

Standing Committee on Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act

Monday, August 16, 1982

Chairman: Dr. Reid

4:03 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to leave here for a short time about 4:25, and I'll ask some other member of the committee to chair in my absence. It won't be for long, I don't think.

Perhaps the minister could introduce the members of his staff and the people from Kananaskis Country, and if he has any initial remarks he wishes to make. Then we can go into questioning by the members of the committee.

MR. TRYNCHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members. I'd like to introduce the people with me. On my far right is Ed Marshall, managing director of Kananaskis. To my immediate right, Sherri Thorsen, planning director of Kananaskis Country. On the far left is Ken Wilson, a director of community recreation programs, responsible for urban parks. The next one is Bill Porter, acting ADM, design and implementation of parks, and John Wiens, acting director of budget co-ordination.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to dispense with any comments. If you look at the November 6 *Hansard* of last fall, where I took considerable time in outlining the programs of Kananaskis, I believe we might just get right into the questions. I'd be prepared to start there.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just looking at the transcript of the testimony before the trust fund last year, we had a figure given of \$200 million plus inflation. Mr. Trynchy, can either you or your officials bring us up to date on the best estimate of the final cost of Kananaskis Country, including the roads and all the various components of the project? I refer you to pages 142 and 143 of the transcript last year, Mr. Trynchy. At that time you indicated a figure of \$200 million in 1980 dollars, plus an inflation figure since then. No doubt you have an update of that. Perhaps for the public record, we should have that information now.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, the figure I presented last year would be the same one we'd use this year, plus inflation. It depends on the rate of inflation one wants to use. It would just be a guess whether you'd use 6 per cent, or 10 or 15 per cent. You'd have to add that on by yourself. We're adding on a 15 per cent inflation factor each year. That seems to be what Housing and Public Works has been using. In 1983-84 dollars, with inflation, it could range to about \$250 million.

MR. NOTLEY: That is the new estimate update?

MR. TRYNCHY: That is the new estimate.

MR. NOTLEY: That estimate, Mr. Trynchy, includes all components of the project? That would include the roads, the golf course, and all the other facilities which have been constructed or are in the process of completion at this time?

MR. TRYNCHY: It includes everything that I presented to you in the November 6 *Hansard*. There have been no additions. That's the total figure.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, a supplementary. Can you give us a final figure on the total cost of the golf course?

MR. TRYNCHY: I believe you'd find that also in last year's *Hansard*. As I made the report last year, \$2.2 million was expended to 1981, \$5.8 expended to March 31, 1981. The total estimated cost, in 1981 dollars, was \$6.8 million. That's on page 15, I believe, in last year's *Hansard*. I think the figures are there. That hasn't changed in our budgeting.

MR. NOTLEY: The golf course is completed now?

MR. TRYNCHY: Just about. It should be ready for opening next year. All our greens and fairways are seeded. Ed, is there anything else that isn't completed on the golf course itself? I believe we haven't got the sand hauled in yet.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, there are really two or three elements to the golf course operation. One is the family recreation centre. The other is the golf course itself and a complex of maintenance buildings which support the operation. Except for landscaping, the family recreation centre is pretty close to the 95 per cent stage. The light fixtures are being installed, and drywall is nearly completed. The landscaping around it is under way now, but it really can't be altogether completed until the heavier pieces of construction equipment associated with the main building get out of there.

As far as the golf course itself is concerned, it's a little hard to express it in a percentage term, but 18 holes are coming along very nicely. They're very close to being completed, except for sand, as Mr. Trynchy said. The next nine holes are in excellent shape, about the stage the 18 were a year ago, and the final nine are coming along. I think it's likely that all will be ready for play next year, although perhaps not all at the same time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Marshall, your estimate then, still with work to be done, is that that figure of \$6.8 million is sound, that we're not going to be going over that in any way?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, we wouldn't be going over that figure, unless of course you add the inflation factor to what work was done after. But it's still sound, yes. You'd have to tie on an inflation factor, because if it's not completed this year you'd have a certain amount of inflation for next year.

MR. NOTLEY: That's what I'm really getting at, Mr. Trynchy. So how much of it has in fact been done and how much is still subject to that perhaps 15 per cent inflation factor, so we have some idea of what the final total may be for the taxpayers of Alberta?

MR. TRYNCHY: I believe the golf course itself is just over 80 per cent complete. So you might take the total cost, and 20 per cent of that would still be subject to an inflation factor.

MR. NOTLEY: So that would mean somewhat over \$6.8 million by the time we look at that inflation factor and the final dollars when eventually Public Accounts renders a final figure?

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes. If you look at our report, we had somewhat over \$1 million to be expended. Once that's expended, that'll be the total cost. But if we only spend \$500,000 this year and \$500,000 next year, you'd have to tie the inflation factor to the \$500,000. So it would be roughly \$6.8 or \$7 million for the total cost.

MR. NOTLEY: I have just one further supplementary question on the golf course, Mr. Chairman. As I recollect our tour last year, one of the impressive features was a fishing spot for the handicapped, as I recall. Either Mr. Trynchy or Mr. Marshall might be able to answer. I'm advised that that happened sort of accidentally, that fill was to be taken for the golf course. Could you perhaps advise the committee, Mr. Marshall, whether that was part of the original project or whether it was the result of the investment in the golf course?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, we developed Wedge Lake by taking the topsoil out for the use of the golf course. After taking the topsoil out, we developed a fishing pond. It had developed in such a way that we had some pretty steep banks to it. So in turn, we took the funds that were allotted for a fishing pond there and developed Lorette Ponds, the ones we paved. I believe you visited those. Those are being used by handicapped people today. They're stocked, I believe the fourth time -- a great success.

We've also now stocked Wedge Lake. That was where we took the topsoil out. It's holding water, and we're fishing there. But that was part of the project.

MR. NOTLEY: That was part of the original plan, the advisory committee had recommended that from the very beginning?

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes, that was from the very beginning. In addition to that we have the Lorette Ponds, which are paved and more accessible to wheel chairs.

MR. NOTLEY: I have other questions, but I'll let other members . . .

MR. SINDLINGER: In regard to the golf course, Mr. Chairman, the minister referred us to *Hansard* of last November, when various cost estimates were given. Along with the cost estimates, estimated completion dates were given as well. Some of them are in regard to the golf course: completion by spring of '82 and practice greens playable by August of '82. I take it now that we're not going to meet those dates. The question I would pose to the minister is: why are we not going to meet those completion dates?

MR. TRYNCHY: Well, we're actually meeting those dates in respect of the development of the golf course. It's just that we don't feel that the 36 holes are in shape to play. The grass has not grown as fast and as thick as we wanted. So instead of going out there and golfing on something that's half ready, we thought it best to wait until 1983 and have a course that can be played.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Trynchy, how much of the damage on the golf course was due to flooding this spring or this winter?

MR. TRYNCHY: I don't believe there's any. Ed, could you comment on that?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, this was quite a severe winter as far as ice on the Kananaskis River was concerned. This situation is going to occur any time you have a peak load situation, where power requirements are very high and the

demands upon the Upper and Lower Kananaskis Lake water production is at its highest level. It's very unlikely that we will have a year where the power draw is any greater than it was this year, which means you have day after day after day of very, very cold weather, and you have an ice build-up.

There were a few holes on which ice actually moved onto one or two of the fairways. To find them, I think you'd have to be told which fairways they were. I can find them, because I know them. But to say there's any discernible damage to the fairways would be overstating it. Unless you really knew it, you couldn't even find them. So we're very pleased to report that the problem was ever so much less than at one time we thought it could be. We did some work in connection with it. We had equipment available, backhoes and loaders and so on, to move ice away, but I think we were probably overprepared for the situation.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Marshall, inasmuch as your opening comments indicated that this was something that could occur at any time given peak demand on the hydro power facilities upstream, could you give us an assurance that this will not recur? Are we to be assured that it will not recur? Secondly, I ask if you would please address the magnitude of the damage. You have indicated that it's difficult to discern at this particular time. But I would like to know what remedial attempts were made to cover up the damage and to repair not only the fairways but the greens as well.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, nothing had to be done. There was no reseeding or anything of the kind. We just didn't have to do it. I'm trying to say that the level of damage was of no consequence.

MR. SINDLINGER: Was there no replacement of topsoil at all on the golf course?

MR. MARSHALL: There has never been any replacement of topsoil during the current year that had anything to do with ice, if that's the question, sir.

MR. SINDLINGER: What did the replacement of the topsoil have to do with then? I've inferred from your response, when you said that no topsoil was replaced associated with flooding due to ice conditions, that there was in fact some replacement of topsoil.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, I don't know that I actually said any topsoil was replaced. There's always some patching and this kind of thing to be done on a golf course. If you have a green, a tee, or something like that, where the growth isn't as good as you would want it to be, the natural thing to do at this stage is to strip it off and redo it. We've done that in a couple of cases, which weren't even close to the river. I thought that's what was meant by your question.

MR. SINDLINGER: Just to summarize: there has been no damage that has required remedial efforts due to flooding from ice conditions and the peak power demands.

MR. MARSHALL: I'll try to answer it just as I answered it before, sir. There just wasn't anything that you saw that had to be done once spring came. I could show you bits and pieces of fairway where the grass on that part of the fairway is less than it might be on other parts of the fairway, but you'd almost have to be taken to the particular places to see what I'm talking about.

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, is this a current pamphlet or an older pamphlet? It doesn't have the golf course pictured on it, and I wonder whether there is some reason for that. It isn't dated.

MR. MARSHALL: I can't read it from here. I don't know what you're holding.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I'll send it over.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is a little brochure on Kananaskis Provincial Park. The golf course is in Kananaskis Country but not in Kananaskis Provincial Park. We call that a handout, if you like. They're given at the park visitors' centre after you've got in there. By that time you'd be quite a few miles past it.

MR. TRYNCHY: You notice that this in green is the provincial park in Kananaskis Country. The golf course is in the Country, out of the park.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Marshall or the minister. Could you tell the committee something about the contract with Mr. Robert Trent Jones? Is his work completed, or does he continue indefinitely on an advisory or consulting basis?

MR. MARSHALL: Our contract with Robert Trent Jones's organization at the present time consists of his keeping one man on the job. Of course he has his back-up team, but there's one resident person on the golf course. He has a contract which expires next October or November -- I forget the exact month. It's one person.

MR. LITTLE: The purpose of the question, Mr. Marshall or the minister, is that the true test of the course is after it's been played upon, and there might be requirements for some changes to the planning or the general layout. Would Mr. Trent Jones or his man be prepared to give you that consulting advice after the course is completed?

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Our contract with Mr. Jones was that he would develop a golf course and, when his contract expired, it would be a golf course that's playable. His people would stay there until the completed golf course was turned over to us, which would be sometime in 1983.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I gather we're still on Kananaskis. I have just two supplementary questions. What review has been made of the impact on Kananaskis Country and whether any additional expansion will be required with respect to the Olympics development? Along with that is the question of the mountain to be chosen. Where is that sitting at the moment and what impact, if any, will that have on Kananaskis Country?

MR. TRYNCHY: With the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, we're asking for proposals for recreational ski sites within the Eastern Slopes, be they in Kananaskis Country or otherwise. We have a short list of some six groups of people who will be putting a proposal to us. The proposal request went out August 10. We hope to get it back 60 days later. Hopefully by January 1983, we'll have picked the site or sites for a recreation scheme. At this time, we have no knowledge whether it's one area or another. So until those proposals are back to us, it would be pretty hard for us to prejudge the location of the recreational ski sites.

MR. NOTLEY: Who is "us" in this case? Is it an interdepartmental committee consisting of you and your colleagues, or is it the department or Mr. Marshall? Perhaps you could give us a little information as to who, in fact, is going to be doing the deciding on these various submissions. I gather we're looking at several mountain possibilities at this stage, are we not? Also perhaps some additional investment, I would take it, if not directly to Kananaskis Country, at least certainly in the area of public funds. So perhaps you could tell us who "us" is in this case, Mr. Trynchy.

MR. TRYNCHY: Of course, we'd like to see the bids we're asking for funded by the private sector. That's why the bids are being requested. The Department of Tourism and Small Business, the Department of Recreation and Parks, the Calgary Olympic Development Association, and a number of consultants and experts will be there when the final decisions are made. We'd like to make sure we have the proper site for recreational skiing.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Trynchy, as a supplementary, has any structure been given to whatever committee evaluates these proposals? You mentioned certain people. I would think that certain people would be there simply in an advisory capacity. You're not going to have consultants making these decisions. They have to make recommendations to someone. So members of the committee are clear, what is the formal structure?. In fact, who will be deciding for the government of Alberta where we move? Obviously I see that the Olympic association has to be involved, because we have international commitments to meet. We wouldn't want to jeopardize the Winter Olympics, so we have to work very closely with international people. But who, in fact, will be involved in the formal mechanism that will make the decision?

MR. TRYNCHY: The bids will flow back to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. He will then present that to the cabinet committee on Kananaskis, along with the reports we get from consultants and other knowledgeable people who know about the ski areas; a decision should be made. I think that's the way it works. Ed, am I . . .

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, sir.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Marshall, what role, if any, would you have? Would you be part of the evaluation process?

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes, Mr. Marshall would be involved as part of that because of the managing director titleship he holds to Kananaskis Country.

MR. NOTLEY: I take it that it will be a cabinet committee, presumably you, Mr. Trynchy, and Mr. Miller and Mr. Adair. Are there any other members of the committee?

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes. The Kananaskis cabinet committee consists of some seven or eight ministers. Those would be the ones who would make a recommendation, which would then flow to cabinet or caucus.

MR. NOTLEY: So the formal process would be this cabinet committee. Prior to that time, you'll be meeting with the Olympic people, with Mr. Marshall and the consultants, to evaluate the proposals.

MR. TRYNCHY: That's right. We're just as anxious as the members here and all Albertans are that we have the proper site and don't jeopardize the Olympics. That's correct.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have one additional supplementary question in a different area of Kananaskis. If there are further supplementary questions on the process re the Olympics, perhaps I'd defer to members who have questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have five people. If the Member for Spirit River-Fairview is going to go to some other subject, perhaps we can put him at the end of that list. The Member for Little Bow followed by the Member for Calgary Currie.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Trynchy. Is there a cabinet Olympic committee, and is that committee the same committee as the Kananaskis committee at present?

Mr. Zaozirny in the Chair

MR. TRYNCHY: No. We will have a cabinet committee to work with the Calgary Olympic Development Association, the city of Calgary, and possibly the federal government. We'll be entering into a four-party agreement, so it will be a somewhat different structure. But it will have members from the Kananaskis cabinet committee and, of course, people such as Ed Marshall and others who can help us make the right decisions.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, on television within the last 10 days, I noted that a private group, not a Canadian group, made a proposal of development in the Kananaskis Country area, I believe, just up from Canmore. Is the minister involved in that kind of development, or would it be this four-party committee that would eventually look at those kinds of proposals? Does the Alberta government have control of any private-sector development, such as that massive proposal being made by this person on television?

MR. TRYNCHY: I've heard about it too. A week ago Spray Lakes corporation, with a firm from Paris, France, put a package together. They're on the short list. Those six people I talked about would have our proposal sheet. They will come back to us with a proposal. If they feel they can put a proposal like that forward, it would come to this committee. We would assess it and see if it's what the people of Alberta would like to see happen. We're not telling them what to put in their proposal. We're asking for proposals. All the firms will have an equal chance of developing what we'd like to see happen, a good recreational ski site or sites in Kananaskis Country.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Marshall would like to add some comments.

MR. MARSHALL: I must have a certain look about me, Mr. Speaker. I was just sitting here enjoying your questioning, sir.

MR. R. SPEAKER: To understand what the minister said, Mr. Chairman, any proposal such as that one would compete with other proposals. It wouldn't be given any special preference or consideration. They must be refined through your committee. Is that correct?

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes. We're hoping to have six or seven proposals, whatever the case may be. After we assess each and every proposal, we would hope to pick the one that would do the most good for Albertans.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, the other question related to that. The minister has indicated we're looking at something like \$250 million as a final cost for this Kananaskis project. Would those six or more proposals lead to other costs? Does the minister foresee any other kinds of expenditures being

requested from the heritage fund because of those proposals, or have we reached the final cost on this project?

MR. TRYNCHY: That would be something separate, tied to the Olympics, I suppose. But from the reports I get from the media -- I haven't met with these people -- they suggest they would do it all with their own funding. The private sector would get involved. The roads there now would serve as part of it. They would develop their own roads, power system, and all these kinds of things. Until we see the proposal, it wouldn't be fair for us to comment on whether we would be involved. I'd like to see what their requests would be and go from there. You never know what you get from these proposals. They might want government assistance and they might not.

MR. R. SPEAKER: The government is open to other expenditures, though, or considering that there may be other expenditures. Would they come out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund?

MR. TRYNCHY: Personally, not as a minister, I'm open to any proposal and any good suggestion. I think you're talking Olympics now, and I don't know if we would fund the Olympics from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I think there would be other ways we'd like to fund the Olympics, so I don't see us moving that way. Of course, we'd have to see the proposal before I'd want to commit myself or the government to that type of action.

MR. R. SPEAKER: In this committee, we can rest assured that any moneys from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund for the Kananaskis Country project will not be diverted or manipulated to funding some Olympic whatever?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, there is just no way that I would agree to manipulating. I don't know if you want to use that word, but I'll use it because you did. No, Kananaskis funds will not flow unless we come back to the House, as we do every fall, and request funds from the heritage fund for something other than Kananaskis. No, I can't see us taking funds allotted or designated to Kananaskis Country for the Olympics.

MR. ACTING CHAIRMAN: Does the Member for Calgary Buffalo have a supplementary?

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's in regard to the decision-making process. I wonder if the minister might generally outline the number of committees involved in Kananaskis Country and Park and how they relate to the ultimate decision-making, and perhaps as an undertaking agree to provide the committee with an organizational chart which shows the relationship of all these committees.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, there's one cabinet committee responsible for Kananaskis. That's the Kananaskis cabinet committee, which I chair, with seven or eight cabinet ministers on it. Before we reach that stage, we have the citizens' advisory committee, which is chaired by Brian Targett. The citizen has input through that committee. Their recommendations come to our committee. We assess the recommendations and the concerns. After we reach a decision, we take it to cabinet and caucus for final approval. So there's just one committee that handles Kananaskis.

MR. SINDLINGER: Are there subcommittees in any degree or aspect of the project?

MR. TRYNCHY: No, there's no subcommittee of Kananaskis. There's just the one committee.

MR. SINDLINGER: Are there local committees or committees of the department?

MR. TRYNCHY: There's an interdepartmental committee, that reports back to us, where forestry, wildlife, energy, housing, and those meet and go through the recommendations in regard to capital costs. Yes, we have that. We also have a deputy ministers' committee, which acts on a number of issues that we send to them. They make recommendations to the cabinet committee.

MR. SINDLINGER: Do you have any special committees that deal with auditing or cost control, to ensure that costs are spent where they were in fact allocated or budgeted?

MR. TRYNCHY: We have our audit people on the committee, through the Department of Recreation and Parks, so everything that goes through -- the budget is thoroughly analyzed and assessed for every year's budget.

MR. SINDLINGER: Do they do it on a manual or a computerized basis?

MR. TRYNCHY: It's manual.

MR. SINDLINGER: I wonder why it would be manual, given the magnitude of the project. Secondly, why can we not have more current cost information given to us? You began by saying the information you provided in November 1981 was the most recent, I believe. Inasmuch as it's almost one year since then, why could we not have more current, up-to-date cost information?

I ask that question because, going through the different projects here for Kananaskis Country, there have been considerable cost increases from its initiation, and not all have been due to inflation. There have been changes in scope, additions to projects, and expansion to others. When I did some inflation accounting on the projects and tried to come up with a current figure, it's very close to \$300 million, if we take an arbitrary number, as you said earlier could be done -- perhaps arbitrary, nevertheless reasonable. Now in light of the fact that you have advised us that you are using a manual system and that you cannot give us more current information than that which was provided almost a year ago, I wonder what current cost controls you have on the project.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, the figures we are giving you are the ones for a year-end, and that's what we deal with in this committee. Certainly we have an update on a monthly basis. That isn't what I was asked to come here with. We have a cost projection on a quarterly basis, that we have before us. But when we were asked to come forward, we were asked to come with a year-end figure. That is the figure we have.

This fall, when I present to the Legislature our accounting for next year's budget, I will go through the process again, as I did last year, and outline where we're at on projects completed, percentage, dollars spent, and those kinds of things. If you go back to *Hansard*, we've outlined quite clearly what the original project was and what we've added, the additions and expansions. They're in there. So if the member can be specific, Mr. Chairman, I can probably provide that information.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I don't recall -- perhaps I'm mistaken -- the minister's response to Mr. Notley's question in regard to total projected cost. Did you in fact give a number of total projected cost?

MR. TRYNCHY: Oh yes, it's in both documents.

MR. SINDLINGER: Is that the November '81 estimate that you're giving us?

MR. TRYNCHY: That's right. On November 6, 1981, I gave the projected cost. I started out from the beginning and went right through the whole thing. I gave you the additions, the expansions, and the total cost. We also have that in the other document, the minutes, I believe.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Trynchy, if those are the November '81 estimates, \$245 million, and you have before you a cost projection on a quarterly basis, could you not give us something more current?

MR. TRYNCHY: I didn't get the question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SINDLINGER: In response to one of my other questions, you indicated that you had quarterly cost projections. Surely several quarters have gone by since you last gave us the November '81 estimate, so I wonder why we could not be given the more current estimates.

MR. TRYNCHY: I don't have them with me.

MR. SINDLINGER: Would you undertake to provide them to the committee?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I have some difficulty with that request. I suppose if that's the wish of the committee and the Chair, and if it's proper, I have no difficulty providing it. My understanding is that we present our full year's report, and that's the one we work on. Come this fall or whenever we meet again for the next budget review, I present the report again. I wasn't aware that your committee would be asking for an update on a three-month basis, quarterly, or six-month basis. So I didn't bring that with me.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I'll explain the reason for the question. We don't need it before us immediately, of course. If the minister would provide it, that would certainly be acceptable. The reason for the question is this: this project was initially estimated in the \$40 million range. It motivated the Auditor General to make a recommendation to the Legislative Assembly in regard to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, that when a minister came before the committee asking for funds from the heritage fund for any particular project, a total cost estimate to completion should be given, the reason being that once the Legislature appropriates some funds for a particular project that would be of an ongoing nature, it wouldn't be reasonable the second year to come back and approve or disapprove funds for the continuation or completion of that project.

Now that recommendation by the Auditor General was quite explicit. This was the showcase example of what happens when the Legislative Assembly approves so much money -- in this case, \$40 million -- and finds out that it's not a commitment to \$40 million but a commitment to almost \$300 million to date. What I'm trying to determine is: is the \$300 million to date anywhere near the end of the road, or do we have even further yet to go?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I don't know where the \$300 million figure is coming from. If the hon. member would look at page 1510 of the November 6 *Hansard*, I started out in some detail with the concept of some \$40,520,000, in 1977 dollars, and I went from there with expansion. I also stated that the total package consisted of some \$213,610,000, in 1981 dollars. So if the hon.

member would take some time and read what I have in *Hansard*, the breakdown, the expansion, the addition, the whole thing is there.

If the hon. member wants something else and the Chair directs me to get it, I will. But I don't really know what the hon. member is looking for, because it's there in *Hansard*, and it's as precise as I could get it.

MR. ACTING CHAIRMAN: To the minister and to the committee. It's my understanding that the terms of reference of the committee are such that we are able to expect that ministers attending before the committee will provide detailed information for the preceding fiscal period. It's also my understanding that the minister has attempted to give a projected overall cost figure of the project that is accurate to the present time. That is my understanding of the information he has provided the committee. If I am mistaken, I'd appreciate some clarification from the minister.

That being the case, as Acting Chairman I believe the one thing that would be beyond our terms of reference and perhaps reasonableness under those circumstances would be to expect the minister to come up with detailed information that goes beyond the end of the most recent fiscal period.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Even if we took your ruling literally, the year we're dealing with ended March 31 this year. If we have an estimate of \$250 million for November 1981, we appreciate that. But Mr. Sindlinger has asked for the quarterly estimate since that. If there is a more recent quarterly estimate, and I'm sure there is before March 31, certainly that request would clearly be within the purview of the committee by our own terms of reference.

I would also refer members to Recommendation 16 that we as a committee made almost unanimously last year -- as I recall, I think it was unanimous -- that we ask ministers not only for current investments, but projections as to what these investments will cost. Mr. Sindlinger has not asked that the information be made available today, but simply supply the committee with the most recent information. If it is not unreasonable from the minister's point of view, I think we should request it.

MR. ACTING CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the minister can clarify, but it is this Chairman's understanding that the minister has supplied us with the most current information on the projected final costs of the project. Could the minister perhaps clarify that?

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Certainly I'll present the total figures again, as I did last year. As soon as the House is sitting, I will stand in my place and go through it again. To update, in addition to what I presented last year, the budget approved for that year was \$68,321,000, which we all voted on. We expended \$46,522,000. We underspent \$13,799,000, with a total expenditure in Kananaskis Country to March 31, 1982, of \$113,373,000. I think that's what the member's asking for.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, perhaps Mr. Trynchy misunderstood my point. I understand Mr. Sindlinger's request was for the most recent projection. The minister indicated that will be forthcoming this fall when the capital estimates come in; that's certainly appropriate. But it's also appropriate to give that information to this committee. For the minister's information, I would just cite our recommendation of last year in which we requested not only the amount spent to date but the projections of what these costs are going to be.

MR. TRYNCHY: I think I can give that to the hon. member now. Last year, in 1981 dollars, the total cost of the project was \$213,610,000. In 1982-83 dollars, our projected costs of Kananaskis Country are \$250,310,000. I thought I gave you that to start with.

MR. NOTLEY: Fair enough.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, both my questions are with respect to Kananaskis Country. The first one deals with the topic, raised earlier, of the Olympics and Kananaskis Country. Is it still the philosophy of the government that any facilities built for the Olympics should have a long-term use attached to them for the people of Alberta? If so, is that dimension of future Olympics planning being taken into account in Kananaskis cost projections? Will making our facilities useful for the future so they meld with the Olympic facilities increase the cost to any extent?

MR. TRYNCHY: Certainly anything developed for the Olympics has to have long-lasting benefits to Albertans, and we'll work toward that goal. At present I can't give you a commitment that it will increase the price of Kananaskis, because we don't know what development will take place. There's been no request for any development within Kananaskis Country that we've accepted or approved.

Let's assume that we have a request for a downhill ski site, an alpine site, or what have you. Then we'd have to come forward. If the private sector develops these recreational ski sites on its own initiative, there might be no additional costs within Kananaskis Country. So it's premature to say we will or won't put in more dollars, because we haven't had a proposal requesting such dollars.

MR. D. ANDERSON: For clarification, however, it is quite possible that next year in this committee, if decisions are made regarding the Olympics in Kananaskis Country, we'll see some modification of the figures, be it downward, upward or just a change in categories of expenditure.

MR. TRYNCHY: Probably the best way to answer that would be: if we were to request funds for the Olympics from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, you would see a change in figures. But if the Olympics were to be funded from general revenue or other means -- hopefully with lotteries, coins, stamps, and the federal government -- of course that would change that. Until we know what site is requested, the cost of it, and whether it will in fact be Heritage Savings Trust Fund funding or otherwise, I couldn't answer that.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Is it not possible that although the Olympic projects themselves will be funded from other sources of revenue, modifications will be necessary to the Kananaskis facilities to make use of that in the long term for the people of Alberta, and therefore you may in fact be changing some directions in Kananaskis Country as a result of the Olympic proposals, which may well be funded elsewhere?

MR. TRYNCHY: Certainly we'll try to accommodate the Olympics, Kananaskis, and the people of Alberta the best way we can. Certainly you could expect some modification upward or downward when we have some firm proposals before us, but that is a good possibility.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, just one further question with respect to Kananaskis Country. The William Watson Lodge, utilized for handicapped individuals, has now been in operation for a while. Do we have any figures

with respect to that utilization? How often is it used, and does there seem to be a need for further facilities of that sort in Kananaskis?

MR. TRYNCHY: I'd like to comment that it's used. I guess it's just about booked up every week. It has tremendous use. From the reports and letters I've received, it's just a tremendous asset to Albertans. I've had some handicapped people there for a week at a time. I think it's the greatest thing that's happened within that area for handicapped and underprivileged children.

Ed, would you like to comment?

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, sir. Mr. Chairman, I think it's fair to say that we really intend to build William Watson Lodge in two phases, depending upon the availability of funding and as our experience develops. In the beginning, it called for eight double cottages and a main lodge. In fact, we built the main lodge and four double cottages. If every bed were filled, the total capacity of the cottages is 40. That has happened, but sometimes it doesn't happen. You can have a full house, so to speak, without having every bed filled, because some of the cottages have two bedrooms a side and others have three. But the use of it has been enough to bring joy to your heart. Unfortunately, it tends to follow almost a seasonal pattern, like a resort. In the wintertime, it's jammed full on weekends and over holidays. In the summertime, it's jammed full all the time. It's very, very successful. It's been able to accommodate a great range of people, whether they're blind, have cystic fibrosis, or a mobility problem, in wheel chairs and so on. I don't think it can accommodate everybody, and it certainly can't accommodate all kinds of handicapped or disabled people at once. These are learning things we're going through. But it's working out very well. I would say that it's one of the very, very successful things that has been opened up in Kananaskis Country so far. The response from users has been just delightful.

MR. D. ANDERSON: If indeed the utilization has been great and in fact there were two phases, did Mr. Marshall indicate that therefore the second phase is in the cost projections and will be built?

MR. TRYNCHY: No, Mr. Chairman. The first four were in the construction phase, and we want to assess the usability and the acceptance by the public. If we want to go beyond the four, we would be back for additional funds requested from this committee and from the Legislature.

I might also add that we have had some 300,000-plus visits to Kananaskis this year, so it's well accepted. But we would come back for additional funds if we were to expand the William Watson Lodge.

MR. D. ANDERSON: When will the minister be making a decision to come back to the Legislature, or not to, for those funds for what Mr. Marshall has called phase two of William Watson Lodge?

MR. TRYNCHY: We opened that on September 22 last year. We hope to have, say, a year's assessment. Possibly at the end of this year, after we've had a full year of operation, we'd be better able to see what the need is and if we have turned away more people than we should have. So I would imagine that in a year's time, we would have to make a decision whether we proceed further.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Thank you.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Chairman, in our tour last year I also was extremely impressed with the William Watson facility. My question relates to the place of

residence of the users. Have you kept track of where the users originate? Is it primarily southern Alberta, or are they coming from across the province to utilize the facilities?

MR. TRYNCHY: I don't have those figures. I know that two families from my constituency visited the William Watson Lodge and, when they got back, phoned me and told us what a tremendous place it was. Mr. Marshall, do you have figures on where they come from?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, we are advertising it province-wide and are getting people from just about all over the province. If you didn't do that, there would be a tendency to get a concentration of users from the Calgary area. All we can do is keep telling the story as broadly and widely as we possibly can and fit visitors in, wherever they come from. We've tried to do that. Of course they register. I won't say we've had somebody there from every post office in Alberta, but it broadens all the time. It's very, very good use.

MRS. FYFE: Just to be specific, do you actually keep a record of where the families originate?

MR. MARSHALL: Oh yes. They must register, just like a hotel. We could give you the name of every place somebody came from, if you really want it.

MR. TRYNCHY: As a matter of fact, when I do my report this fall I'll make sure we give you the names of the towns, villages, cities, and hamlets across the province that these people come from.

MRS. FYFE: Thank you. I would not ask for specific locations, but I would be interested in just a general way -- families that originate, for example, north of Red Deer opposed to those who may originate from southern Alberta. In planning other locations, I think it would be helpful to know whether distance plays an extremely major factor in the utilization of such facilities. I think there's no doubt they're first class; they're top rate. If any further planning or development takes place, I think that type of development should receive priority in our expenditures.

MR. TRYNCHY: You will have that information.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Chairman, my question is with respect to the utilization rate. I was interested to hear that the fishing lake with handicap access was stocked four times, I think. I wonder whether the minister or his delegation could give us an indication of the utilization rate of the William Watson Lodge and overall use rates within Kananaskis Country, being as it is open to the public. I assume some information is developing about overall utilization.

MR. TRYNCHY: We'll provide that specific information in our November presentation to you. As I mentioned, we had some 300,000 visitors to Kananaskis, and I don't have a breakdown of how many were at William Watson Lodge. The hon. Member for St. Albert asked that question and we'll try to give it to you, unless somebody else here has it.

MR. MARSHALL: It keeps changing, Mr. Minister. It would be inappropriate for me to do that.

MR. PAHL: Thank you. I would appreciate some overall indication of the utilization rates, the patterns of utilization, and whether they're governed by the fact that certain facilities aren't open or simply that you may be finding that people are using something more than you thought and something else less. That's the sort of information I'd appreciate.

MR. NOTLEY: I'd also like to second some of the comments that have been made about William Watson Lodge. From as far away as the Peace River country and the northwest corner, a little place called Bear Canyon, I have nothing but rave reviews about William Watson Lodge.

I'd like to put this to the minister, but perhaps it should go to Mr. Marshall, as the managing director of Kananaskis Country. Undoubtedly much of the funds would be tendered out. I'm talking about the whole project: roads, golf course, Alpine Village, William Watson Lodge -- the whole shebang. But some of this undoubtedly would be done by the department itself, and some would involve agreements with the various private-sector rental companies. Are you or Mr. Trynchy in a position to give us a breakdown between the amount tendered out as a result of competitive bids and the amount done directly by the government, and whether or not there were rental companies? Could we also have a list of those rental companies -- not supplied today, obviously, but during the course of our discussions this fall?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, as much as possible we try to tender all our work. You must remember that a lot of the work in regard to capital construction of buildings is done by Housing and Public Works. Development of trails and all those kinds of things that we're responsible for we tender out. On page 1511, of November 6, we tendered a contract for clearing and grubbing at Boulton Creek. We had an estimate of what it should cost. The tender came in at \$118,000. We felt that that was too high because our estimate was that it should cost about \$45,000. So we did it in-house with our own crews, and the total cost was \$45,400. We do that when we feel that tenders are too high. But basically I would suggest that 90 per cent or better is tendered to the private sector so that people are involved. We don't like to do these kinds of things ourselves if we can help it.

MR. NOTLEY: Fair enough, Mr. Trynchy. I appreciate that, and I think that's the appropriate course to take. I'm just saying that there are going to be examples, such as you cited, and undoubtedly that would mean that you're not going to have in-house staff who will be able to do it all the time. Sometimes you're going to have to make arrangements for rental of equipment, et cetera. Eventually this comes out in Public Accounts, because every dime that goes to any private-sector company comes in Public Accounts. But perhaps it would be useful to the committee if we had a list of the rental companies. I'm sure that Mr. Marshall as managing director would be able to obtain that. If that information could be obtained, it would be useful.

MR. TRYNCHY: I don't see any reason you can't have it. We'll make note of it and when we make our presentation, we'll list some of the contractors and people we rent from. It is public knowledge, and it's there. So we'll make note of it, and we'll provide that.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, is there such a thing as a supplementary answer?

MR. ACTING CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

MR. MARSHALL: There are times when we have people who may not be as busy as we would expect them to be, and that's a happy situation, particularly the likes

of instant attack firefighting crews. Those people are engaged to fight fires. A summer like last year, they didn't have very much to do with respect to fighting fires, because it was just a coincidence that we had a very rainy month. It was particularly wet during the weekends, and concentrations of people are when you'd expect them. So the hazard was always low. You keep these people busy doing what we tend to call soft construction with respect to trail making and this kind of thing. In one case last year, we had them busy building a new forest fire lookout.

But for the most part it's appropriate -- and it's nearly always appropriate, except for the circumstances I talked about or Mr. Trynchy spoke about, or where you have a crew involved in campground layouts or something like that -- to engage private sector, whether by contract, rental, or whatever. That's just the way the project has gone from the beginning.

So we do have some people who can do in-house preliminary engineering, design, and this kind of thing. We utilize them to the extent we can, but much of the work goes outside.

MR. SINDLINGER: Two supplementaries, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make sure I understand the response in regard to cost projections. If, as the minister said, cost projections are done on a quarterly basis, then I expect that the last one completed would be the end of June. I'm not too sure if that's the number the minister has given us, the \$250 million cost projection.

I have gone through the transcripts and have done a great deal of work on that. I've listed all the projects. I've listed all the different estimates that we've been given for each project at different times, and taken the different estimated completion dates. Using an inflation factor of 12 per cent, which is conservative -- I seem to recall the minister using the number 15 per cent for the golf course -- I get a projected cost to completion, as of today, of just a little under \$300 million. Now there's too wide a discrepancy between the \$300 million that I come up with and the \$250 million that the minister has given us. I feel it's worth exploring to make sure that I haven't misunderstood the response.

The second part of the question is in regard to the accounting system. The response to the question I posed earlier was that it was being done manually. I ask why it's being done manually and why a more sophisticated computerized system is not being used.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, if I left the wrong impression in regard to quarterly reports, I should correct it. We do have a quarterly update report within Parks, but you have to appreciate that there are Alberta Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife, Transportation, Travel Alberta, and other departments that don't provide those until the year-end. That's why we have an annual. So the only report I could provide on a quarterly basis is our own department.

In regard to the inflation factor, unless the hon. member is using the inflation factor on dollars already spent -- it might be to get the \$300 million, because we don't get it that way with the figures we have before us, the amount of work that's to be completed, and the dollars we have left to complete it. So if there are some specifics, it might be an appropriate time for the hon. member and I to get together so we could understand each other and what he's asking for.

MR. SINDLINGER: I would like to take advantage of that opportunity, Mr. Chairman. I will submit to the minister the calculations that I have done, and perhaps we can come to some reconciliation. I also have some other incidental questions which I wish to submit through the Chair to the minister at the conclusion of this meeting.

The second question I asked has not yet been addressed by the minister. That is in regard to why a manual system is being used rather than a more sophisticated computerized system. After all, it's a very large project, even accepting the minister's numbers of \$250 million. I have some concern when I'm told that the costs for this project aren't segregated from other departments and other elements of those departments, so that we cannot be given a definitive response to these types of questions.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I'll have John Wiens answer that, supplemented by Ed Marshall in budgeting.

MR. WIENS: We have a departmental EDP plan which includes a proposal to prepare system for capital budgeting. It is included among a number of other proposals we have which are prioritized in our department. This program has not yet been activated, but it is on our plan. I can't tell you when we will be doing it, but we have a plan to put this on computers.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, given the elapse in time since 1977, I guess, when the project was initiated, and it's now 1982 -- four or five years -- why is the department taking so long to getting around to implementing the more sophisticated plan, to ensure we don't have recurrent problems like that which we encountered at the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, before I let Mr. Marshall supplement this, we've run a pretty tight ship on this development. There is no overspending or dollars mislaid or lost. If the hon. member has a specific he'd like to point us to, I'd appreciate knowing about it. I think we've done a really good job with our finance co-ordinator. Who is that now, Ed?

MR. MARSHALL: Mrs. Linda Taschuk.

MR. TRYNCHY: We just hired a new person to take that over from a gentleman who just quit our department. We don't have any difficulty in that regard. So if the member has something that he feels we should know about, I'd sure appreciate knowing.

Mr. Marshall, could you add?

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Chairman, I'd be glad to. I don't want the impression left that we're doing things with a green eyeshade and a quill pen. It sounds a little like that.

Each of the implementing agencies uses its own computer system for the purpose of recording the work that is done by that department or that agency. Their information is gathered together manually by our finance and budget people for presentation of Kananaskis Country as a project. We don't have a little group, shall I say, that is just Kananaskis Country. We have various departments that make up the Kananaskis Country implementation, and I believe each one of them is on computer. I'm not quite sure about Fish and Wildlife, but certainly Housing and Public Works, Transportation, Recreation and Parks, and Energy and Natural Resources are all on computer.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, just for the record, I don't mean to imply that anything is amiss, because certainly I'm not aware if there is. Nevertheless, I would like to emphasize that it is prudent to have the most sophisticated accounting and cost control procedures in place for projects of this magnitude, especially in view of the fact that we are dealing with public funds and the responsibility that we have to the public.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, we also want to make sure that every dollar is accounted for. Just this last year, since July 1, my department is being reorganized completely. When we have that completed, it will have a system in place with the computers working. That should happen in the very near future. But we're just as well aware as every member here that public funds must be accounted for.

MR. ACTING CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Minister. We're now back on our main list of questions. I have the following members with questions: the members for Calgary Currie, Calgary Buffalo, Macleod, Edmonton Mill Woods, and Spirit River-Fairview. Has the Member for Calgary Currie asked his questions?

MR. D. ANDERSON: Yes, we dealt with those in the supplementary, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the minister what is being done in regard to Kananaskis development in the Calgary Regional Planning Commission. I'd like to know specifically if any meetings have been held in camera with the regional planning committee. What has been done in regard to the municipal Planning Act? Has Kananaskis Country been split off from the ID of which it was once a part, and if so, for what reason?

MR. TRYNCHY: The Calgary Regional Planning Commission is not part of Kananaskis Country. Effective January 1 or thereabouts, Kananaskis Country will become ID5, with a new administration. We haven't arrived at what the procedure will be. But it's my understanding, and Mr. Marshall can correct me, that the Calgary Regional Planning Commission is not involved in any planning within Kananaskis Country.

MR. SINDLINGER: Why will it become ID No. 5 on January 1?

MR. TRYNCHY: Pardon?

MR. SINDLINGER: Why the change on January 1?

MR. TRYNCHY: The Department of Municipal Affairs has taken ID6 and ID8, which were two parts of Kananaskis, out of Kananaskis and developed one ID so it would be a designated area of its own and better administered. It will just be Kananaskis Country and will be called ID5.

MR. SINDLINGER: Will it still be subject to the normal hearing process and approval procedures as before?

MR. TRYNCHY: Oh yes, nothing changes except it will be ID5 instead of part of 6 and part of 8, which was giving some ID members some concern that they were half here and half there. It's just to streamline and make it more efficient.

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NOTLEY: Just so I'm clear in my mind, under the terms of this new arrangement, simply removing Kananaskis Country from two IDs and making it into an ID itself -- of course, IDs are members of planning commissions; they certainly are in the north. Will this Kananaskis ID5 be part of the Calgary Regional Planning Commission, and will it be subject to the planning decisions of the planning commission the same as other IDs in the province relate to their respective planning commissions, Peace River or whatever the case may be?

MR. TRYNCHY: That's a good question.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Notley, the present situation is one in which Kananaskis Country is really covered by four or five jurisdictions: two improvement districts, two municipal districts and, if you like, some municipal governments as far as the town of Canmore is concerned. It's a little complicated the way it is. ID8 comes within the sphere of control, if you like, of the Calgary Regional Planning Commission. I'm frankly not sure whether or not ID6 does; it's down at our south end. Mr. Ivan Robinson is manager of the Calgary Regional Planning Commission. Both Mr. Robinson and Mr. Bert Dyck, the manager, or whatever his title might be, of Improvement District 3, receive reports from the business conducted by the Kananaskis Country interdepartmental committee, so they'll know exactly what we are doing or planning to do that may have some influence on the business of the Calgary Regional Planning Commission or of the improvement district.

I think that answers your question. We are in contact with them. They know what we must do. But up to this point the buildings that have been put there are government buildings, and government buildings don't come under the same sort of umbrella as private buildings insofar as the Calgary Regional Planning Commission is concerned. Nevertheless, some things we might do could affect their decisions or their interests, so we keep them well informed for that reason.

Dr. Reid in the Chair

MR. NOTLEY: If I could just supplement that, Mr. Chairman. What you're saying is that there will be consultation. However, other planning commissions operate in a somewhat different way. For example IDs 19, 20 and 21, which happen to be in my constituency, are also in the Peace River Regional Planning Commission, perhaps soon to be two planning commissions but at the moment one planning commission. They're subject to certain decisions of the planning commission with respect to development. For example, is there not a lake area with some private cottages which will now come into ID5? Will development permits which might at one point have been considered by the regional planning commission still be, or will that all be done now by Kananaskis Country?

Mr. Marshall, the point I guess I want to get at is: is Kananaskis Country in a situation where you are consulting with the planning commission -- that's all -- but you are not subject to the planning commission the way other improvement districts in the province are?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, government is not subject to planning commissions. With the decision of the cabinet committee, the cottages on the Kananaskis lakes will not be expanded, so there will be no additional cottages. We will be consulting with the planning commission if we were to develop something through the private sector. But as government, if we develop the family recreation centre at the golf course, we notify them that we're doing it but we don't have to go through the process of having their approval.

MR. NOTLEY: I understand that, Mr. Minister. What I was interested in was the situation with respect to the private cottages and what the development permits would be for improvements and that kind of thing. Would that be done through Kananaskis Country?

MR. TRYNCHY: Yes, I believe that will be handled by Kananaskis Country. When we develop ID5, we'll have an ID advisory board the same as ID 21 and 19 have.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Minister, have there been any meetings with or materials given to the Calgary Regional Planning Commission that they were requested to hold confidential?

MR. TRYNCHY: Not by me, no. I have not corresponded with the Calgary planning commission. As a matter of fact, it's not under my jurisdiction. You might direct that question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I have no knowledge of that.

MR. SINDLINGER: Perhaps I might ask the same question of the officials who are attending you today. Of the five, have any of them had meetings with or provided material to the Calgary Regional Planning Commission which it was requested to hold confidential?

MR. TRYNCHY: All reports that pertain to Kananaskis Country would come through my office, and I have no knowledge of any report to anybody to be held confidential.

MR. SINDLINGER: Perhaps for greater certainty, I might place the question to Mr. Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: We don't make a big thing about the reports. They just get mailed to the manager of the Calgary Regional Planning Commission and the manager of Improvement District 8. A report is prepared for them, telling them about the business we've conducted at the Kananaskis Country interdepartmental committee. They aren't stamped "confidential" or anything like that. I meet with both these gentlemen from time to time to make sure that everybody knows what everybody else is doing, but there's no big thing about it. I've never asked them to keep this quiet or anything like that, if that's what you mean.

MR. SINDLINGER: Your response has been specifically in regard to reports, and I asked about meetings as well. Would you reply in the same way in regard to meetings?

MR. MARSHALL: Sir, if you mean have I attended some meeting of the Calgary Regional Planning Commission or something, I never have. I've never done that. I've never been invited. Since my involvement in Kananaskis Country started, I was invited to one advisory committee meeting of Improvement District No. 8, and I attended it. I think they just wanted to see what I looked like. There's been nothing hush hush at all. I can think of no reason why there would be. There hasn't been.

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have two more names on the list of people who wish to ask questions, the Member for Macleod and the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods. Is there anybody in addition?

MR. PAHL: Mr. Chairman, my question was answered on a supplementary.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question is to the minister, and it's with respect to concerns raised with me particularly with regard to Kananaskis Country but as a general policy on lakes across the province, and that is basically from senior citizens who go fishing at lakes and can't camp beside the lake. They have trouble putting their boat in to start with and, because they can't camp next to a lake, they have to take it out every night.

That is not only in Kananaskis Country. Is that a general policy in Kananaskis Country and across the province at other lakes also?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, we've had some concerns about people -- all people, including senior citizens -- who wish to camp closer to a body of water. In a particular case in Kananaskis, there was some idea to move the campsite away from the shore of the lake. We've changed that across the province to allow campsites to be built as close to a body of water as possible, so seniors and everybody else would at least have access to the water and would be able to keep an eye on their boat so they wouldn't have to take it out of the water. I'd sure appreciate knowing if the hon. member has a specific area where we haven't done it, because that's not our policy. Hopefully we're changing it so it makes it easier for all Albertans to use the waters of our province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, one last question. This question would probably come under the purview of Mr. Adair, but it deals with Kananaskis Country and because Mr. Marshall is here -- and I gather he won't be back when Mr. Adair is present -- perhaps I might direct it now. It's with respect to the Alpine Village. I gather that there will be applications, that you are soliciting proposals from the private sector for the Alpine Village, and that by the end of October, presumably, a decision will be made.

Is delaying any action one of the options that Kananaskis Country is considering at this stage? Suppose we don't get satisfactory applications from the submissions. Is the government going to go ahead on its own, or will the matter be left in abeyance until there is a sound proposal from the private sector to build the Alpine Village? I guess the point is: from your discussions with the advisory committee, what priority does the advisory committee put on the construction of an Alpine Village, even if that has to be done with public-sector funds?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, in responding to that, Mr. Adair is a member of the Kananaskis cabinet committee and of course reports to us, and to me as chairman. We are now asking for proposals on both A and C projects; B has been taken up. Until we get those back, we won't make any decision. I'm not sure what the cabinet committee's recommendations will be if the private sector doesn't pick up either parcel A or C. We're hoping that the private sector will be involved in all three aspects of the Alpine Village, and I'm sure that's what Mr. Adair will tell you when you meet with him.

Until such time, I would like to hold on saying whether we would be involved. The question raised is, is it the proper time to be involved? Some people would suggest it's not. So we could have a hold for some time. But until those submissions come back to us, I'd hate to prejudge. We might have two proposals saying that we'll go ahead. Until we have that back, I wouldn't want to prejudge what our decisions will be.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman. Has there been any recommendation from the citizens' advisory committee on the question of the Alpine Village and what the cabinet committee should do, should private-sector proposals not be adequate?

MR. TRYNCHY: I think the citizens' advisory committee is recommending that the private sector be involved. They haven't gone beyond that to recommend that if the private sector doesn't do it, the government does it.

MR. NOTLEY: So at this stage, Mr. Trynchy, it would be a fair assessment to say that the government is seriously entertaining the option of deferring any construction should a satisfactory proposal not be forthcoming from the

private sector, that that would be one of the clear options the committee will consider. Is it still an option that the government proceed?

MR. TRYNCHY: I'm sure that the option of deferring the decision or deferring moving with it would probably be the right one.

MR. NOTLEY: As the one socialist on the committee, might I suggest that the government stay out for the time being?

MR. TRYNCHY: Coming from there, we'll take that as notice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have two more names, the Member for Calgary Buffalo and the Member for Little Bow. It's three minutes until our normal adjourning time. Can I have any indication as to how long this is liable to take? Do we carry on, or do we adjourn and come back?

MR. SINDLINGER: I have two more questions I'd like to ask, and perhaps they could be dealt with within 10 minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. SINDLINGER: The first question is with regard to the Moose Mountain pipeline project, which was a natural gas pipeline gathering system proposed by Shell Oil over the last few years. It underwent extensive hearings, and went before the Energy Resources Conservation Board. It was subsequently rejected by the Energy Resources Conservation Board late this winter or early this spring. I understand now, however, that there is some trenching going on out there and that some pipeline is being laid: four pipes of 6-inch thickness diameter, for a distance of something like 1,000 feet. I'm wondering what monitoring your department has been doing in that regard to ensure that, first of all, the trenching being done is, first of all, compatible with the recreational objectives of the area and, secondly, that what is going on is not a direct contravention of the order handed down by the Energy Resources Conservation Board.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, could I get clarification: a pipe 6 inches thick or in diameter?

MR. SINDLINGER: The diameter of the pipe is 6 inches, and there are four 6-inch pipes. The trenching has already been done for a distance of about 1,000 feet.

MR. TRYNCHY: I don't know what is proceeding there. I'll ask Mr. Marshall to comment, but I'm sure they would not be proceeding with anything the Energy Resources Conservation Board rejected. It would be internal works or infilling that they would need. Mr. Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Minister. I must confess, sir, that I do not know about this trenching you speak about. There was a request from Shell Oil to run a pipe through a great quantity of fill which we are placing at Canyon Creek on Highway 66 west of Bragg Creek. If a pipeline is ever run from Moose Mountain south through Whiskey Creek down to the Quirk Creek gas plant, it would be very, very costly to have to push pipe through the thousands of yards of fill at Canyon Creek. Shell did make the request to lay some pipe at Canyon Creek, through which they would lay a gas pipeline if, as, and when such a pipeline is ever approved. I'm afraid that's the only one I know about.

If you could give me some specific area about this other pipeline, I would certainly like to know about it and will follow up on it. You must appreciate that many areas of Kananaskis Country are already covered with pipelines.

MR. SINDLINGER: Notwithstanding that pipelines are already there, it doesn't mean we have to build more. I think that was one of the points made during the hearings.

I'm looking at a Kananaskis map now. Highway 66 goes down by Paddys Flat and then continues in a westerly direction to Beaver Flat. At Paddys Flat, there's a junction with an unmarked road going north. It crosses Canyon Creek and comes very close to the ice caves by Moose Mountain. It's my understanding that the trenching has been done in the vicinity of the ice caves. If you are familiar with the map you'll know that by the ice caves, that junction heading north from Route 66 takes a fork. The right-hand fork is shown as being constructed and the left-hand fork going right to the ice caves as being dashed, which I understand would be under construction. I am informed that that is where pipeline trenching has been undertaken.

I gather from your comments that you're familiar with some provisional pipelining. Is that the section you're familiar with, Mr. Marshall?

MR. MARSHALL: I'm not quite sure what you're looking at, sir. Maybe it's a route that somebody would like to see used for a pipeline. To my knowledge there's been no pipelining in there. I'll admit it's probably been two months since I have been up to the ice caves. But there was nothing of the kind, and I can hardly believe that anybody would proceed to do any trenching.

MR. SINDLINGER: Would it be possible that another department -- for example, Alberta Forestry -- could have approved the trenching of this pipeline on a contingent or provisional basis?

MR. MARSHALL: No, sir.

MR. SINDLINGER: I wonder if there's any way we can resolve this issue. Would it be worth while for you and I to go there tomorrow and take a look at it?

MR. MARSHALL: It would take me a very few minutes to find out, sir, if there has been any trenching there. I don't believe there's been anything of the kind.

MR. SINDLINGER: I think that would be something worth clearing up. Given the decision by the Energy Resources Conservation Board, I would think that nothing like this should be undertaken, even on a contingent or provisional basis.

MR. MARSHALL: Sir, I'd like to assure you that with or without the Energy Resources Conservation Board, about 18 people would be nailed to the wall if anything of the kind occurred that I didn't know about.

MR. SINDLINGER: All right.

I have a second question. Is it my turn to ask a second question, Mr. Chairman? The second question is in regard to the pine bark beetle. I wonder what assessment has been made in the Kananaskis valley of the threat from the pine bark beetle.

MR. TRYNCHY: I'll have Mr. Marshall answer that.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to say we've had great fortune in Kananaskis Country with respect to the pine bark beetle. For some reason or other, it doesn't seem to want to come that far north. I hope it stays that way. We monitor to ensure that pine bark beetles have not penetrated that country without our knowledge. Thus far they've seemed to stay south, and we hope they'll stay that way. We can't promise an infestation wouldn't occur, of course, but we hope they'll be stopped closer to the Crowsnest Pass.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Marshall, in regard to the monitoring has there been any discovery of the pine bark beetle west of Kananaskis, in British Columbia?

MR. MARSHALL: I think there has, sir, but tending to be south of Kananaskis Country even though it's in British Columbia.

MR. SINDLINGER: In regard to the pine bark beetle, I was in Kananaskis over the weekend, enjoying it as many other Albertans have. I noticed there was a lot of pine damage on the slopes and in some of the valleys. It's scattered throughout. It bears a great similarity to the pine bark beetle damage in the south Castle River area down by Pincher Creek. From a distance, it looks to be the same. It's a bright red and appears to be a little different from the normal rust one sees from chinook wind damage or large or quick changes in temperature. I wonder if a recent analysis has been made of that damage to determine whether or not it was due to factors other than the pine bark beetle.

MR. MARSHALL: Sir, it's clear we have a similar concern. I got a little nervous too when I saw those red trees in Kananaskis Country. I immediately checked with Alberta Forest Service, and they promised me that I wasn't even looking at diseased trees. It's a phenomenon known as "red belt". I'd never heard the expression before, but I talk about it now like I know something about it. I really don't. But they say it's simply a question of dehydration, and that brings out the present look of the trees. They are not in fact dead. I've said many times, they certainly look dead to me. They said, keep watching them; the green will come back; it's not the pine bark beetle.

MR. SINDLINGER: I might just ask when the most recent analysis was done of the trees that we're talking about. How recently did anyone do an analysis on those trees to determine whether it was pine bark beetle or something else?

MR. MARSHALL: That sort of thing never stops, sir. There's such a nervousness about pine bark beetle that they never stop looking for it. I am assured that the particular trees you're talking about are not infested with the pine bark beetle.

MR. SINDLINGER: I am as nervous as you are about it. At some time when it's convenient, I wonder if you might advise us when the last analysis was done to determine whether or not there was evidence of the pine bark beetle.

MR. MARSHALL: I've tried to say, sir, that monitoring for the pine bark beetle goes on continuously. This is a little gadget that is mounted to catch any kind of insect to see if the pine bark beetle might be among them. So far he hasn't been found in Kananaskis Country, for which I am very grateful.

MR. SINDLINGER: For informational purposes, could you provide us with the most recent report on those little monitoring boxes?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, sir.

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, my question to the minister is a general one. We've had enough experience with the Kananaskis project now. We can look back at what has happened administratively. The minister has also had experience in developing provincial parks through the general revenue of the province. I wonder if the minister could comment on how other persons in the province, other provincial parks that are competing for dollars in the general revenue, see this special project. It's getting special privileges that the provincial parks may not be getting. In the administration of the broader provincial parks program and this specific one, does the minister see some conflicts? In terms of the way we've handled this in the heritage committee, would the minister have any recommendations as to whether this project really should have qualified this way or been done through the general revenue budget?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I don't think we have any competition between provincial parks and the parks funded through the heritage fund. Of course, that includes our urban parks. Since I became the minister of the portfolio we've been very successful, in that we develop a provincial park on a yearly basis. We have planned four provincial parks, one each year, and we go through that system. We've also developed our five urban parks. Of course, we're developing Kananaskis. The administration of provincial parks and Kananaskis doesn't give me any difficulty. There is no fighting -- I guess that's a bad word to use. There's no struggle for more funds for provincial parks or urban parks or the Kananaskis-type parks because the Kananaskis and urban parks come out of the heritage fund and the provincial parks out of general revenue. So I don't see any conflict or any difficulties in getting both on stream and proceeding well, as you're well aware of our five urban parks through the province this last year.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, maybe rewording the question. Kananaskis Country as such could have been developed through the general budgeting process without any problem. Would that be correct? Did the project require any kind of special attention?

MR. TRYNCHY: It didn't require special attention. Our provincial parks usually cost anywhere from \$4 million to \$6 million, and you can develop a pretty nice provincial park. I forgot to mention too, to the hon. member, that we also have 20 recreation areas that we've initiated in the last two years, which help along with our provincial parks.

No, with Kananaskis the funding was greater. Take the road program itself: over \$110 million to develop a park. So if we were to do it through the General Revenue Fund and not increase our budgets out of proportion, it could have taken us a lot longer to develop the Kananaskis-type provincial park. So I feel confident that the heritage fund was the right place to go for the funds and, in the future, if we develop other regional parks on a large scale such as Kananaskis, we should use the heritage fund, because it is a park for all Albertans.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, in your absence the minister graciously agreed to accept some written questions from me, which I think would be more expedient to handle in that way. I would like to table them, through you to the minister, if I may please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any more questions for the minister and his staff?

I'd like to thank the minister and his staff for staying beyond the allotted time, but I think everybody will appreciate being finished for the day.

The committee stands adjourned until tomorrow at 9 a.m. for the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower.

The meeting adjourned at 5:42 p.m.