in two-parent families, particularly if the family is low-income (Ross et al., 1998). In addition, regardless of family structure, dual-wage families are increasing, resulting in “time crunches” which can limit parents’ abilities to be involved in their children’s education and in the need for increased out-of-school care. The trend toward two parents working outside the home is almost certain to continue over time, placing additional pressures on schools to provide supervision and guidance to students. The ability of schools to accommodate these demands will influence students’ educational outcomes and long-term social and economic success.

Additional challenges for the education system stem from increasing numbers of immigrant and Aboriginal students. At present, about 18,000 school-aged young people in Calgary were born in countries other than Canada. In 2002, 79% of children aged 11 years and under and 62% of those aged 12 to 17 years spoke neither English nor French (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2003). In 2003, there were 11,057 English as a Second Language (ESL) students enrolled in Calgary Board of Education schools alone (Calgary Herald, 2003). This figure represents 11% of all public school students and more than a 300% increase in ESL enrolment over the past decade (Calgary Herald, 2003). The public education system is already challenged to address the needs of these students, which include levels of English proficiency, socio-economic status, cultural background, experiences of hardship in their country of origin, and experiences with discrimination, marginalization, and issues of identity. Students who come to Canada as adolescents are more likely to experience problems in schools for a variety of reasons. Pre-migration stressors, such as the violence and trauma often experienced by refugees, directly affect children’s overall physical and emotional well-being and, by extension, their school performance. Other factors include disrupted or lack of prior schooling, disrupted family support, long duration at refugee camps, and poor health (Cooper, 2003).

On a positive note, research using data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth (NLSCY) on the success of immigrant children and youth in the school system shows that, overall, this group performs as well as their Canadian-born counterparts and is equally likely to complete high school. In addition, a larger proportion of immigrant youth aged 20 to
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35 See, for example, Cooper (2003).
36 The NLSCY is a joint project of Statistics Canada and Human Resources Development Canada. The survey follows a large, representative sample of Canadian children from birth to 25 years of age with a view to measuring the well-being and development of Canada’s children and youth into adulthood. Data collection commenced in 1994 and continues at two-year intervals. Researchers have analyzed findings to date to produce a range of papers on the biological, social, and economic characteristics influencing child outcomes. NLSCY data have greatly enhanced our knowledge about the conditions in which Canadian children live and the ways in which we can improve children’s well-being. See Human Resources Development Canada (2000).
24 years (54% versus 37% of Canadian-born youth) are enrolled in post-secondary studies (Kunz and Hanvey, 2000). Other research using these same data shows that the school performance of the children of immigrants, who may or may not have been born in Canada, generally meets or exceeds that of the children of Canadian-born parents by age 13 (Worswick, 2001). Young adult immigrants are also more likely to attend school. In Calgary in 2001, 60% of recent immigrants aged 18 to 24 years indicated they had attended school in the nine months preceding the Census, compared to 49% of non-immigrants in this age group (Schellenberg, 2004). These students may be the brightest hope for Calgary’s social and economic future.

Yet, the academic progress of many immigrant youth in Calgary is far from encouraging. Although they are somewhat dated, Calgary statistics reveal high school dropout rates between 60% and 75% among ESL (not all immigrant) students (Watt and Roessingh, 2001), as compared with 34% among all students across the province (Statistics Canada, 2003b). In addition, school failure and gang membership are often connected, although it is not always easy to determine which comes first (Cooper, 2003).

Aboriginal youth in Calgary experience lower levels of educational attainment than non-Aboriginal youth, although there have been improvements over time. Between 1981 and 2001 in Calgary, there was a 20% decline in the share of Aboriginal male youth (aged 20 to 24 years) who did not complete high school and who were not attending school, compared with an 11% decline for non-Aboriginal male youth; for Aboriginal female youth, there was a decline of 11%, compared with 10% for non-Aboriginal female youth. Likewise, school attendance rates among Aboriginal youth aged 15 to 24 years increased from 38% in 1981 to 51% in 2001; for non-Aboriginal youth, it increased from 42% to 59%. The proportion of Aboriginal women aged 25 to 34 years who had completed post-secondary education and were not attending school also increased, from 21% to 35%, compared to non-Aboriginal females, the proportion of whom increased from 37% to 51%. Post-secondary completion rates for Aboriginal men in this age cohort remained at 31% over the 20-year period (Siggner and Costa, 2005).

Clearly, the educational situation of both immigrant and Aboriginal children and youth is critical to Calgary’s ongoing prosperity and high quality of life. It remains to be seen, however, if Calgary’s education system will be able to accommodate increasing demands for ESL instruction, growing diversity of educational and cultural backgrounds, and the social and economic challenges often experienced by immigrant and Aboriginal families. Failure to do so may perpetuate poor social and economic outcomes among the immigrant and Aboriginal population and contribute to the social exclusion of immigrant and Aboriginal youth, who may express their alienation in negative ways.
3.2.5 Crime

Population Aging

It is projected that, as the population ages, more money will be spent on safety via, for example, gated communities and law enforcement (Sauvé, 1999), although crime rates are projected to fall dramatically.

The two most important factors affecting crime rates are the size of the male population between 15 and 25 years of age and, to a lesser extent, the economy.37 Few young people account for most of the crimes committed by young offenders. In Calgary, about 5% of the young people aged 12 to 17 years are responsible for all youth crime (Tough et al., 2000).

Based on age projections alone, the overall recorded crime rate in Canada is forecast to fall to 85% of its 1999 level by 2026 and to 81% by 2041. The risk of criminal victimization is forecast to follow a very similar trajectory. Recorded rates of crimes that are characteristic of teenagers and young adults, such as robbery and break and enter, should fall slightly faster and farther; whereas crimes that are more characteristic of older adults, such as sexual assault and impaired driving, should be affected less by the aging of the population (Carrington, 2001). Recent Calgary crime statistics are consistent with these projections: Robberies decreased by 20% and the number of property crimes decreased by 7% in just one year, from 2003 to 2004. In fact, Calgary’s property crime rate is at a 25-year low (Calgary Police Service, 2005). However, fraud, credit card offences, and drug offences have increased by 25%, 80%, and 52% respectively over the past five years (City of Calgary, 2005b). Among youth, from 2003 to 2004, the number of property crimes decreased by 11% but the rate increased by 4%; both the number and rate of youth crimes against persons declined, by 17% and 15% respectively (Calgary Police Service, 2005).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9: Person and Property Crimes, Calgary38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes against People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Charges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 See Schneider (2001). Schneider notes that, based primarily on these two factors, researchers in the United States and the United Kingdom predict that there will be a low to moderate annual increase in the overall crime rate in these countries beginning in the next few years, and that similar patterns should be expected in other developed countries. If this holds true for Canada, it would represent a significant departure from recent trends.

Young Offenders

Age-based forecasts are complicated by the other factors that are associated with crime. Some predict the emergence of a new breed of young offender: technologically-astute youth who use their knowledge to hack into computer networks, and so forth. But it is generally agreed that the more familiar type of young offender will continue to be responsible for traditional youth crimes. Like current young offenders, “[t]hey will largely be of lower socio-economic status, the product of dysfunctional environments, with learning disabilities and a history of criminal involvement” (Schneider, 2001). Some predict that advancing technology and the new knowledge-based economy may disproportionately affect less skilled, lower socio-economic groups, creating black markets or feelings of exclusion, resulting in an increase in crime among disenfranchised populations (Schneider, 2001).

A growing number of Aboriginal youth in Calgary may also contribute to local crime rates. At last report (1996), crime rates among Calgary’s Aboriginal people were 4.5 times higher than among non-Aboriginal people. This is considerably lower than in Regina and Saskatoon, where the Aboriginal population is larger and the crime rates were 12 times higher.\(^{39}\) According to the Calgary Urban Aboriginal Initiative, by 2011, Aboriginal youth will account for 48% of the young offender population (Calgary Urban Aboriginal Initiative, n.d.: 21). As pointed out by LaPrairie, high crime rates by Aboriginal people should not be surprising as they reflect the high proportion of the population who fall into the age cohort when people are most likely to be criminally involved; on average, they have lower levels of education, income, and employment, and many have grown up in the very circumstances that are associated with the onset of criminal activity in adolescence and early adulthood (LaPrairie, 2002). Such variables have contributed to the growth of Aboriginal gangs in cities such as Saskatoon, Winnipeg and, more recently, in and around Calgary and Edmonton. This may, unfortunately, encourage discrimination against Aboriginal people, which has the potential to escalate as the Aboriginal population grows. Aboriginal people comprise 3% of Canada’s population, yet they account for approximately 20% of people serving a sentence in custody (Statistics Canada, 2005a). It is hoped that the justice system, which has traditionally been unresponsive and, sometimes, overtly discriminatory to Aboriginal peoples, will soon evolve to better address the needs of Aboriginal young offenders and adults.

\(^{39}\) This figure, reported by the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, appears to be from 1996. See Department of Indian and Northern Affairs (n.d.).
3.2.6 Social Services

Population growth alone over the next 30 years will result in increased demand for social services. The nature and dimensions of this demand will also be shaped by changing demographics and the social trends described above.

Population Aging

Clearly, growth in the number and percentage of seniors in Calgary will be accompanied by higher volumes of persons with disabilities and low-income seniors who may require extensive health and social supports. As life expectancies increase and many seniors remain healthy and active, however, demand for alternate forms of recreation which are accessible to this age cohort are also expected to rise (City of Calgary, 2005b). Whether future demand for recreation services is met will depend in part on financing and associated fees. In the past few years, both average household spending and the percentage of households reporting expenditures on the use of sport and recreation facilities have declined dramatically (City of Calgary, 2005b).

Family Structure

Increased numbers of dual wage-earner families and lone-parent families will heighten demand for child care. In Calgary in 2004, there was an average of 1,135 families per month with children enrolled in out-of-school care programs, of which 91% were lone-parent families. Although figures specific to Calgary are not available, the percentage of children receiving formal or informal child care in Alberta as a whole increased from 39% to 46% from 1995 to 2001, although this was still lower than the national average of 53%. The increase in the proportion of care was greatest for lone-parent families, increasing from 39% to 60%, and for low-income families, increasing from 23% to 37% (City of Calgary, 2005b).

Immigrants

Greater heterogeneity among the immigrant population may increase the challenge of developing appropriate supports to meet both instrumental and integration needs of those who require assistance. Demand for ESL and settlement services in particular will continue to rise, and service delivery organizations, many of which are not-for-profit agencies, may be challenged to tailor programming to a wide range of languages and cultures (Grant and Sweetman, 2004). Because the majority of new immigrants are members of visible minority groups, some researchers predict an increasing focus on issues concerning race and racism (Kobayashi, Moore and Rosenberg, 1998), more backlash against immigrants in economic downturns, more emphasis on multicultural programs, and more exploration of integration issues (Sauvé, 1999). Complaints to the Alberta Human Rights and Citizenship Commission on the ground of race have almost doubled in the past five years in the province, from 88 in 1998-99 to 197 in 2004-05, but this is consistent with growth in the number of complaints on all grounds. Race as the percentage of all complaints declined from 12% to 9% over this time frame.40 While human

rights complaints are an imperfect proxy for the incidence of racial discrimination, they do suggest that racism may not be on the rise, although this may simply suggest that members of visible minority groups are unaware of existing avenues of recourse or find the complaints process is unwieldy or unwelcoming. In any case, Calgary must remain on the alert for rises in racism and vigilantly strive to combat current and emerging problems.

Aboriginal Peoples

Growth in Calgary’s Aboriginal population also has social service implications. As observed by the Canada West Foundation (1999), urban Aboriginal peoples take on greater political prominence than their numbers alone suggest because of related issues such as unemployment, poverty, housing, homelessness, and crime, particularly among youth (Vander Ploeg, 2000; Roach and Berdahl, 2001). The foundation states that “[i]f Aboriginal peoples continue to be over-represented among the impoverished and unemployed, they will be disproportionately reliant on government transfers and social programs” (Canada West Foundation, 1999: 9). Siggner and Costa add that high “levels of mobility within the Aboriginal population… may put strain on the service delivery agencies facing high turnover in their clientele and on the schools in neighbourhoods with high concentrations of Aboriginal people. The impact of mobility on Aboriginal children in terms of their grades and school attendance must also be a challenge as they change from one school district to another” (Siggner and Costa, 2005). It is hoped that many of these problems will be circumvented by increased education and employment among young Aboriginal peoples, along with other positive developments in Aboriginal communities. As Wotherspoon observes, “[i]ncreasing numbers of educated and skilled Aboriginal people are making inroads into key labour market and decision-making positions, their profile enhanced by prominent professional, political, and business leaders. The more difficult transformation entails the creation of environments that will enable considerably larger proportions of the population to have similar options and advantages” (Watherspoon, 2003: 164).

3.3 Built Environment

As revealed by the city’s 2004 Citizen Satisfaction Survey (Ipsos-Reid, 2004), 53% of Calgarians identify infrastructure, traffic, and roads as the most or among the most important issues facing their communities, followed by transit at 19%. These issues will become even more pressing in the coming years. Growth in Calgary’s population will tax existing infrastructure, much of which was built 40 to 50 years ago and will soon require expensive maintenance and upgrades. As noted by Vander Ploeg, “[a]n aging public capital stock implies the need for more dollars because older infrastructure is more costly to maintain than new. It also implies the need for better asset management strategies. The natural aging process of infrastructure has been compounded by a lack of previous investment in maintenance and renewal (Vander Ploeg, 2004: 3). In addition, continued suburban expansion carries with it costly infrastructure development, which exceeds the city’s current fiscal capacity. Finally, infrastructure demands will be driven by changing population dynamics and social trends, along with increases in the absolute number of Calgarians.
3.3.1 Neighbourhood Development and Urban Sprawl

Calgary currently has a total planned land supply of 12 to 15 years in the suburbs (with only a six to eight year supply of land with municipal infrastructure and services in place), which are expected to be built out by 2015. Over the next 10 years, developing communities are expected to accommodate 100% of population growth. The city’s footprint will continue to expand to the north, northeast, northwest, south, southeast, and southwest. Efforts are underway to annex 150 square kilometres within the Municipal District of Rocky View, which borders the north, east, and west sides of Calgary. Further expansion west is curtailed by the Tsuu T’ina reserve, and there are no plans to build further east (City of Calgary, 2000).

Due to ongoing demand, the price of residential and non-residential land is expected to continue to rise over the next 30 years, which will spur population growth in more affordable towns in the Calgary Economic Region. Calgary’s population share of the region is forecast to fall to about 80% by 2026, and may decline further in subsequent years (City of Calgary, 2003b). Commutes and uses of Calgary services by residents in metro-adjacent areas (which may, in fact, be annexed by or de facto absorbed by Calgary in less than 30 years) will place increasing strains on Calgary’s infrastructure, and these commuters, sometimes referred to as “free riders,” will likely not contribute to Calgary’s tax base. Calls for high-speed public transit systems connecting towns to downtown Calgary should also be expected.

Outward suburban growth carries with it extensive and expensive infrastructure demands. The costs associated with constructing and maintaining systems for transportation (roads, public transit, paths), water (sewer, storm, fresh water), sewage and solid waste, electricity, and natural gas obviously increase with distance to and from points of delivery and collection, along with low-density housing. The costs of higher per capita costs are also incurred for distance-sensitive services such as public transit, police, fire, emergency medical services, garbage collection, and snow removal (City of Calgary, 2000). And, of course, these new subdivisions also require parks, recreational facilities, community services, and schools. Tensions between the new and established suburbs and, especially, the inner city, over school construction and school closures have already emerged and are expected to escalate over time.

Demand for large, low-density housing may begin to fall in about 2016, in accordance with the aging of the population and decline in household size. It is expected that older Calgarians may seek other forms of accommodation, including seniors’ residential complexes and higher-density housing closer to the city centre and to C-train stops. This may spark a gradual exodus from the new suburbs, just as they have been fully built out, and spur redevelopment of communities closer to the centre of the city. Calgary’s established suburbs, which are located between the inner city and the newer suburbs, are now experiencing declining populations. Over the next few decades, these communities are expected to lose population, eventually stabilizing around 90% of their peak population (City of Calgary, 2003b).

---

41 City of Calgary (2000). See also City of Calgary (2005d).
Long-term demand for housing in the suburbs may also be influenced by a combination of immigration patterns, the economic status of new immigrants, and housing prices. The residential settlement patterns of new immigrants are harder to predict. As discussed earlier, in most Canadian cities, recent immigrants tend to reside in neighbourhoods featuring low-cost rental accommodation, which can be one variable contributing to the geographic concentration of particular immigrant groups. In Calgary, however, immigrant households are not overrepresented in “high rental” neighbourhoods; in fact, 62% of recent immigrant households live in accommodation that is owned by a household member. Home ownership among immigrants is higher in Calgary than in any other major Canadian city and, like elsewhere, increases with the number of years since landing (Schellenberg, 2004). It is speculated that the low cost of home ownership in Calgary relative to other cities, at least until recently, is a major contributing factor to these patterns. As housing prices continue to escalate in Calgary, however, we may see increases in immigrant spatial concentration in low-income, high rental districts, with concurrent social and economic problems. Drawing on lessons learned in Toronto, planning to ensure that low-income rental housing is widely dispersed around the city will be vital to prevent the formation of dense, low-income ethnic neighbourhoods (Myles and Hou, 2003; Hou, 2004).

Efforts to increase development and population density in the “Centre City,” which encompasses the downtown and Beltline areas, have been underway for some time. The city hopes to increase the number of residents in the Downtown East Village alone to at least 12,000, while the Beltline seeks to double its resident population from 17,000 to 34,000. It is generally agreed that increasing the Centre City’s resident population has the potential to improve quality of life for Centre City residents and all citizens of Calgary. As well, it is recognized that all aspects of development and attracting new residents to the Centre City are conditional upon improvements to social issues and reductions in social disorder and crime (Cooper, 2005: 25). Increased residential density in inner city communities and established suburbs would be one means of partially controlling burgeoning infrastructure costs.

Even if residential density is significantly increased, residential property taxes, which account for a large share of the city’s revenue base, will not be sufficient to finance expansion of the city’s infrastructure or maintenance of the existing infrastructure. The possibility of larger and more frequent capital grants from the federal and provincial governments may mitigate construction outlays, but the expense of maintaining new and existing infrastructure will place the city at high risk for large future liabilities. Yet, as noted by Vander Ploeg, “[t]he potential costs of failing to address the issue include higher operating costs for government and business, negative impacts on the environment, threats to public health and safety as well as other social costs, lost economic potential and productivity, and most important, the prospect of even higher capital costs in the future” (Vander Ploeg, 2004: 1). The city urgently needs to secure new funding arrangements with the federal and provincial governments, and to revisit the relationships between service provision and taxes well before Calgary’s population reaches the 1.23 million mark.
3.3.2 Transportation

The transportation infrastructure costs associated with population growth in the new suburbs may be profound. Reliance on private vehicles to transport suburban residents to work and other destinations influences public transit development, road construction and maintenance, traffic congestion, and air pollution, and commuting to work by car is expected to remain a significant problem. Calgary continues to be characterized by a strong concentration of jobs in the downtown core. In 2001, 56% of all jobs in Calgary were located within five kilometres of the city hall, compared to 38% of jobs in Canada as a whole. Efforts are being made to shift employment to centres outside of the downtown core, particularly in suburban locations, with moderate success. Although Calgary’s plan to move a high proportion of downtown jobs to “Town Centres” in the east and west ends of the city has not materialized (City of Calgary, n.d.a), the number of “reverse commutes” in Calgary has increased by more than 40% over the past few years. This is partly because some retail trade and industries, manufacturing in particular, has begun to move to the suburbs, with industry concentrating in the northeast and far regions of the southeast quadrants of the city (Heisz and Larochelle-Côté, 2005). Other changes reducing peak period traffic pressures downtown have included lifestyle changes such as working from home and working part-time or flexible hours (City of Calgary, n.d.a), a trend which, thanks to technological innovations and growing emphasis on “work-life balance,” is likely to grow in the coming decades.

The objective behind job relocation is to reduce commuting to and from downtown and its concomitant problems. However, in the absence of adequate public transit, this may actually have the adverse effect of increasing private vehicle use, albeit in directions other than downtown. Research shows that “because public transit systems are most often city-centre oriented – with trips to and from the city centre being the best served, suburb to suburb commutes may require a less direct route and more time than what is available from the car... For example, it may be that obtaining a direct route (say on a single bus) by public transit becomes harder” (Heisz and Larochelle-Côté, 2005: 41). In addition, in Calgary, higher-paid, professional jobs are still concentrated in and around the downtown core, high-income commuters are less likely than average to use public transit and more likely to drive the farther the distance from their residence to the city centre (Heisz and Larochelle-Côté, 2005), and the new subdivisions are located far from existing Light Rail Transit (LRT) stations and currently receive infrequent bus service. Given the anticipated ongoing population growth in the new subdivisions in the coming decades, and the ongoing focus on construction of new roads rather than public transit to accommodate commuters, it is difficult to imagine how reliance on private vehicles could possibly be contained, let alone reduced. The imminent construction of a “ring road” and within-city connector roads are being planned to accommodate population growth and land use for at least the next 50 years, but this is unlikely to contribute to decreased automobile usage.

Despite this, demand for public transit will continue to grow and, if provided, will partially offset reliance on private vehicles, at least among some segments of the population. Those who are most likely to use public transit include women, young and lower-income persons, and recent immigrants (Heisz and Larochelle-Côté, 2005). An increasing immigrant population – particularly if Calgary does not manage to improve immigrant workforce integration – will...
require increased bus and LRT service to access jobs in remote locations, in addition to other mobility needs. Finally, as the number and percentage of seniors and, correspondingly, the disabled population, increase, demand for accessible public transportation will also rise.

### 3.3.3 Affordable Housing

Over the next 30 years, the city will be progressively more pressured by population growth and demographic change to address affordable and non-market housing shortages in Calgary. Affordable housing shortages are approaching crisis proportions, and this trend is expected to continue indefinitely. As noted by the federal Caucus Task Force on Urban Issues (Sgro report), “[m]unicipal governments and housing providers cannot meet the demand for affordable housing and emergency shelter. As more and more people migrate to cities, the pressure to find suitable accommodation has a ripple effect on society as a whole. As competition for existing housing stock intensifies, tenants at the lower end of the market increasingly have no choice but to turn to shelters or remain in already overcrowded conditions (Canada, Prime Minister’s Caucus Task Force on Urban Issues, 2002: 17-18).

The incidence of core housing need in Calgary is highest among Aboriginal, immigrant, and lone-parent households, and among people who live alone, particularly seniors and women. In 2001, Calgary had the second-lowest level of core housing need (13.4%) in Canada, and this was concentrated among renters. But this represented almost 46,000 households (Engeland et al., 2005), and it is believed that this number has grown considerably over the past five years, due to rising rent and utility costs, along with economic and population growth. Demand will continue to rise indefinitely as the numbers of low-income seniors, immigrants, and Aboriginal peoples escalate in Calgary.

The social and health consequences of affordable housing shortages can be broad and pernicious. For example, low-income families are forced to allocate money that would otherwise be spent on food, clothing, and other essentials toward rent payments that exceed their means. The result is that children may subsist on rationed meals or food from food banks, which may not adequately address their nutritional needs. They also suffer the consequences of inadequate income to pay for recreation, clothing, and other necessities of life. In addition, there is substantial evidence linking housing type, quality, and structure with physical and psychological health and, for children, with a range of developmental outcomes. And nowhere are threats to health and safety felt more acutely than within the Aboriginal population (Cooper, 2001).

The most extreme consequence of housing shortages is homelessness. Calgary’s 2004 biennial count of homeless persons revealed that homelessness had increased by 49% since 2002. Almost 2,600 individuals were counted, including 104 homeless families (City of Calgary, 2004a). The number of absolutely homeless people (individuals living on the street with no physical shelter of their own) is projected to rise to 4,000 by 2008; the number of low-income individual and family renter households who are at risk of becoming homeless will increase from about 16,000 in 2001

---

42 CMHC defines a household as being in “core housing need” if the housing requires major repairs, if it has insufficient bedrooms for the size and makeup of the occupying household, and/or if shelter costs (including utilities and fees) consume more than 30% of before-tax household income and if the household would have to spend 30% or more of its income to pay the average rent of alternative local markets.
to about 19,000 in 2008 (Calgary Homeless Foundation, 2003). Confident long-term projections of homelessness are impossible due to the many factors shaping the problem, however, we can be sure that there may be no upper limit on the numbers. In Toronto, for example, 31,985 homeless individuals (including 4,779 children) stayed in a shelter at least once during 2002 (City of Toronto, 2003). These numbers are not directly comparable to Calgary’s due to different methods of counting homeless people.43

Several new affordable housing projects initiated or completed by the city in collaboration with other partners44 are increasing Calgary’s stock (Cooper, 2005: 2). These initiatives helped to further the city’s goal of providing 800 to 1,000 units of affordable housing by 2008, which the Calgary Homeless Foundation (2003) believes that the community should be able to match over the same time period (Calgary Homeless Foundation, 2003). However, the construction of these units will only partially address low-income Calgarians’ need for affordable housing, and the city alone lacks the tax base to build and maintain a sufficient number of subsidized units to meet current and future needs of low-income Calgarians.

3.4 Natural Environment

One of the features about Calgary most prized by residents is the beautiful and pristine natural environment in and around the city (Praxis Group, 2005). Calgary boasts over 7,500 hectares of open space and parkland within the city, offers the most extensive urban pathway and bikeway network in North America, and has been rated the cleanest city among 215 cities around the world.45

The importance of the natural environment for all aspects of life in Calgary can not be overstated. As summarized by Wilkie and Roach, urban natural capital directly and positively influences residents’ health and well-being by protecting and enhancing air quality, reducing urban heat and noise pollution, and serving as a buffer for precipitation runoff and by providing opportunities for aesthetic enjoyment, outdoor recreation, education, public art, and social gatherings. The natural environment also contributes to the vitality of the urban economy by attracting residents, skilled labour, businesses, and tourists, increasing property values, and reducing public spending (Wilkie and Roach, 2004b).

43 Calgary’s homeless count counts the number of individuals in shelters or on the street on a single night, rather than all individuals who have used a shelter at least one during the preceding year.
44 In 2002, the federal government and Alberta signed an Affordable Housing Program Agreement that will provide $67.2 million in federal funding over five years to help increase the supply of affordable housing in high need areas of the province. The city is also exploring partnerships with the private and not-for-profit sectors.
3.4.1 Threats to the Environment

Unfortunately, burgeoning population growth and ongoing suburban development threaten Calgary’s environmental sustainability on all dimensions. For all of Calgarians’ much-vaunted appreciation of the natural environment, Calgary already has the second largest “ecological footprint” in Canada, second only to York, and Canada has the third largest footprint in the world.\(^\text{46}\) Calgary also has one of the highest levels of domestic water usage in the world at 339 litres per capita per day, compared to 195 litres per capita in Edmonton and 285 litres per capita in Alberta as a whole. Domestic water usage accounts for about two-thirds of overall water use in Calgary (Wilkie and Roach, 2004a). The Calgary Health Region reports that, in the past few years, Calgary’s Glenmore Water Treatment Plant has been experiencing increasing turbidity levels (the amount of sediment or foreign particles) which are an indication of bacteria, viruses and protozoa, although levels have remained within government standards. And both the Bearspaw and Glenmore Water Treatments Plants indicate an increasing trend of fecal bacteria levels. All of this has meant that there has been a significant increase in the amount of chlorine that needs to be added to make the water drinkable or safe (Calgary Health Region, 2005). In addition, only 20% of Calgary’s waste is currently recycled; the remaining 80% goes to landfills. Edmonton, for example, now recycles 50% of its waste, probably because 84% of households participate in a curbside recycling program. The average Calgarian produces 800 kg of garbage in a year which typically includes: 27% paper, 24% yard waste, 20% food waste, 9% plastic, 3% metal, 2% glass, 2% household hazardous waste, and 12% other waste (City of Calgary, n.d.c). Another contributing factor has been Calgary’s ongoing suburban expansion, which has increased dependency on passenger vehicles and increased the length of commutes. Transportation is the biggest cause of air pollution, and passenger vehicles in urban areas create about 30% of transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions (Canadian Urban Transit Association, n.d.). At least twice in November 2005, Calgary’s air quality hit a key pollution threshold, consistent with slow increases in air pollution over the years (Calgary Herald, 2005d: B1).

3.4.2 Environmental Protection

To date, the City of Calgary has proposed or initiated some steps to control these harmful trends. First and foremost, Calgary purchases zero-emission wind energy to power its Light Rail Transit (LRT) system. This represents an annual reduction of 26,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide, roughly the amount produced by 2.5 million trips made by private vehicle (City of Calgary, n.d.b). Water meters have been introduced in parts of the city, and the city participates in provincial planning to manage future water shortages and threats to water quality. At present, the city reports that Calgary uses only half of its allowed water draw from the Bow River (Calgary Herald, 2005b: B1), but the Bow River Basin is now threatened by climate change.

\(^{46}\) An ecological footprint, expressed in hectares per capita, weighs demand for biological capacity against the ability to supply it, and serves as an important indicator of environmental sustainability. Six factors are used to calculate an environmental footprint: energy land (area of forest required to absorb the CO\(_2\) emissions resulting from energy consumption); crop land (area of crop land required to produce the required crops); pasture land (area of grazing land required to produce the necessary animal products); forest land (area of forest required to produce wood and paper); sea space (area of sea required to produce marine fish and seafood); and built area (area of land required to accommodate housing and infrastructure). See Federation of Canadian Municipalities (2004).
Growing smog problems have prompted the city to begin working on an ozone management plan, similar to plans in place in cities like Toronto (Calgary Herald, 2005d: B1). The city also aims to increase the proportion of all waste that is recycled to 80% by 2020 (City of Calgary, n.d.c) although, given the ongoing controversy about the possible introduction of a city-wide curbside recycling program, it is not clear how this might evolve. Calgary’s landfills still have 35 years of capacity, prompting some to suggest that there is no motivation for residents to reduce the amount of garbage they throw away, or for government to encourage them to do so. In addition, no efforts have been made as yet to reduce or divert commercial waste, which accounts for 64% of garbage going to landfills (Calgary Herald, 2005a: A4).

3.4.3 Ongoing Concerns

Unless stringent conservation measures and viable and comprehensive public transit expansions are introduced in the near future, population expansion in the suburbs will wreak havoc on Calgary’s natural environment over the next 30 years. Increased water consumption is a key concern. Wilkie explains that “Alberta is already experiencing water declines – river and lake levels have declined between 10% and 20% over the last century, glaciers are shrinking, 70% of natural wetlands have been lost (reducing water infiltration and groundwater recharge), groundwater aquifers are recharging lake levels at a slower rate than in the past, and – in drier times – aquifers themselves are not being recharged” (Wilkie, 2005: 14). In addition, climate projections suggest a multi-year, possibly a decade long, drought (Wilkie, 2005: 14). Methods of diverting water from northern to east central and southern Alberta are already in development, and diversion to the United States at some point in the future is, despite assertions from the provincial government, a very real possibility. Many, including former Alberta premier Peter Lougheed, have speculated that the United States may act aggressively to ensure its water security.

Wilkie and Roach (2004a). point out that, in addition to issues of water and energy consumption, there are larger-scale ecological effects that result from restructuring and reshaping the landscape to support new residential development. The consumption of wild and agricultural lands not only reduces the capacity for food production and threatens groundwater systems, it also changes the physical/topographic character of the landscape which can alter ecosystem structure and impact how the land functions ecologically (such as the availability of soil nutrients). Wildlife species are threatened by loss of habitat caused by the removal of grasses, flowers, shrubs, trees, wetlands and watercourses during development, along with loss and fragmentation of space. Urban habitat also provides ecological functions for humans by controlling erosion, filtering water, and absorbing storm water runoff. Replacing natural land covers with impervious asphalt and concrete surfaces directly affects water quantity, quality and aquatic ecosystems. Finally, “the pattern of new communities (proximity of homes to grocery stores, to public transit, to the places where people work) is directly related to automobile use. It is difficult to promote the use of public transit to someone who has to walk more than 10 minutes to the nearest bus stop” (Wilkie and Roach, 2004a: 12).

47 See, for example, Government of Alberta (2003).
48 See, for example, Wood (2005) and Maich (2005).
Environmental problems associated with inner city development and residential development of former industrial areas in the city should not be overlooked. Lessons should be learned from the discovery of contaminated soil in Lynnvie Ridge, prompting the displacement of 240 households, 40 of them with children, and many of them low-income. Over the past decade, environmental problems in neighbourhoods built on or near former industrial land have arisen in other North American cities, and it is not clear that Calgary is immune from similar concerns.

3.5 Governance

Over the next 10 years and beyond, the City of Calgary will be called upon to build new and upgrade existing infrastructure, respond to increased calls for social and municipal services, and explore new mechanisms to engage individuals and groups in the governance process. In addition, ongoing outward expansion, including the likely advent of amalgamation with nearby towns in the Calgary Economic Region, has implications for the size and structure of municipal government.

3.5.1 Urban Expansion and Representation

As noted earlier, most, if not all, of Calgary’s population growth will occur in suburbs which are under development or have yet to be built. Given the population projection of 1.23 million residents in 2031, this means that city council will represent as many as 200,000 more people who reside in new neighbourhoods bordering the city’s current footprint. In addition to expanding the size of council, the city may need to explore additional methods of representation, such as “aldermen-at-large” and, as pointed out by Clutterbuck and Novick, among others, stronger, formal relationships with other local authorities – school boards, band councils, social service agencies, and so on – to secure upper level policy support and ensure its fit with local conditions (Clutterbuck and Novick, 2003). Also, annexation of bordering communities may require some form of amalgamation of towns’ governing bodies within Calgary’s city council, or even replacing council with an entirely new structure.

3.5.2 Civic Engagement

Over the next 30 years, changing demographics in Calgary, along with shifting attitudes toward and expectations of government, will pressure the municipal government to explore new approaches to representing and engaging citizens. The city will need to open new avenues to participation for growing segments of the population – particularly immigrant and Aboriginal peoples – who have traditionally been denied access to decision-making power.49

Civic engagement is a two-way street: individuals and groups need to participate in decision-making, and governments need to invite, listen to, and make changes in accordance with the input and expertise of these individuals and groups. This implies that vehicles for participation are available to citizens.

---

49 See, for example, Clutterbuck and Novick (2003), Norris and Clatworthy (2003), and Hanselmann (2003).
Research suggests that civic participation among traditionally excluded groups is fostered by multiple forms of involvement in both group-specific and mainstream organizations (National Anti-Racism Council of Canada, 2004), removing barriers to participation and promoting access to political processes, and increasing civic literacy and political knowledge (Tolley, n.d.). Typically, governments operate in an environment in which they can depend on organized interests to represent the stakeholders in an issue. It will be incumbent upon the city to build upon current practice and provide more support and greater authority to representative organizations in the decision-making process using vehicles such as the Calgary Urban Aboriginal Committee, the former Diversity Task Force, and “civic panels,” as proposed by Inclusive Cities Canada. Inclusive Cities Canada, a collaborative venture of five social planning organizations across Canada and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, has been working in five pilot cities (including Edmonton) to “mobilize community leadership and shape public policy through the establishment of civic panels that will conduct local social inclusion audits/inquiries, which will identify civic policies, capacities and practices contributing to inclusive communities, with a particular focus on youth and families with children, vulnerable individuals and groups, and populations of diversity.”\(^{50}\) Inviting new forms of civic participation will be particularly important for Aboriginal peoples, whose current and historical experiences of social inclusion and exclusion and civic engagement are complex and multi-faceted “as they recognize themselves as distinct from other Canadians and as belonging to ‘nations within’ and as nations that are not represented within” (Whittles, 2005).

### 3.5.3 Tax Base and Financing

It is generally agreed that Canada’s cities are critical to the economic prosperity of the country. To remain viable and sustainable, cities need to build and maintain infrastructure and they need to deliver a wide range of services to attract and retain skilled workers and businesses. However, as noted in the Sgro report, “[t]here is mounting evidence that our cities are ailing due to deteriorating infrastructure, declining air and water quality, traffic gridlock, homelessness, growing income polarization and marginalization, and budget crises. With few ways to generate revenue other than through property taxes, urban regions are finding it increasingly difficult to provide basic services and make repairs to infrastructure (Canada, Prime Minister’s Caucus Task Force on Urban Issues, 2002: 2).

Calgary is no exception to this trend. Although the City of Calgary is responsible for a wide range of services, it has only three sources of revenue: property and business taxes, franchise fees from utilities’ use of city rights-of-way, and user fees. All three are under public pressure for reduction or reform, and none are sensitive to the needs of a growing population. Property taxes account for about 40% of the city’s total revenues, and they have already risen by 20% over the past decade (City of Calgary, 2004c). Plans to increase property taxes by 5% in 2006 and more in subsequent years are meeting with resistance from the public and generating controversy on city council, although the increase is likely to ensue nonetheless.

---

\(^{50}\) See the Inclusive Cities Canada website at [www.inclusivecities.ca](http://www.inclusivecities.ca).
As noted by the city, Calgary’s per capita revenue declined by 6% during the 1990s, while the Government of Canada’s per capita revenue increased by nearly 8% (and provincial government per capita revenue grew by 22%). “In an era where more demands are being placed on municipal governments to deliver the direct services on which citizens rely – potable water, security, public transportation, emergency services, and recreation facilities – the need for fiscal reform has never been greater” (City of Calgary, 2004c).

A recent city study on financing growth identifies new development charges, in the form of a cash levy on developers and/or the physical construction of infrastructure that is turned over to the city, as a partial solution to new infrastructure costs. Under the proposed guidelines, developer contributions would be considered appropriate for funding all on-site infrastructure in new communities relating to roads, waterworks, sanitary sewers, parks, and pathways. Other proposed initiatives include implementing user fees for a greater number of services, including road tolls and utility rates for waste and recycling service, and expanding the use of local improvement levies and temporary property tax surcharges (City of Calgary, 2005c).

The federal government’s “New Deal” for cities also provides an opportunity for more collaborative relationships among the three levels of government and increased long-term and predictable funding for Calgary. Recent federal grants for infrastructure improvements and construction of transitional housing and homeless shelters have been welcome contributions, but more, stable, and consistent funding will be required to address current and future infrastructure needs. But the majority of “new” federal monies outlined in the New Deal are already in place.

The city has called for many changes, including the establishment of a trust fund with the proceeds from the federal fuel tax to provide transfer payments to cities, a 10-year flexible capital grants program to lower financing costs for new and rehabilitated affordable housing, and transfer payments to municipalities to support Aboriginal peoples who migrate to the city (City of Calgary, 2004c). While these may be reasonable demands, additional mechanisms are required to allow for intergovernmental partnerships to set long-term policy goals and priorities that correspond to Calgary’s specific needs, respect the province’s constitutional responsibility for cities, and maintain the federal government’s desire to ensure accountability for its investments. As cautioned by Séguin and Germain, advocates of greater autonomy for cities must ensure that decentralization does not result in downloading of responsibilities without the transfer of adequate resources (Séguin and Germain, 2000).
4.0 Case Studies

4.1 Case Study 1: Governance and Civic Engagement in Toronto

The *Stronger City of Toronto for a Stronger Ontario Act, 2005* received First Reading in the Ontario Legislature on December 14, 2005, and is expected to be passed in the middle of 2006. The Act sets out new legislative and fiscal frameworks for the City of Toronto, effectively increasing the city’s powers in many important ways. The Act:

- will enable Toronto to exercise governmental powers (i.e. license, regulate, prohibit, require, raise revenue, etc.) with respect to broadly-defined municipal purposes, subject only to certain restrictions informed by the provincial interest. This approach will provide Toronto with a level of autonomy rivalling and possibly exceeding that of any other city in Canada;
- includes provisions for the city and the Province of Ontario to work to develop additional agreements and for the city to participate in policy, program and budget deliberations undertaken by federal and provincial governments;
- provides Toronto with a general authority to levy taxes subject to certain restrictions (e.g. no income or sales tax, no payroll tax, no gas tax, etc.), which will give council the option of easing pressure on the property tax base and will partially offset burgeoning infrastructure costs (City of Toronto, n.d.);
- gives the city broad permissive powers to determine the composition of council and ward boundaries, allowing the city to be more responsive to changing demographics;
- provides the city with the ability to delegate more powers and responsibilities to committees, boards or staff to provide it with greater flexibility to manage its deliberations and to streamline decision-making; and
- gives the city more control over the look and feel of the city, through controls over architectural detail and building design, including certain exterior environmental features (Government of Ontario, 2005).

While all aspects of the Act may be instructive to the City of Calgary, Toronto’s exploration of a new governance model is particularly relevant to the current discussion. In anticipation of the new Act, the city convened an advisory panel to conduct public consultations and research to inform the development of a new structure of democratic governance which reflects both the broader powers granted by the legislation and the evolving needs of a larger and increasingly diverse population. The just-released Report of the Governing Toronto Advisory Panel (2005) explicitly recognizes that “Toronto’s current model of democratic governance is simply not capable of generating the sophisticated economic and social policies that citizens rightly expect from the government of Canada’s largest and most complex urban centre” (Governing Toronto Advisory Panel, 2005: 6). Among many other recommendations, the Advisory Council recommends that:

- some decision-making authority be delegated to community councils,
- processes be developed to solicit input from the city’s 140 neighbourhoods on policy and service planning,
ward-based representation be maintained,
• budgeting be more strongly tied to pre-identified strategic priorities, and
• in consultation with the community, the city develop a shared, common civic engagement strategy and, in particular, use this strategy in the 13 neighbourhoods identified as having priority for infrastructure investment under the Toronto Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy.

Toronto appears to be the only city in Canada that is exploring issues of civic engagement in any depth. It is explicitly recognized that the complexity of the city requires agility in civic engagement response, and knowledge and techniques to ensure that public input is sufficiently robust to inform an issue or sector specific initiative. Further, the city is contemplating the formal articulation of civic engagement principles, along with the development of sophisticated indicators of civic engagement, beyond voter turnout and representation of diversity on elected and other representative bodies (Robinson, 2005).

4.2 Case Study 2: Supporting Urban Aboriginal Youth in Winnipeg

The City of Winnipeg has the largest urban Aboriginal population of any city in Canada, and it is projected to continue to escalate over the next 15 years. The City of Winnipeg, along with the Governments of Manitoba and Canada, has recognized that the city’s future is highly dependant on its ability to address the needs of Aboriginal youth. To this end, governments have introduced a wide range of programs and supports for youth who live in Winnipeg or who migrate to and from reserves. Examples of such programs include:51

• Keewatin Youth Initiative

Established in 2001, the Keewatin Youth Initiative provides: skills, resources and opportunities for youth to become employable or to further their education; recreational programming; volunteer and work placement services; career guidance and support; and workshops on a range of issues affecting youth. Services are available to Aboriginal youth aged to 15 to 19 years who have been unemployed and not attending school for a period of at least three months.

• Manitoba Indian Education Association – Urban Transitioning Programming

As part of its mandate, the Manitoba Indian Education Association provides Aboriginal youth who have come to the city to study with liaison and advocacy services to help them to transition and adapt to their new environment.

• Circle of Life Thunderbird House

The Circle of Life Thunderbird House has developed programming in response to recommendations from gang-involved youth. These include PAA PIU WAK, a safe house for gang members who “want out” using traditional Aboriginal methods, Clean Start, a gang tattoo cover-up/removal service, and an intervention program designed to address “criminal thinking” and behaviours.

51 These examples have been identified as best practices by the Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples (2003) and the program descriptions can be obtained from them.
5.0 Summary and Conclusions

Over the next 30 years, Calgary’s civic profile will be influenced by population growth, along with three primary demographic trends: population aging, immigration, and the growth of the urban Aboriginal population. While the projected impacts of these trends may be influenced by a range of capricious, or “rogue,” variables, some reasonable inferences can be drawn about the ways in which a larger, older, and more multicultural population may shape the evolution of Calgary’s economic, social, natural and built environments, governance systems, and human needs within each of those systems, depending on current and future policy responses made by the City of Calgary and other policy actors.

In 30 years time, Calgary will be home to an additional 250,000 people, most of them aged 45 years or more, and almost 100,000 of whom will be seniors. Overall, 28% of Calgary’s population will be in the 45 to 64 age cohort; 15.4% will be aged 65 or more. The proportion of children and youth will be much smaller than it is today; in fact, there will be only about 24,000 more children and 3,000 more youth in Calgary. The proportion of Calgarians who are immigrants has long been and is expected to remain at around 20% but, because of shifts in source countries, the percentage of Calgarians who are visible minorities will increase to 25% (and to one-third of children) in just 10 years. This trend is likely to continue over the following two decades. Finally, for reasons including birth rates, migration, and “ethnic drift,” Calgary’s Aboriginal population will increase by about 40% over the next 10 to 12 years; most of this growth will be concentrated among Aboriginal children and youth. While longer-term projections are confounded by a number of unpredictable factors, it is certain that a significantly higher proportion of Calgary’s child, youth, and young adult population will be Aboriginal in the coming years.

Although Calgary boasts one of the strongest economies among all Canadian cities, the population is increasingly divided into “haves” and “have-nots.” In the past few years, child poverty rates have almost doubled, such that 20% (about 43,000) of Calgary’s children now live below LICO. Almost one in five parents in Calgary reports that they do not have enough money to buy food all of the time. Poverty rates and unemployment rates are much higher for immigrants and Aboriginal peoples than among the rest of the population. Aboriginal peoples continue to suffer a broad range of health, social, and economic problems at rates vastly exceeding those of other Calgarians. Calgary’s long-term social sustainability depends on the city’s ability to address all of the factors which contribute to the social exclusion of a growing proportion of the population. Continued economic growth alone will be insufficient to reverse current trends, as the labour market may be increasingly polarized between high-skill, high-wage-jobs and low-wage, low-skill jobs. Along with evolution in the demographic composition of the population, changes in family structure and the education system may mean that more workers will be subject both to conditions that restrict their capacity to participate in the labour market and to discrimination and disadvantage at work. Depending on policy and planning decisions made now, there is a very real danger that many of Calgary’s workers will be left behind in the new economy, with escalating numbers of “working poor” Calgarians at risk of social exclusion on all its dimensions.
The “greying” of Calgary’s population carries with it a broad range of implications for each of the five systems. While much has been made of the potentially ruinous effects of a population dominated by seniors on the economy, such concerns, while not to be dismissed, are probably overblown. Increases in longevity in conjunction with healthier aging, extended workforce participation, and accumulations of wealth among a significant portion of Calgary seniors are likely to mitigate many of the possible problems associated with growth within older age cohorts. At the same time, however, there will be more seniors, many with diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, who require a range of publicly-provided health and social service supports, over a longer time frame, to remain healthy and socially engaged. In addition, an older population will likely prompt changes in infrastructure requirements, as demand shifts from schools and playgrounds, large, low-density housing, and family-friendly amenities to services and facilities addressing the health, social, housing, and mobility needs of mature adults, whose children have long left the nest. The need for public transportation that is accessible on all dimensions will likely rise, and it is possible that demand for higher-density housing, located close to amenities, may eventually spark an exodus from the suburban communities which are currently in or planned for development.

Calgary’s continued economic growth and social vibrancy will, to a great extent, depend upon the city’s ability to attract and integrate skilled workers from elsewhere in Canada and around the world. Increased immigration also has the potential to boost Calgary’s “cultural capital” and help the city to evolve into a truly cosmopolitan and world-class metropolis. Because global competition for educated immigrants is on the rise, Calgary’s success in maintaining a productive workforce will hinge on its continued “livability” – affordability, amenities, environmental health, safety, economic security, and social cohesion – along with the extent to which immigrants’ social and economic integration can be facilitated via improvements in recognition of foreign credentials, provision of English-language instruction and other social and educational supports, and respect for religious and cultural diversity. If, however, the current trajectory of increasing poverty among immigrants continues, the city will not only fail to entice and retain global talent, it will perpetuate and heighten social exclusion among a significant proportion of the population, perhaps even creating a disenfranchised immigrant underclass, with profound negative social implications.

Likewise, Calgary’s future is intricately connected to the well-being of the Aboriginal population. The imminent surge in the number of young Aboriginal peoples in Calgary presents both challenges and opportunities. Calgary’s continued economic growth and positive social climate will require ongoing efforts to bolster the social inclusion of Aboriginal peoples and to ensure that young Aboriginal people are afforded education and employment opportunities to allow them to fully participate in the workforce and all other aspects of society. This will require careful planning to create welcoming and supportive environments to nurture the growth of professional, political, and business leaders within and beyond the Aboriginal community (Wotherspoon, 2003). Failure to do so may threaten Calgary’s social and economic sustainability over the long-term.

Current municipal plans lay the foundation for ongoing expansion of Calgary’s urban footprint, with extensive residential development creeping outward into agricultural lands to the north, northeast, northwest, south, southeast, and southwest of the city over the next decade. While
public transit will expand over time, residents of these new suburbs will generally rely on private
vehicles for mobility, contributing to higher greenhouse gas emissions and probably, over time,
to increased traffic congestion. Outward suburban development carries with it extensive and
expensive infrastructure demands, and continued population growth and urban sprawl in
conjunction with global warming seriously threaten Calgary’s water ecosystems, along with all
other aspects of the natural environment in and around the city. It is not clear that current
recycling and water conservation plans will be sufficient to slow, let alone halt, the
environmental tolls of expansion. The consequences for all aspects of life in Calgary may be
profound.

The City of Calgary is already challenged by the costs associated with infrastructure
development and maintenance. Much of Calgary’s infrastructure is over 50 years old and will
soon require expensive upgrades, yet the city is fiscally constrained by its limited autonomy in
the taxation field. Proposed development levies and user fees may offset infrastructure costs in
new subdivisions, but alternate revenue sources will be required to prevent imminent
deterioration of existing road, water, and other systems, and to support the demands of the
burgeoning population within Calgary, along with people living in its environs who commute to
the city. In addition, due to downloading from higher levels of government, the city will be
increasingly pressured to provide a broader range of social services to growing numbers of
people. The sustainability of Calgary’s built and social infrastructure will, therefore, greatly
depend on the city’s success in negotiating new funding arrangements with the federal and
provincial governments.

Over the next 30 years, the city will also be challenged by changing demographics, along with
shifting attitudes toward and expectations of government, to explore new approaches to
representing and engaging citizens. The city will need to open new avenues to participation for
growing segments of the population – particularly immigrant and Aboriginal peoples – who have
traditionally been denied access to decision-making power in order to foster social inclusion and
social cohesion, with a view to sustaining broad social well-being among Calgarians.

In 30 years, Calgary may be strikingly different than it is today. The city may or may not succeed
in retaining and further cultivating economic growth and prosperity, strong infrastructure and
services, a green and flourishing natural environment, thriving neighbourhoods, and a healthy
and harmonious population. All of these facets of urban life will be shaped by Calgary’s growing
and evolving population, and the ways and extent to which demographic change is anticipated,
embraced, and accommodated with a view to ensuring the city’s long-term sustainability on all
dimensions.
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Appendix 1. Demographic Trends – Key Findings

Calgary’s Population Is Expected to Increase to 1.23 Million By 2033.

Along with increases in the size of Calgary’s population, the most important demographic trends are population aging, immigration, and growth of the Aboriginal population.

Most Significant Implications of Population Growth Overall

- Given that Calgary has purchased quantities of land beyond existing new communities and that 100% of population growth is expected to be accommodated by additional, planned new communities, Calgary faces a high risk of ongoing urban sprawl, which has negative impacts on the environment, especially water, and on infrastructure costs.

- Demand for municipal services and all aspects of infrastructure will continue to escalate and, unless the tax structure is changed significantly or a “new deal” for cities is made with the federal and provincial governments, this will not be accompanied by a concurrent increase in tax base/municipal revenues.

- The city will probably need to revisit its governance structure to reflect changes in population density and distribution, along with probable annexation of surrounding towns.

| Total Projected Population, Calgary^52 |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                  | 2006             | 2011             | 2016             | 2021             | 2026             | 2031             | 2033             |
| Total            | 965,000          | 1,026,000        | 1,070,000        | 1,134,000        | 1,188,000        | 1,219,000        | 1,231,000        |

Most Significant Implications of Population Aging

- Significantly more seniors in conjunction with a constant number of children and youth may result in even larger labour force shortages.

- A higher proportion of seniors, and especially the prospect of more frail elderly, may have negative impacts on the economy, although these impacts will probably not be as devastating as often projected.

- An older population will have different service demands, particularly in the areas of health, social services, recreation, transportation, and housing.

- A larger population of seniors will have more political clout, and may influence shifts in public policy and spending from families, schools, and children’s programming and supports to areas reflecting the wants and needs of seniors.

- As crime rates, particularly property crime rates, are driven primarily by the number of young males in the population, crime rates may continue to fall.

^52 Table reproduced with format modifications from City of Calgary (2003b)
### Total Projected Population by Age, Calgary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>2033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>173,000</td>
<td>188,000</td>
<td>201,000</td>
<td>202,000</td>
<td>199,000</td>
<td>196,000</td>
<td>197,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17.9%)</td>
<td>(18.3%)</td>
<td>(18.8%)</td>
<td>(17.8%)</td>
<td>(16.8%)</td>
<td>(16.1%)</td>
<td>(16.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>133,000</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>149,000</td>
<td>148,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15.0%)</td>
<td>(13.0%)</td>
<td>(11.6%)</td>
<td>(12.8%)</td>
<td>(13.0%)</td>
<td>(12.2%)</td>
<td>(12.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>332,000</td>
<td>357,000</td>
<td>370,000</td>
<td>367,000</td>
<td>361,000</td>
<td>352,000</td>
<td>351,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(34.4%)</td>
<td>(34.8%)</td>
<td>(34.6%)</td>
<td>(32.4%)</td>
<td>(30.4%)</td>
<td>(28.9%)</td>
<td>(28.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>257,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>309,000</td>
<td>338,000</td>
<td>346,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22.8%)</td>
<td>(23.9%)</td>
<td>(24.0%)</td>
<td>(24.7%)</td>
<td>(26.0%)</td>
<td>(27.7%)</td>
<td>(28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=65</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>103,000</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>164,000</td>
<td>184,000</td>
<td>189,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.8%)</td>
<td>(10.0%)</td>
<td>(11.0%)</td>
<td>(12.3%)</td>
<td>(13.8%)</td>
<td>(15.1%)</td>
<td>(15.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>965,000</td>
<td>1,026,000</td>
<td>1,070,000</td>
<td>1,134,000</td>
<td>1,188,000</td>
<td>1,219,000</td>
<td>1,231,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Most Significant Implications of Immigration

- The “face” of Calgary will be multicultural, multilingual, multi-religious population, which will boost Calgary’s cultural capital and contribute to a more cosmopolitan city.

- Calgary faces ongoing labour force shortages which may be offset by immigration. As aging workforces and labour force shortages are a global concern, Calgary will need to offer competitive advantages to attract new workers. However, new immigrants will face ongoing challenges in social, cultural, and labour force integration. Adults will require more English as a Second Language (ESL) training and better recognition of foreign credentials to allow for workforce integration; children and youth will require improved ESL instruction and public education. If Calgary succeeds in meeting these challenges, everyone will benefit.

- If we do not succeed, the negative outcomes may include increased poverty/social and economic polarization, racism, neighbourhood segregation, school dropout and crime, and ongoing labour force shortages with serious negative economic spinoffs.

### Visible Minority Ethnocultural Characteristics Projections, Calgary CMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Visible Minorities</th>
<th>Immigrants</th>
<th>Non-Christian Religions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>165.8</td>
<td>295.2</td>
<td>202.8</td>
<td>288.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excluding those responding “no religion.”

---

53 Table reproduced with format modifications from City of Calgary (2003b).
54 See Belanger and Malenfant (2005). Selections from Table 12. Population (in thousands) of the ten CMAs with the largest number of visible minority by ethnocultural characteristics, Canada, 2001 and 2017, reference scenario.
### Projected Visible Minority Population by Age and as a Percentage of the Population, Calgary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 14</td>
<td>41,242</td>
<td>49,653</td>
<td>57,954</td>
<td>66,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 24</td>
<td>27,504</td>
<td>33,113</td>
<td>38,649</td>
<td>44,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>28,586</td>
<td>34,415</td>
<td>40,170</td>
<td>45,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>31,059</td>
<td>37,393</td>
<td>43,645</td>
<td>49,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54</td>
<td>19,290</td>
<td>23,224</td>
<td>27,107</td>
<td>30,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
<td>10,774</td>
<td>12,972</td>
<td>15,140</td>
<td>17,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 75</td>
<td>7,051</td>
<td>8,489</td>
<td>9,908</td>
<td>11,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>3,394</td>
<td>4,086</td>
<td>4,770</td>
<td>5,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168,901</td>
<td>203,344</td>
<td>237,343</td>
<td>270,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projected Immigrant Population by Age and as a Percentage of the Population, Calgary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>11,693</td>
<td>12,347</td>
<td>13,348</td>
<td>13,930</td>
<td>14,361</td>
<td>14,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>17,412</td>
<td>19,661</td>
<td>22,509</td>
<td>23,368</td>
<td>24,607</td>
<td>25,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-64</td>
<td>121,366</td>
<td>136,337</td>
<td>147,861</td>
<td>161,576</td>
<td>173,596</td>
<td>184,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>28,538</td>
<td>31,097</td>
<td>35,076</td>
<td>38,172</td>
<td>41,629</td>
<td>45,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>179,008</td>
<td>199,442</td>
<td>218,793</td>
<td>237,045</td>
<td>254,193</td>
<td>270,030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

55 Table modified from City of Calgary (2003b).
56 Table modified from City of Calgary (2003b).
Most Significant Implications of a Growing Aboriginal Population

- Most of the Aboriginal population is young, meaning that we have a good pool of potential workers and consumers to contribute to economic growth. Children and youth are the fastest growing segment of the Aboriginal population, and Aboriginal children and youth are the fastest growing segment of Calgary’s child and youth population. In 2001, about half of the Aboriginal people in Calgary were aged 24 years or younger; 31% were aged 14 years or younger, compared to 35% and 19% of Calgarians as a whole.

- Many Aboriginal children and youth are growing up in less than ideal developmental conditions and will require significant health, economic, educational, housing, and social supports to fully benefit from and contribute to life in Calgary.

- Failure to support the young Aboriginal population would have serious negative impacts on all aspects of life in Calgary for all residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>15,195</td>
<td>21,915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics Canada Medium growth scenario</td>
<td>24,322</td>
<td>26,576</td>
<td>29,180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics Canada High Growth scenario</td>
<td>24,473</td>
<td>26,945</td>
<td>29,828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase of 1,343/Year (Based on 1996-2001 Actuals)</td>
<td>28,625</td>
<td>35,340</td>
<td>42,055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase of 44%/5 Years (Based on 1996-2001 Actuals)</td>
<td>31,550</td>
<td>45,432</td>
<td>65,422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{57}$ Statistics Canada figures have been calculated based on the growth percentages used to project scenarios for the two large Alberta CMAs. Statistics Canada provides five possible scenarios reflecting different assumptions about fertility, mortality and migration. See Statistics Canada (2005c).
Population Reporting an Aboriginal Identity, Calgary CMA, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4 Years</td>
<td>2,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 9 Years</td>
<td>2,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 14 Years</td>
<td>2,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 19 Years</td>
<td>1,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 24 Years</td>
<td>2,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34 Years</td>
<td>4,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 44 Years</td>
<td>3,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 54 Years</td>
<td>2,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 64 Years</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 64 Years</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,915</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics Canada, 2001 Census. Note that it is estimated that census data underrepresent the Aboriginal population by 20% to 40%.
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