

[Chairman: Mr. Kowalski]

[2 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the second meeting of the Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act. When we had our initial meeting on June 8, 1983, you'll recall there was some direction given to the chairman of this committee to, in essence, set up a schedule of meetings with various ministers who have projects funded under the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. This afternoon I'm very pleased with the presence of the Minister of Transportation, the Hon. Marvin Moore, to discuss with members of the committee those aspects of the fund that currently come directly under his portfolio of responsibility.

It would be my hope this afternoon that we would go directly to the discussion with Mr. Moore. At the conclusion of the discussion with Mr. Moore, we might do a review of the schedule of meetings that we have set up, as there might very well be some modifications that may be of interest to various committee members; then just have a brief discussion on the second subject we discussed on June 8, dealing with field trips in the time frame of August, September, and October of 1983.

So it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce the Minister of Transportation. Mr. Moore, would you like to make some opening comments?

MR. M. MOORE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. First of all, perhaps I could get direction from you and the committee. There is only one program which appears under the department of the Minister of Transportation, and that is the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, capital projects division, airport terminal development program. I'm fully prepared to discuss matters relating to that program. However, there is a second program that we have delivery responsibility for, and that is the roads in Kananaskis Country, which I also came prepared to discuss, at least to some extent.

I would be willing to address those matters separately if you like. My understanding is that the matter of the roads in Kananaskis Country previously was dealt with in part by the Minister of Transportation and in part by the Minister of Recreation and Parks. I'm in the hands of the committee as to how it's dealt with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Moore. I should point out to all members of the committee that I took the liberty of discussing this subject with Mr. Moore, about his availability to discuss the road infrastructure in Kananaskis Country. I'm very pleased to be notified now that he is prepared to discuss that subject as well this afternoon.

Will there be additional overview remarks that you'd like to make, Mr. Moore?

MR. M. MOORE: Perhaps in that regard I could first address the airport terminal program, if the committee agrees, and then we could have whatever discussion, conclude that, and then go into the Kananaskis Country road development program, in which case I will divide my opening remarks into both those subjects.

To deal with the airport terminal building program, my remarks will be fairly brief. I presume the committee is reasonably familiar with what has occurred, but I will just briefly overview that. At the end of this current program, we will have constructed terminal buildings, or have terminal building projects, at 18 locations throughout the province. Perhaps I could briefly name them. They are Red Deer, Hanna, Peace River, Medicine Hat, Medley — which is Cold Lake — Rainbow Lake, Swan Hills, Manning, Camrose, High Prairie, Drumheller, Brooks, Lloydminster, Fort Vermilion, Wetaskiwin, Edson, Grande Cache, and Pincher Creek.

During the 1982-83 year, funds were provided in the amount of \$2.8 million for the initial start on the terminals at Peace River, Manning, Lloydminster, and Fort

Vermilion. I guess it would have been the completion of the Lloydminster terminal. During the current year in question, funds have been provided to complete the terminal building at Peace River; a small amount, \$30,000, for the completion of a water reservoir connected with the Lloydminster terminal; and finally, \$375,000 for the building of a terminal at Wetaskiwin.

According to the information I have, that would amount to 18 terminal projects over the course of the life of the program, to this point in time, at a total cost of \$16,768,000.

Mr. Chairman, I don't have very much to add to that, except perhaps a brief report on the two projects under way this year. We expect to have the Peace River terminal operational within a month, and then demolition of the old terminal and paving and concrete work and landscaping would be completed before freeze-up. In Wetaskiwin, no work has actually started yet, but an architect has been selected and engaged, and has completed all the conceptual work. Meetings have been held with the administration of the city of Wetaskiwin. Working drawings and specifications are being prepared. We hope to call tenders later this month, with construction starting in September. It will obviously be largely a winter works project in terms of construction, to be completed, hopefully, by the end of the fiscal year.

That, Mr. Chairman, is an overview of the terminal projects that occur under the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. We do have funds for terminal buildings that are allocated by grant out of our regular budget. We have an extensive airport runway development program, et cetera, that most of you are familiar with. I would be prepared to try to answer any questions on either this program or anything connected with it to do with the regular airport development program that comes under the regular budget of our department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Gogo.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I will probably have some difficulty separating your responsibilities as they relate to this committee and your portfolio as Minister of Transportation, and I would ask you to bear with me. First of all, you mentioned Red Deer and Medicine Hat in the 18 terminal locations. I understand Lethbridge was built and is no longer part of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund 20 per cent capital projects division, because it returned as a result of lease to the feds. Are Red Deer and Medicine Hat municipal-owned airports as opposed to Department of Transport, or federal?

MR. M. MOORE: That is correct. As I understand it now, both Red Deer and Medicine Hat would be termed, under our criteria, as community airports.

MR. GOGO: A second question, Mr. Chairman. This probably doesn't relate directly, but it would appear to me that if the fund is providing funds for terminal or airport developments — I guess primarily terminals — it goes without saying there have to be airport developments, which leads one to the question of air service in the province. If it's in order, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister — I recognize his responsibility for the regional airline, which is Pacific Western, as an asset of the government, but it would be the third-level carriers, such as Wapiti, Time, and so on. If the question is in order, could the minister make a comment on how he sees these third-level carriers [a] being developed and [b] using these terminal facilities?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gogo, I think that under the parameters of this particular committee, we're primarily looking at the airport terminal buildings. But I guess it goes without saying that there's no sense having a terminal building unless you have an airport.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could comment this way. The objective of serving communities throughout the province with third-level carrier service is still high on the priority list of our government. It was for that reason, and other reasons, that we got involved in providing funds for terminals from the capital projects division.

It is suffice to say that the economic situation in the province has meant fewer people travelling by air than might have been predicted some time ago. The growth of airlines like Time Air, in terms of the new equipment they bought and so on, left them in a position where I think it's fair to say they're not of the same size that would be necessary, in terms of their equipment and so on, to service some of these smaller communities. So what we are seeing now, which I think is very beneficial, is the smaller, third-level independent carriers, like Wapiti Aviation, moving in and filling the void that was created by the fact that larger companies like Time Air were not able to fly economically into areas where you have only two, four, or six passengers. So I really think that the advent of smaller carriers providing regular scheduled service to smaller communities has been one that has been good and will probably result, over the long term, in our getting more communities serviced by air than had these communities not appeared on the scene and Pacific Western Airlines, Time Air, and CP Air had been the only ones servicing us throughout the province.

In short, I think the way has been paved for smaller, third-level carriers to get into business. That's likely the direction we'll see many of the communities being served that we previously thought were going to be served by the larger carriers.

MR. GOGO: Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a couple of comments on our regular airport program, which has nothing to do with this. I helped open an airport in Warner this summer, and I don't think the public or even the government really understands the importance these airports will have in Alberta in the next 10 or 15 years. We've spent very little money building these airports compared to highways and other things. As time goes by, I think we will see that they become increasingly important in the smaller areas.

That aside, we build these terminals — and I'm talking about the terminals now. Who operates and maintains the terminals?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, some time ago I provided Members of the Legislative Assembly with some information with regard to the number of airports that exist in the province. I identified them by way of whether they were provincial airports, community airports, major municipal airports, or federal airports. I would be pleased to provide another copy of that to the hon. member.

I believe there are 16 provincial airports that have been established in the province. The balance are all community airports. What occurs is that where it is a provincial airport, Alberta Transportation maintains the runway and the terminal building, and operates the airport, if you like. Where it's a community airport, we usually have an airport commission, which is made up of members of all the municipalities that might be interested in it. Oftentimes that's one urban municipality and one or more rural municipalities who may use the airport. They appoint members to an airport commission, assess each municipality a certain amount, based on some formula they develop in terms of it's operational cost, and then they go ahead and operate it. In those cases, particularly with regard to repaving, lighting, et cetera, most generally Alberta Transportation provides the necessary capital for developing the airport, lighting it — that sort of thing — in addition to the costs of pavement overlay, which is usually necessary on these more frequently than even on highways.

With regard to terminal buildings, outside of the areas where we've built the terminals that are being discussed here this afternoon, we have a system of providing one time only, lump sum grants of a certain amount to each community that wants to build a

terminal building. That amount originally was \$20,000. We have now expanded that to provide \$25,000 to a community for the building of their own terminal. We find that in most communities, that will in itself buy not a bad building — a trailer-type thing — or build one or renovate one. The municipal governments involved usually come in and pay the cost of putting the building in there in terms of services to it — water, sewer, electricity, or whatever is required — and wind up with pretty serviceable, albeit small in most cases, terminal buildings.

Mr. Chairman, that is a brief description. I can provide maps and names of all the communities where the airports are located.

MR. THOMPSON: No, I just wanted to make sure that as far as the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is concerned, they provide the facility and after that someone else, whether the community or the government, looks after the maintenance and operation of the terminal.

One more question . . .

MR. M. MOORE: Before we leave that, I don't want to leave the impression that that is the case. Where we build an airport terminal under the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, if it's at a community airport, the community would continue to operate the terminal building after we build it. If it's at a provincial airport, then Alberta Transportation will pay the cost of operation.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, as a member from a large urban riding, I haven't had an opportunity to experience directly these airport terminal buildings. I wonder if the minister is in a position to perhaps give us an overview of the utilization of the ones that have been completed for some time — how they're being utilized and what that is doing for the communities. I'm really looking for a more general overview: what we are getting for the heritage fund dollars that are in this project.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, in answer to a motion for a return in the Legislature last spring, I recall having provided a listing of the landings and takeoffs at each of the airports involved. I don't have that with me today, but I would be pleased to provide it to the hon. member. I recall also that I was quite astonished by the numbers involved in terms of landings and takeoffs at some of the airports. Quite frankly, they receive pretty heavy use. One can't always assess the use on whether or not they have scheduled airline service. Some of these airports without any scheduled service have extremely heavy use just by way of private-sector aircraft operations involving the oil and gas industry, farmers, pleasure flying, and so on.

Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to provide, to the extent that we have it, a list involving all the projects under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, 18 of them, in terms of takeoffs and landings. I hasten to add that we may not have some of them; for instance, Peace River, which is listed as a community airport. I'm not sure that we have the records there in our possession. That would likely have the highest landings and takeoffs of any. It would be several thousand per month. But I will try to provide that to the hon. member, or any other members who are interested.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, if I might just follow with a supplementary on this point. I'd be interested in the takeoffs and landings, though that probably wouldn't be as meaningful to me as some indication as to the difference in traffic into those communities from what existed before and what we now have. In other words, why are heritage fund dollars there? Have they in fact increased dramatically over the past number of years, in a general sense? What kind of traffic is that? Is it traffic that has

encouraged the growth of those communities or allowed for more exploration? I don't personally have a handle on that and would like to have a greater understanding of the effect of the airports rather than the pure numbers which, perhaps because of my lack of knowledge in the area, wouldn't be quite as meaningful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You'd like statistics that show before and after.

MR. ANDERSON: Yes. I'd like some indication of effect; what heritage fund dollars have accomplished here, assuming they've accomplished the goals that were established, and why we have put an airport in these areas as opposed to leaving them the way they were, whether it would be a less effective airport or no airport at all.

MR. M. MOORE: All I can say is that I'll look and see what is available in terms of statistics. There would likely not be very much available in terms of before because many of these airports were just coming into development when we built the terminal. In addition to that, I would guess that there are not very accurate records of takeoffs and landings by type of aircraft anywhere nor very accurate records of takeoffs and landings in the community airports because they don't have personnel there all the time. In other words, there simply isn't a record that's definitive of who uses the airport. But I'll do the best I can, Mr. Chairman, to provide whatever information is available about takeoffs, landings, and types of aircraft.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure if the minister said anything about this to start with. Two airport buildings were initially constructed out of the trust fund; Lethbridge — and was Grande Prairie the other one? Are they still in it, or were they changed because of DoT rent? It was found that there was a question about payment to the capital projects division. Were some different arrangements made about those two?

MR. M. MOORE: What originally occurred was that they were at federal airports, and we had said that we would build those terminal buildings at Lethbridge and Grande Prairie from the capital projects division, Heritage Savings Trust Fund dollars. Then as we got into negotiations with the federal government, it developed that we signed an agreement that saw us build them and get repaid the capital cost by the federal government.

The criteria for the capital projects division is that it returns to the province an economic and social benefit but not necessarily a dollar benefit. We then looked at those two terminals and said they don't fit under the capital projects division. So we built them out of general revenue funds, and we're getting repaid by the federal government. That was to be the case in Fort McMurray. We made a similar offer to the federal government with regard to constructing a new terminal at Fort McMurray, which they did not accept and have not to this point. That one hasn't been resolved yet.

MR. HYLAND: So it's only the two terminal buildings that this happened to. The rest still provide a general benefit to the people but don't provide a dollar income to the province.

MR. M. MOORE: That's correct.

MR. MARTIN: I'd just like to look at the future. Specifically, I'd ask if the department is considering, at this point, any other capital projects out of the heritage trust fund. I'd ask about two things: has there been any thought about some LRT as a capital project out of the heritage trust fund, and has any thought been given to light, fast rail transportation between Calgary and Edmonton as something they're looking at in the future. As I'm sure the minister is aware, many people question the feasibility of having

jets flying between Calgary and Edmonton when it is my understanding that they could have trains that would go 100 miles per hour from the centre of the city to the centre of the city. I know it's not a project that would be expensive, but I wonder if there were any thought about those two specifically or any other capital projects for Transportation.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I have made no request to the Provincial Treasurer or anyone else regarding expanding capital projects from the capital projects division for transportation programs. I guess that answers the first question.

The only thing I can say with regard to the second matter the hon. member raised with regard to high speed train travel between Edmonton and Calgary — the Department of Economic Development has been undertaking some studies with respect to the feasibility of moving trains down the centre median of the four-lane highway, if you like. The advice I have from officials in the Department of Transportation is that that has very little possibility. The grades and the problems associated with the development of a high speed train between our two lanes of four-lane highway has probably very little economics. It's likely that if you were to get involved in the movement of high speed trains between Edmonton and Calgary, you would have to move back some distance, to the next road allowance at least, from the existing four-lane highway because any project of that nature would involve overpasses, which are difficult to construct adjacent to the existing highway. If you get back a way, you could do it. Again, the very expensive costs that my guess would be are quite a long way in the future in terms of the feasibility that might be there.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. In the report of March 31, 1983, it's indicated that 15 Alberta communities have facilities completed with a total heritage fund investment of \$14.4 million, which averages to about \$1 million per terminal. I've only had the opportunity of looking at the Brooks terminal in its early development stages, and I don't recall the facility too well at that point. I wonder if the minister could comment on the number of people staffing those buildings now. In a lot of public buildings we build, after about three to five years you again invest the capital cost in operating costs. I see the burden of operating placed on local governments. I wonder if the minister has looked at future terminal buildings in terms of that cost. Could smaller facilities work? Are the buildings being utilized fully at this time? Have we overbuilt them? Will costs come in less from now on? What is the present circumstance? It seems like a lot of money; for a million dollars, I see a million . . . I certainly should look at the one in Brooks; that's the closest one to my constituency. To have a million dollars sitting beside the airport in Brooks for the few people travelling in and out . . . The question I raise in terms of the heritage fund is: are we using it well? Did we overbuild?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I can only answer that question largely on the basis of what I've seen in terms of the utilization of these airports. It can't be general; it has to be specific. Of the \$16,768,000 that will be spent by the end of this year, the largest project will be the Peace River airport at \$4,732,000. I can say without any hesitation at all that it won't be overbuilt. It's a very well-used airport. Next to that, falling almost in the same area, are three: Medicine Hat at \$1,942,000; Medley or Cold Lake at \$1,964,000; and Lloydminster at \$2,052,000. — again, Medicine Hat, a very well-utilized, busy airport, well justifying that expenditure. Red Deer is \$1,900,000. Red Deer, for obvious reasons of commuter distances between Edmonton and Calgary, is not well-used; Lloydminster, not as well used as might have been projected but bear in mind that the projections for traffic in the Lloydminster area, because of heavy oil development and other things, were much greater when we built the terminal than they are now.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's fair to say that a number of terminal buildings and airports here are not as well utilized as might have been anticipated, but that begins to be true from time to time with highways and other things based on past projections. I do

have to say, however, that I don't think there are too many other community or provincial airports that require very expensive terminal buildings. By that I mean — if you look here at the list, the Edson terminal cost \$165,000; Pincher Creek, \$190,000 — dollars in that order are certainly more appropriate for the balance of communities that need to be served by better airport terminals. I think a great many of them can be adequately served, as I mentioned earlier, by the \$25,000 grant and a much smaller terminal than that. So quite frankly I don't see the need to expand this program. Certainly there isn't a need to build any more \$4,700,000 terminals like we're presently building in Peace River, because that's the last major community airport that didn't have a good terminal.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. The minister is saying that his department — and from his own examination — is satisfied that from the heritage fund we didn't overbuild or that we've impacted local government by high operating costs which were unnecessary, from the research that's available. I know the minister can say right off the top of his head that things are great and they've accepted it. Has the minister had any complaints from local government as to the cost of operating these facilities, and are there requests for operational subsidies?

MR. M. MOORE: I should have answered the latter part of the member's question earlier, Mr. Chairman. I've had no complaints with regard to operational costs. I think that's because, even though we may have spent \$1,900,000 building an airport terminal building in Red Deer — if you have a brand new, well-built, well-designed terminal building, utilization dictates the costs of janitorial services and so on. If the utilization isn't great, the costs are down. If the utilization is greater, they don't mind paying the costs. So I've had no complaints in that regard. In fact, as far as I'm aware, the cost of upkeep of community airport terminal buildings built under this program is being handled quite well by the local communities. The larger cost that the communities incur is the cost of maintaining and rehabilitating their airstrips, lights, beacons, and that sort of thing. As I mentioned earlier, we are providing most of the capital dollars required to upgrade and overlay the strip and those sorts of things.

I wouldn't want to say that all these terminals are utilized to the extent that they should be in terms of their size. With building for the future, I don't think there was anything wrong with any of them being built at the level they were. But certainly there is spare capacity in most of them at the present time.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I noticed in last year's discussion that a terminal at Jasper was discussed briefly. With the difficulty of access to Jasper now, especially with the cancellation of the commuter trains and accessibility only by road, has consideration being given to airport expansion at Jasper under this project?

MR. M. MOORE: We have the Jasper-Hinton airstrip that we developed and a good terminal building and runway. My understanding is that the federal parks minister and the federal government are not interested in expanding or improving the Jasper airstrip because of the policy they believe is essential that precludes, or at least doesn't encourage, the development of airstrips in national parks. That's the reason we built the Jasper-Hinton airstrip, as we refer to it, west of Hinton, within about a 45- or 50-minute drive from Jasper. In short, in the near future I don't see the possibility of an improved airstrip right in Jasper.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think the most useful part of the discussion this afternoon is on the question of how we encourage our third-level carriers, and I don't think we necessarily do that with major terminals. The minister indicated this new approach, which I gather is \$25,000 for a minimum building. How many of these sites

would be considered at the moment?

MR. M. MOORE: We have 85 provincial or community airport sites identified in the province. I've said that that is, for the time being at least, the end of the identification of new sites, because we must begin to improve them by building runways and so on. I have scheduled a program that would see us, if funds are allocated by the Legislature, provide about 10 to 15 \$25,000 grants annually over the next three or four years until we have provided a grant to construct the terminal building in every location where there is presently not either a Heritage Savings Trust Fund terminal, like the 18 we're referring to here, or another good terminal building that has been built by the community. In fact, I have amended our program, if you like, to ensure that I can provide some of those grant dollars when they want to improve existing terminal buildings that are community terminal buildings. In other words, they don't have to build a brand new one. If they have a terminal building that looks pretty good and is reasonably adequate but they can show us that \$25,000 spent on it would improve it to the extent of it being much more serviceable, then we'll provide the grant in that direction.

In short, over the next four years at least, we hope to be able to provide a grant to every one of the remaining on the list of 85.

MR. NOTLEY: Who is going to be making that decision? What will be the process of determining which of the 10 or 15 communities in a given year? There used to be a caucus airport committee that I gather recommended such things as Red Deer, Brooks, and some of these other projects. Is it still going to be done by the caucus committee? To what extent would we be bringing in the third-level carriers? It would seem to me, for example, that it would make a good deal of sense — Wapiti being a case in point; they have schedules and proposed schedules. Frankly, having people in the airline business have some input on a sort of formal basis might be more useful than politicians doing it.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member asked me that same question during the Legislature last fall. I don't have a copy of my answer, but it will be much the same. That is, we have to look at a variety of things. Sure, third-level carrier service is important. But, for example, we're building a Heritage Savings Trust Fund terminal building at Wetaskiwin airport right now, and it has far in excess of the landings and takeoffs, on an annual basis, of many points — for instance, Fairview, High Prairie, or Slave Lake — that are now on a scheduled aircraft basis. So you can't just go on whether or not they have scheduled service. First of all, I think we need to take into consideration the number of takeoffs and landings. Secondly, we need to take into consideration the location of the particular airport. In my view, it's more important to provide better airport, airstrip, terminal facilities in an isolated location that has no access, like Fort Chip, than it is in some place that is served by a major highway in addition to other modes of transportation. So we need to take that into consideration. Thirdly we need to take into consideration the kind and condition of the existing terminal building. If there is no terminal building at all at one airstrip, it may rate greater importance to place a terminal there than at some point where there is third-level service but there is an existing terminal. Then, as I said earlier, the representations of the community involved and the members of the Legislature are all taken into consideration.

There is no sort of magic formula, but I believe the way I have now outlined the program we'll be able to accommodate almost every community that's ready to do something, on the basis of when they're ready. Many of these communities are not ready. If we have 10 to 15 grants a year, that gives us an opportunity to pretty well cover those who are urgently requiring some assistance. We've already provided 20 grants over the last fiscal year and this fiscal year. I hope to boost that a bit for the next fiscal year by detracting from some pavement overlays and so on. In other words,

we'll put a bit more money into the airport terminal thing than we might into the development of new paved strips, and I think we can accommodate most requests in that \$25,000 grant program.

MR. NOTLEY: Could I ask one final question then. Since we have sort of gone beyond the terminal issue and got into airports at least once or twice during the course of this discussion, what priority is given to Wabasca-Desmarais for a paved strip, in view of the very serious flooding problems they've had this year? They've been isolated and, at the present time, it's only a gravel strip into that centre of almost 1,500 people.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, the present construction year has us doing some work in the Wabasca — in fact, a fair amount. We're spending \$800,000 there on upgrading and regravelling the existing runway. That runway was not in shape to pave. We're making some improvements to the ramp area, the taxiway, and putting in lighting. That's being done this year. That will be a very serviceable airstrip then.

What we'll do in future years I'm not sure yet. I think we have some problems with respect to people believing the solution to every airport problem is pavement. The reason is that it's extremely difficult in the northern part of the province to properly drain an airport site so that pavement will last. If you're out there building a highway and you have 20-foot wide ditches, you can drain the sub-surface if you like so the pavement will last. We're experiencing some pretty severe problems now with respect to pavement that was laid on ground that couldn't be drained and carries a lot of water. Consequently we get frost heaves in it. You can live with those on a highway a little easier than you can on an airstrip.

I've asked the department to give more consideration in some communities to building really good turf airstrips as an alternate to paving or gravel. If they're constructed properly, well drained, and the turf is well looked after, they can be extremely serviceable compared to pavement that has a frost heave every 40 feet.

So I'm not sure what the answer is in Wabasca. We may look at it and decide we can get good enough drainage to pave it. The other thing I think we ought to be looking at is the possibility of some oil. If the oil busts up, we can then go in there and scarify it, work it up, re-oil it, and lay it down at a minimal cost. But if you have a layer of pavement, the only thing we can do is overlay it, and three years later you may have the same problem. The cost of overlaying right now runs from \$500,000 to \$600,000 on the average strip.

I guess what I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, is that we have some construction problems that have to be dealt with. Bear in mind that we never got into this airport program until 1975 really. We're learning now that some of the things we did constructionwise were perhaps not as good as they could have been. The only way to have improved that would have been to have spent an awful lot more money on the base. The airport runway at Fairview, for instance, is being overlaid this year. From the amount of actual aircraft traffic, one wouldn't think that any of them would need overlays.

So we have some problems there, and I guess they need further consideration before I can make too many commitments about how many we're going to pave and how many we're going to surface in some other way. But certainly Wabasca is a priority in terms of ensuring it's a serviceable strip.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have no more members who have expressed an interest in raising a question with respect to the airport terminal program. So perhaps, Mr. Minister, we might move on to the second subject that you indicated you would be prepared to discuss today, and that deals with the transportation infrastructure at Kananaskis. I would like to suggest, however, that the chairman was rather flexible in allowing a wide-ranging discussion on airports coming under the heading airport terminal projects. When we get

into the transportation infrastructure for Kananaskis, I hope we will try to relate our remarks to Kananaskis rather than having, as an example, the hon. Member for Cypress discussing some of the road infrastructure in that part of the province.

MR. M. MOORE: Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman. Yes, if we expand this discussion to any road in the province, it could be a long one. But perhaps there are some roads leading to and connected with Kananaskis Country that members may want to touch upon. In fact there are some road construction programs that are important in Kananaskis Country to just outside of it.

If I could just briefly review the total Kananaskis road construction expenditure, to the end of March 31, 1983, it was \$91,373,000. This year, 1983-84, we will be spending \$12,087,000 on the various projects that are involved that we hope to complete by the end of this construction year. We have recently reviewed the future requirements for construction, and it would appear that we can meet the original target in terms of the number and types of roads to be constructed in the Kananaskis area by the expenditure of roughly \$20 million after the current fiscal year. So if a decision were made to continue with the Kananaskis Country road projects from the capital projects division, it would take about \$20 million over a period of probably two future fiscal years to complete that construction.

I don't know, Mr. Chairman, whether any members are interested in specific trails or roads, but I have information as to what we've done this year in various areas. I think the best thing for me to do is just ask, first of all, if there are any questions on the overview of how much we've expended thus far and on how much more it would take to complete the program, and then any specifics I would be pleased to try to answer. I think I have some of the information at least.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I guess my question is how many years do you expect funding from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund to be committed for roads in Kananaskis?

MR. M. MOORE: The original approved budget would see us requiring another \$20 million, as I just mentioned, after this construction year. It likely wouldn't be possible for us to spend that all in the next fiscal year, because some of it is pavement overlay on top of base course, and so on. It's a two-year project. So to complete the project, we will need funding from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, capital projects division, for at least two more years. Like any other highway project, we can almost stop any time and have gravel or dirt instead of pavement. Of course some of these roads aren't going to be paved; they are only rebuilt and gravelled. It would be my hope that we could get funds to complete the project, which would be another \$20 million, about equally spread over the next two fiscal years.

MRS. CRIPPS: A supplementary. In essence, you're saying that the commitment of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund to road building in Kananaskis would be completed after the next two fiscal years.

MR. M. MOORE: I'm only saying that it would be my preference that we complete the project and that's what it would take. It's going to be up to the Legislature, and the Provincial Treasurer in terms of putting it forward, to make that decision.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. That two years and the \$20 million would give what one might term a good, all-weather road both directions from Kananaskis — for us who live in the south to go up the road and for those who live in the northern part of the province to come down. Is that right?

MR. M. MOORE: Well, it depends how far north you go.

MR. HYLAND: I'm thinking mainly from Highway 1 south.

MRS. CRIPPS: I was thinking of Highway 22 south.

MR. M. MOORE: If the member is referring to Highway No. 40, it is now upgraded and paved, and there is good access from the north, from Highway 1 south. Perhaps the member could be a touch more specific with regard to the particular road he is concerned about in the south, because there are some secondary highways leading in from the east and some secondary highways leading north from the south.

MR. HYLAND: For example, the road from Lundbreck north into the area. Doesn't it join No. 1 later on if you follow it through? I don't know the number.

MR. M. MOORE: If you're talking about Highway 22, which runs from High River straight through to Lundbreck . . .

MR. HYLAND: The forestry road coming from Blairmore comes in there pretty close too, doesn't it?

MR. M. MOORE: The forestry trunk road, Highway 940, really terminates in Coleman, Blairmore, or close to there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that answer it, Mr. Hyland?

MR. HYLAND: Yes, I guess so.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I just have a quick question. A couple of weeks ago, I had occasion to walk on Highway 22 because you had it blocked off through Elbow Falls. I think that's the right highway number. I'm curious: will that be paved, and how much farther will it be upgraded in towards the mountains?

MR. M. MOORE: From Highway 22 — which direction were you going?

MR. MUSGREAVE: Going west.

MR. M. MOORE: From Longview?

MR. MUSGREAVE: Yes. Maybe I'm on the wrong highway. It's going into Elbow Falls.

MR. M. MOORE: The secondary highway from Longview to the junction of Highway 40 follows along the Highwood River.

MR. MUSGREAVE: This one is farther north. It's the one that runs due west from Midnapore; I think it may be 22A or 22X. Bragg Creek.

MR. M. MOORE: It's 546 from Black Diamond and Turner Valley.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Farther north.

MR. M. MOORE: You're talking about the one that goes through Bragg Creek?

MR. MUSGREAVE: Right.

MR. M. MOORE: Are you talking about inside Kananaskis Country?

MR. MUSGREAVE: Yes. I believe Elbow Falls is inside Kananaskis Country.

MR. M. MOORE: That's Highway 66, Mr. Chairman. My information is that at the end of this construction year, Highway 66 will be completed to a graded standard but not paved. Whether paving might occur there would depend on how far we proceed in future years. There's work going on there now. It should be completed by the end of this construction season. The funds have already been allocated to a graded standard, but not paved.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I might mention, Mr. Chairman, that the facilities that have been provided by the Minister of Tourism and Small Business and also Forestry are a tremendous improvement over what they have been, and the road is that much better. So there is obviously going to be a lot of traffic there, and I just assumed it would be paved.

MR. M. MOORE: That's a good representation. It will be noted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there additional questions of the minister with respect to transportation and construction in Kananaskis?

MR. THOMPSON: I'd just like to make a couple of comments. I honestly believe that in 10 or 15 years Kananaskis Country is going to be a major tourist attraction in Alberta. You look across the line at the United States, and their parks are full and are getting worn out. I think we will see a major influx. If we put the facilities in there and the routes into the park, it will really help the tourist industry in Alberta.

Therefore, getting back to what Mr. Hyland said, I honestly think that it is a very short-sighted policy if we build a very good highway up to the edge of the park and then it deteriorates to a secondary, rural highway like it is at the present time. Hopefully we can sit and start to feed in there so that the tourist traffic in Alberta from south of the border, from other provinces, is encouraged to go in there and use those facilities. Once the facilities are in there — they're not there at the present time, but I can see that it is going to be a real major aid to the tourist industry in Alberta.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate the comments of the Member for Cardston. I have just the opposite view, Mr. Minister. I would certainly hope that we live up to the proposed Kananaskis Country announced some eight years, that it was designed for Albertans and not to be used for international visitors. I hope, Mr. Minister, that in your wisdom you would retain that as a gravel road.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before you respond, Mr. Minister, Mr. Musgreave wants to get in. You might wish to provide your comments after hearing all three views.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Minister, Mr. Thompson was really making the point I was making, only in a better fashion. It was fantastic. I walked in there two weeks ago. You have the highway blocked off, so you have to walk five kilometres in to get to Elbow Falls. I think you opened it for August 1 weekend. But the facilities are fantastic. The kind of work they're doing is superior to anything you see in the national parks. They are providing day areas for picnickers. There's going to be a fantastic volume of just Alberta traffic. I really feel that the road — and I assume from the way it's graded, it's going to be paved very soon.

So I'm just saying again that it should be high priority, if it isn't, because it's going to be well used. I agree with what Mr. Thompson said, and I'll have to talk to the hon. member from Lethbridge later.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, the best way for me to get out of this problem is to say that the Minister of Recreation and Parks is responsible for policy in terms of Kananaskis Country. We build the roads where they tell us to. I can report to you on what it costs, what we've done, and what it cost to complete the program, and take as notice your comments but ask that you pass them along to the hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there additional comments or questions to the minister with respect to the Kananaskis infrastructure? If not, I have one, Mr. Minister.

This summer, I had the opportunity to do a bit of travelling in Alberta. Travelling from Calgary to Banff, I drove under an overpass at Canmore that had a sign on it: Benchland Overpass, Funding by the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Obviously, there must be an explanation as to why an overpass is being funded by the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, considerably north of what I anticipate to be Kananaskis Country. I would really appreciate a response to that question.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I had the good fortune of driving over the same road on July 23, I think it was, and seeing the same thing. I was a bit taken aback that we were building overpasses with Heritage Savings Trust Fund money, under Alberta Housing Corporation's budget. On inquiring, I learned that the highway runs through the town of Canmore, and Alberta Housing Corporation has a development across the highway. Part of the developer's agreement apparently required the developer, Alberta Housing Corporation, to build an overpass. They built it, as any other developer would do and, because the whole project was financed not from the capital projects division but from other dollars the corporation gets from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, they signed it as a Heritage Savings Trust Fund project. So in fact it is, but it isn't an Alberta Transportation project at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That answers it.

Are there additional questions to the minister with respect to this subject? If not, Mr. Minister, I thank you very much. We've had a wide-ranging discussion, and we look forward to seeing you next year.

Ladies and gentlemen, at the outset of the meeting, I indicated that when we last met at our organizational meeting on June 8, 1983, we discussed a number of dates we would be setting aside in the months of August, September, and October. Since that time, you've received several pieces of paper from either me or Mrs. Peggy Davidson, our committee secretary, with respect to the dates we've been able to resolve. I must say that checking with upwards of 20 people and trying to get dates in place has been an interesting task.

You should have with you in your files a memo dated August 2, 1983, which sets out the most recent schedule we've been able to arrive at. I would like to point out that the differences in it, compared to the times and dates we had agreed to on June 8 as a first draft, indicate four changes.

You'll note that while we indicated on June 8 that we might want to set aside the dates August 23 and 24, and September 6 and 14, those have now been eliminated as possible meeting dates for the trust fund, primarily because we've been able to double-book ministers on various dates toward the end of August; and, secondly, because of some conflicts with the other select committee that starts its hearings very shortly. The fifth change is that we've added one other date, Wednesday, October 5. That was the one date available for the Premier to meet with the committee, so we've added that.

I would like the concurrence of committee members that these dates are fairly firm as I would like to put out a public statement for the people of Alberta, particularly the media who might be interested in covering our committee meetings, and to have that an open document. Prior to that, if there are concerns of committee members on

particular dates, I suspect that now would be the time to raise them.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have no particular quarrel. I think you've done some excellent work trying to tie down ministers for given periods of time. The only point I would make — and I think it needs to be made at this juncture — is that there is always the possibility that we may find that in a given area there is sufficient interest that we have to run over to another day. As a matter of fact, in 1977, I think we went seven or eight days with the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care — maybe Mr. Speaker can confirm that; I know it was certainly more than several days — when we got into the cancer centre in Calgary and the health sciences centre in Edmonton.

So with the caveat that we're going to have to have some flexibility should we find we do have more questions in a given area, I have no quarrel with the schedule you've set out. It may mean that on some days, such as today, where we're an hour ahead of schedule, we might be able to backtrack and pick up a minister. It will require a fair amount of work on the part of the chairman to guess, in a sense, which may be less controversial and see if he can have another minister on deck to come back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it goes without saying, Mr. Notley, that that optimum amount of flexibility would have to be built into it. You will note that I indicated four open dates in the memo I sent to committee members some time ago, and indicated that if they were not required for visitation with ministers, we might want to use those scheduled dates for discussion of recommendations and the report itself. But the point is valid.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I think you and Mr. Notley caught in those closing comments the fact that there are those four days. Also, if we see we're not going to make it, we'll just have to set more dates, because we have cancelled two or three. I know it conflicts, but there may be other dates that don't. Some of them may have to conflict if we find that we need more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there other comments on this subject?

MR. GOGO: This is sort of allied to that, Mr. Chairman. For example, with the Minister of Recreation and Parks, if there was sufficient interest, I wonder if maps could be distributed to the committee in matters such as that, if notice were given to you a week ahead or something.

The other point is: I don't know what the inspection trips — which I would prefer to call them, as opposed to field trips — hold for us. I wonder if the committee would consider the Minister of Recreation and Parks having a slide presentation available, if the committee would want it. I would find that helpful in the overview of the Minister of Recreation and Parks. I just put that on the table. If committee members would like those kinds of things, is it in order for them to ask you to put it in place?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's certainly in order. I might point out, however, that those projects funded by the heritage fund under the administrative portfolio of the Minister of Recreation and Parks are the Kananaskis Country recreation development and the urban parks program. I'll certainly convey that thought to him. He's going to be receiving the minutes of this meeting today. I'm sure some of us may want to raise questions with respect to policy, as suggested by the Minister of Transportation. Fair point.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I note that Tuesday, September 20, has "tentative hearing" — no time period there — for Doug Rogers. Are you going to leave it like that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I just haven't had an opportunity yet to confirm it. That's the

reason for the word "tentative". Hopefully we'll have that done in the next several days.

Does the time frame we have in the schedule in front of all committee members meet with their satisfaction, recognizing there has to be some flexibility in the event something comes up?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much.

The second item we briefly touched on on June 8 was one dealing with field trips. Mr. Gogo prefers to use the phraseology "inspection trips". At that point, we had a brief discussion on it, and I'd requested from all members a written statement expressing their interest in field trips. At that meeting, there was a general consensus that as much as possible we should avoid field trips in August, September, and October, because of other commitments that hon. members have. The feeling generally was that if we wanted to undertake some of these investigations, we might do it in the post fall session time frame and perhaps the January-February time frame. As a result, I didn't receive any correspondence from anybody, so I haven't scheduled any field trips. I take it the general assessment is that we should wait until post fall session, early winter. Okay, that's fair game with me.

The last item I have to bring to the attention of committee members is basically the notation that tomorrow we'll be meeting with the Hon. Allen Adair, Minister of Tourism and Small Business, commencing at two o'clock. On Thursday, we have slated the Hon. William Diachuk, commencing at ten o'clock.

Just a request from me to committee members. There were four days of activity that I took on behalf of the committee since the last meeting: June 22, July 11, July 13, and July 16. I would appreciate confirmation by committee members that those expenses incurred therein would be . . . There was a motion on that; I'm not sure if we need a seconder. Thank you very much, Mr. Thompson.

We'll move to adjournment here this afternoon, and we'll reconvene tomorrow afternoon at two o'clock. The secretary of our committee has an administrative piece of paper for all members to fill in. If you would do that, I will complete the signature of it.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, with the payment of accounts and expenses, is it better to wait for at least a week at a time, or something like that, instead of filling one out every day?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have no problem at all with that either way. It's just in the event some members may not be here tomorrow or Thursday. None have advised me that they won't be here. I am very flexible, Mr. Hyland; you can do it either way. We'll adjourn the meeting, and if you wish to do it now, come up. If you wish to wait several days, we'll do it that way.

Thank you very much.

[The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.]

This page intentionally left blank