

## Summary of Additional River Run Documents - July 14, 2025

1. **Aug 12, 2013, construction article** announcing that the West LRT opens at double the cost estimate. *(This identifies that, when City Council voted to expropriate River Run on September 12, 2023, not only did Council have 4 years of cost overrun warnings – such that at no point did anyone know whether River Run would be needed for transit – Council also had very recent and similar cost overrun experience with the West LRT.)*
2. **Nov 27, 2013, Harvard press release** re Eau Claire redevelopment. *(In 2013, the City and Harvard were aligned on Harvard building 2.5 square feet of development on Harvard's land with the Green Line running down 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and not through River Run.)*
3. **Oct 4, 2015, Herald article** re Harvard redevelopment with River Run still standing. *(The City was concerned, and the Eau Claire Community Association was concerned, that Harvard no longer wants to build based on its approved 2008 Development Permit. Whatever Harvard did want to build, the development picture used in 2015 depict towers constructed with River Run still standing.)*
4. **Dec 8, 2015, Herald article** re Harvard announces City approval of Eau Claire development. *(Some on City Council viewed redevelopment at this “crown jewel” location as critical and identify that ‘compromises’ may be needed to move the development forward.)*
5. **June 13, 2017, Green Line Plan** has a 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave SW station and it is not on River Run *(In 2017, it appears the City was still planning to run the train on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, with a 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave SW station, with no indication that River Run would need to be taken for the Green Line.)*
6. **July 6, 2017, CBC story** re Province commits to fund Green Line. *(The Green Line was planned from 16<sup>th</sup> Ave North to Shepard and the diagram indicates that the City continues to plan for the train to run on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, and not on River Run.)*
7. **Sept 11, 2017, Herald article** re Harvard development approved. *(Harvard had approval for 5 towers in 2.1 million square feet of development and, although the development is referred to as “on the banks of the Bow River”, River Run continues to be depicted as remaining in between Harvard's development and the waterfront.)*
8. **Feb 4, 2019, Rethink Team letter** to Council identifying costs concerns. *(This letter identifies that both internal and external experts expect the planned Green Line train will be \$2 billion over the \$4.65 billion budget and notes that City taxpayers are 100% at risk for all cost overruns. With such expected cost overruns, any use of River Run for public transit was always highly uncertain.)*
9. **April 12, 2019, Herald article** re City and Harvard negotiations. *(Harvard identifies the Green Line as a reason for delay. Area Councillor Druh Farrell identifies that the Eau Claire Market property was sold to Harvard, not for the sale proceeds, but to generate more property tax and the City wants development to proceed soon.)*

10. **Oct 16, 2019, Herald article** re City and Harvard closed door negotiations. (*Harvard is negotiating with the City behind closed doors and Councillor Farrell again notes the City's primary goal is to see the development move forward. These behind closed negotiations came shortly before: (i) on March 3, 2020, the City starts to publicly depict the train running through the eastern edge of River Run; and (ii) Councillor Farrell publishes on the City website that the City: "worked hard with the Market owners to design a station that works for the Green Line and supports future redevelopment of the site. ...This station ...is also key to finally pushing the redevelopment of the Market forward" and "One unfortunate element of this alignment is that it still requires the purchase or expropriation of the River Run condominiums that sit along the Bow River Pathway"*).
11. **June 16, 2020, City press release** re Council approves Green Line with restrictions (*Council approves of the Green Line, with stages to reduce risk such that the 2B segment (north of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave SW Station to 16<sup>th</sup> Ave north – where River Run is located) is not to proceed until after the 2A segment (Elbow River to 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave SW station) is confirmed to be on budget – something which never occurred.*)
12. **June 17, 2020, Herald article** re Mayor Nenshi assures the public there is funding to go from Shepard to 16<sup>th</sup> Ave N. (*In addition to the Mayor's assurance, a Councillor assures the public that "this is anything but a roll of the dice" and that for \$4.9 billion, plus interest, the City can tunnel through downtown and construct a large bridge across the Bow River, for 20km of train line – assurance which soon proved to be highly unrealistic.*)
13. **April 3, 2021, Herald opinion** raising cost overrun risks for downtown tunnels. (*Independent experts again warn the City that it is financially reckless to try to build the planned downtown tunnels and again identifies that: (i) billions in cost overruns should be expected; and (ii) based on the agreements entered into by the City, Calgary taxpayers are 100% responsible for all cost overruns.*)
14. **Dec 2021, Green Line Board Q4 2021** cost uncertainties are clearly identified. (*City Council is again informed of the risk of significant cost overruns by its own Green Line Board in public meetings – and this is two years before Council votes to expropriate River Run.*)
15. **Dec 2021, Green Line Report Appendix** identifies cost overruns could be more than 35 per cent. (*The "yellow" cost risk indicator identifies cost overruns of up to 35% can be expected, which later moves to red – with red meaning that the City should expect cost overruns exceeding 35%.*)
16. **Jan 25, 2022, CBC story** re Green Line Board budget concerns. (*The Green Line Board publicly reports to Council that they have a "low level of confidence" the planned 20km of the Green Line from Shepard to 16<sup>th</sup> Ave North can be built within the available budget. As such, City Council was informed publicly by its own Green Line Board that the project is unlikely to proceed as currently approved by three levels of government –*

*making any use of River Run for transit highly uncertain – 20 months before Council voted to expropriate.)*

17. **Jan 25, 2022, Global News** article re Green Line Board raises cost concerns. *(The Green Line Board identifies that the budget may be sufficient to build from Shepard to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave SW station, but is not sufficient to build north of that station. Such potential scope reduction would require new approvals from the provincial and the federal governments. With River Run being two blocks north of the start of such station, the revised scope being signalled by the Green Line Board does not appear to require the River Run land – again, 20 months before Council votes to expropriate.)*
18. **Nov 3, 2022, Herald** article re Premiere remains concerned about downtown tunnels. *(The Premiere states publicly that she supports the south line of the Green Line but remains concerned regarding the concept of tunneling through downtown, which confirms the City does not have provincial support for the potentially shortened train line from Shepard to a 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave SW station as suggested by the Green Line Board – which adds further uncertainty regarding any potential need for the River Run lands.)*
19. **Jan 8, 2023, River Run email** to City re ongoing pressure to sell while disregarding expropriation rights. *(The River Run Board of Directors again inform the City that the City caused uncertainty is causing harm, in particular the City's continued pressure to sell while refusing to respect expropriation laws, and when a transit need for River Run is uncertain.)*
20. **Jan 19, 2023, Harvard and City announce deal** for the station with no mention of River Run. *(Harvard and the City announce plans for an underground station to be constructed on Harvard's property with no indication regarding how River Run may be impacted. The River Run families have repeatedly asked the City how the City's agreement(s) with Harvard may impact River Run – with no clear answer to date.)*
21. **Jan 21, 2023, Green Line Board update** with cost concerns. *(In addition to cost overruns, the report indicates that downtown property acquisitions continue, but it is unclear whether that includes River Run because, in the Board update, the City depicts the train line stopping short of River Run and the City privately maintains that it does not intend to expropriate River Run.)*
22. **Jan 28, 2023, CBC story** re demise of Eau Claire market. *(In contrast to the above, the City continues to publicly depict a train running through River Run and through Prince's Island Park, despite the Green Line Board, independent experts and the province making it clear that the City does not have funding to build such planned train line – and this is nine months before Council votes to expropriate.)*
23. **Feb 15, 2023, CBC story** re City filed NOITEs on February 14 2023. *(City officials mislead the public by stating that it has been in negotiations with River Run families since 2020 and that the City wants to pay fair compensation when, in reality, the City: (i) continues to refuse to negotiate compensation based on expropriation principles; and (ii) refuses to make funds available for families to obtain independent advice.)*

24. **May 10, 2023, Rethink letter** to Council identifying the City cannot build Stage 1 within budget. *(The Rethink team inform Council that the proposed Green Line will be over budget by at least \$1.5 billion, before the actual costs are even known, again highlighting the uncertainty as to whether River Run might ever be used for public transit – several months before Council votes to expropriate.)*
25. **July 31, 2023, Western Standard article** noting River Run not needed for Green Line. *(A reporter highlights uncertainty and points out that a developer stands to profit significantly from the demolition of River Run, at such a prime location.)*
26. **August 2, 2023, CBC article** re the Inquiry Report released. *(CBC identifies that an independent expert has issued her report confirming that the City's process is unfair, high-handed and the City has been unwilling to communicate with River Run families in an honest, transparent manner, for years. A month after the Inquiry Report, Council votes to expropriate River Run despite having no idea whether River Run is needed for transit. To date, no one from the City has discussed the Inquiry Report with the families.)*
27. **Jan 2024, Green Line Board report** identifies insufficient funding. *(This Report, issued before the City has paid almost all River Run families any amounts for their homes, identifies that cost overruns will exceed 35%. This again confirms that new provincial and federal approvals will be needed for more money or a shorter alignment and, as such, no one knows whether River Run lands will be needed for public transit.)*
28. **Feb 1, 2024, CBC article** re City takes ownership of River Run. *(CBC identifies that the families have been devastated by the City's conduct, they are being forced to rent their own homes to stay at River Run and they will be kicked out of their homes by the end of May 2024, despite uncertainty as to whether River Run will ever be used for public transit.)*
29. **May 9, 2024, Herald article** re lack of budget for Green Line. *(The Province again confirms the City needs to stay within its budget and a Councillor is quoted as questioning why the project is proceeding without the City having 'any remote idea' of the actual costs.)*
30. **May 9, 2024, Livewire story** re Provincial concerns with downtown tunnels. *(The Premiere identifies concerns with the downtown tunnels, and cost overruns, and notes that the Province is willing to work to rescope the project, to remain within budget, confirming that whether River Run will ever be used for public transit remains uncertain.)*
31. **May 10, 2024, Herald article** identifying cost overruns. *(The public dispute between the Province and the City regarding funding for the Green Line continues, with the Province confirming that its contribution of \$1.53 billion will not increase.)*
32. **May 11, 2024, River Run letter** to City Council identifying the City does not need River Run for the Green Line. *(The River Run Board identify that the City does not need River Run for transit and, instead, is taking River Run to transform a wealthy developer's multi-tower project into a more valuable waterfront development.)*

33. **May 17, 2024, Herald article** re Nenshi blames province. (*With Phase 1 of the Green Line potentially costing \$10 billion (for the Shepard to 16<sup>th</sup> Ave North – the segment Nenshi assured citizens will be built for \$4.9 million – knowing Calgary taxpayers were 100% responsible for cost overruns), and the former Mayor suggests the provincial and federal governments should contribute more to cover the cost overruns.*)
34. **May 2024, Green Line Board** progress report identifying lack of funding. (*With insufficient funding to build the Green Line, the Green Line Board identifies that it will bring recommendations to Council for approval, which again highlights the ongoing River Run uncertainty. At this stage, many River Run families are still in their homes and: (i) the City knows the approved Green Line cannot be built; (ii) the City knows new federal and provincial approvals are required, but might not be granted; and (iii) Council has not even received (at least publicly) the Board's recommendations for a revised project scope.*)
35. **June 6, 2024, Green Line Board** presentation again highlighting cost overruns. (*The project dashboard as of April 30, 2024 again confirms the currently approved Green Line cannot be built with the available budget. Despite knowing this, the City forces River Run families from their homes by midnight May 31, 2024.*)
36. **July 4, 2024, Herald article** re Province identifying poor Green Line city planning and cost overruns. (*The Green Line was so poorly planned from the outset, with entirely unrealistic budgets, such that the City chose to proceed without having “any remote idea” what the cost would be. As such, at no point in time did anyone at the City have a reasonable, informed belief that River Run was needed for public transit.*)
37. **July 9, 2024, Herald story** where the Premiere identifies tunnels were not costed. (*The Premiere publicly identifies that City Council approved of proceeding with Green Line tunnels downtown Calgary without ever costing such tunnels. In the absence of a reasonable cost estimate, at no point did anyone at the City know whether River Run would even be needed for public transit.*)
38. **July 15, 2024, LiveWire** story re initial cost estimates were not well informed. (*A City Councillor acknowledges that the City's cost estimates for the Green Line were not serious, reliable estimates.*)
39. **July 29, 2024, letter** from the Province to Mayor. (*The Premiere again confirms that any proposed change in scope to the Green Line will need to be reviewed and approved by the Province for provincial funding to be available, as required under the Public Transit and Green Infrastructure Act.*)
40. **July 30, 2024, Green Line Press Release** for proposed new alignment - no mention that federal and provincial approval will be needed. (*The City Press Release is drafted as if funding approval from the province and the federal government has been confirmed, without identifying that the City's business case for the change in scope must be submitted for review and whether approvals will be granted is unknown.*)

41. **July 30, 2024, Herald article** re 10 to 5 Council approves of shorter Greenline even though tunnel costs unknown. *(The fact that provincial and federal approval for the revised scope – now estimated at \$6.2 billion for a potential 10km of track – is made clear. Experts again identify that cost overruns above this estimate should be expected and the City’s vote to proceed is very risky financially for Calgary taxpayers.)*
42. **July 30, 2024, Sonya Sharp critiques** potential tunnels as reckless. *(Councillor Sharp identifies her concerns regarding the potential for taxpayers to spend over \$6 billion for a short amount of track in a location where there are already many transit options.)*
43. **July 31, 2024, Herald article** re Kenny blames Nenshi. *(Former Premiere Jason Kenny puts 100% of the blame on the Green Line uncertainty on former Mayor Nenshi and the lack of proper planning by the City from the outset.)*
44. **July 2024, Eau Claire station** depicted south of River Run. *(In July 2024, the City website depicts a 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave SW station in Eau Claire, at the 30% design phase, as constructed south of Barclay Parade, which is the road immediately south of River Run. Based on the City depicting the station constructed south of Barclay Parade, it appears some within the City were of the view that River Run was not needed for the 2A segment – Elbow River to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave SW station.)*
45. **Aug 1, 2024, Herald article** re the Province does not approve of new proposed shorter alignment. *(City Council’s plan for the Green Line, under the former Mayor, was not based on engineering or proper cost estimates and, as such, was never a realistic plan. As such, there was never a genuine public need for the City to take River Run.)*
46. **Sept 11, 2024, CTV News article** re Premiere continues to disapprove of downtown tunnels. *(The Premiere identifies that the full Green Line as envisioned by the City, from the far north to the far south, could cost \$20 billion, which is not a viable project the province will invest in, but the province will continue to work with the City. At this time, the River Run homes were continuing to be damaged by the City through Fire Department drills and later Calgary Police drills where many windows and doors were smashed.)*
47. **Sept 17, 2024, CBC article** re City wind down of Green Line. *(The majority of Council vote to wind down the entire Green Line project instead of working with the province.)*
48. **Sept 18, 2024, Herald article** re History of Green Line. *(The history of the Green Line project is tracked and at no point was there a reasonable basis to believe there was ever a diligently planned and funded public transit need to take the River Run homes.)*
49. **Dec 16, 2024, Herald article** re Nenshi warns of developer suing city if the Greenline does not go to Eau Claire. *(Nenshi states: “...the most obvious question people should ask is, what happens to that very valuable piece of land at Eau Claire market? ...There’s hundreds of millions of dollars at stake on that development that cannot go forward unless the Green Line is built to Eau Claire. You think the city and the province aren’t going to get sued for at least nine figures? Of course, they are.”)*

50. **Dec 16, 2024, Herald article** where a Councillor admits City already committed to go to Eau Claire. (*A Councillor confirms that the City entered financial and contractual obligations based on the possibility the Green Line would make it to Eau Claire, even though there was never reasonable certainty the train would do so.*)
51. **Dec 20, 2024, Herald article** re River Run families appeal for fair compensation. (*The City falsely represents to the public that it has been willing to negotiate for years and that the amount paid to families was based on independent appraisals. In reality, the City's appraisals are not independent (and such appraisals do not contemplate that this is an expropriation), and the City still refuses to negotiate based on expropriation principles.*)
52. **Jan 16, 2025, City press release** confirms the demolition of River Run will fulfill contractual obligations. (*The City press release makes no reference to needing River Run for public transit as a reason for demolishing the River Run homes.*)
53. **Jan 23, 2025, CBC story** re demolition of River Run. (*The City again confirms that the demolition of River run homes will "fulfill contractual obligations".*)
54. **Jan 29, 2025, CBC story** re River Run fire. (*Under the City's management and control, the River Run homes were set on fire.*)
55. **Jan 29, 2025, CityNews story** re River Run fire. (*Although it is reported that the cause of the fire will be investigated, no thorough investigation occurs and, instead, the demolition restarted a day later.*)
56. **Feb 28, 2025, Eau Claire Community Association update** re waiting to hear from the City and Harvard what will be on the River Run land. (*The ECCA identifies that it is waiting to hear from Harvard and the City regarding the future of the River Run land, which is consistent with many believing that Harvard and the City have a plan for River Run that has yet to be disclosed.*)
57. **April 9, 2025, River Run letter** to Councillor Wong re City not paying its debt. (*The River Run families committee reminds their Councillor that the City was ordered on July 1, 2023 to reimburse their reasonable costs for the Inquiry but, to date, has not reimbursed any amount. The City did offer to reimburse less than half of such costs, but would only do so if the families gave up their right of appeal.*)
58. **May 12, 2025, River Run families committee** letter to the City regarding ongoing non-payment of City debt. (*With no response from their Councillor, the families identify the City's failure to pay its debt to River Run families, due since 2023, to all of Council.*)
59. **May 26, 2025, River Run families committee letter** to Council re City disregard for rule of law. (*The families committee updates Council that the City owes \$310,935 as a reimbursement for the Inquiry costs, however: "On May 14, 2025, the City issued a cheque for that sum – conditioned on \$167,273 remaining City-owned (either to be returned to the City or held in trust for the City's benefit), leaving us \$143,662. This is consistent with the City's approach, throughout this process, of creating an appearance of acting lawfully while having no actual regard for the law, fairness or our well being."*)

60. **June 11, 2025, City letter** re 371001 cost to process families access to information request. *(In response to an access to information request for communication between the City and Harvard, the City informed the families that they will need to pay the City \$371,001.47 in order for the City to process their access request.)*
61. **June 25, 2025, Families committee letter** to Council re City refusal to engage. *(The families committee identifies that the City continues to refuse to discuss fair compensation and provides documents from 2021, 2023 and 2025 where the families have tried to get someone from the City to meaningfully engage regarding this situation.)*
62. **June 30, 2025, CBC article** re Eau Claire Plaza is a postcard location. *(The City highlights Eau Claire Plaza, immediately west of River Run, as a “postcard” location downtown and waterfront, where \$47 million in taxpayer funds were just spend on improvements, in addition to the \$11.5 million for the new Jaipur bridge.)*
63. **June 16, 2025, Lindsay letter** to Council identifying City refusal to discuss fair compensation. *(The family identifies that the City remains unwilling to discuss fair compensation and that the amount the City chose to pay in February 2024 is \$199,000 less than the City’s own 2024 tax assessed value, which means the City did not pay enough for the family to buy their own home as a replacement for their own home, based on the City’s numbers.)*
64. **July 1, 2025, Evidence of undisclosed Harvard and City agreement** impacting River Run. *(In order to more narrowly focus a new access to information request, a summary of evidence was collected which indicates that the City and Harvard have entered into secret agreement(s) that are likely to significantly impact River Run.)*
65. **July 2, 2025, LiveWire story** re Eau Claire Plaza. *(The Mayor refers to Eau Claire Plaza, immediately adjacent west of River Run as a world class destination, emphasizing the unique, irreplaceable and valuable location of the River Run homes.)*
66. **July 9, 2025, Families committee letter** to Council re access request fee. *(The families identify that, in contrast to the City’s commitment to transparency, the City wants a very large fee to produce communications between Harvard and the City and the families request that the City be transparent and produce any agreements with Harvard that impact River Run.)*