



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 31st Legislature
Second Session

Special Standing Committee
on
Members' Services

Tuesday, June 9, 2026
3 p.m.

Transcript No. 31-2-3

**Legislative Assembly of Alberta
The 31st Legislature
Second Session**

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

McIver, Hon. Ric, Calgary-Hays (UC), Chair
Yao, Tany, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (UC), Deputy Chair
Dyck, Nolan B., Grande Prairie (UC),* Acting Deputy Chair

Eggen, David, Edmonton-North West (NDP)
Getson, Shane C., Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland (UC)
Gray, Christina, Edmonton-Mill Woods (NDP)
Hoffman, Sarah, Edmonton-Glenora (NDP)**
Metz, Luanne, Calgary-Varsity (NDP)
Petrovic, Chelsea, Livingstone-Macleod (UC)
Rowswell, Garth, Vermilion-Lloydminster-Wainwright (UC)
Sabir, Irfan, Calgary-Bhullar-McCall (NDP)
Singh, Peter, Calgary-East (UC)

* substitution for Tany Yao

** substitution for David Eggen

Also in Attendance

Sinclair, Scott, Lesser Slave Lake (UC)

Support Staff

Shannon Dean, KC	Clerk
Ketsa, Tammy	Executive Assistant to the Clerk
Trafton Koenig	Law Clerk
Hillary Cleminson	Chief of Staff to the Speaker
Aaron Roth	Committee Clerk
Terry Langley	Sergeant-at-Arms
Dave Ludwick	Executive Director of Corporate Services
Darren Joy	Senior Financial Officer
Lyndsay Tischer	Director of Human Resources
Amanda LeBlanc	Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>

3 p.m.

Tuesday, June 9, 2026

[Mr. McIver in the chair]

The Chair: It's now 3 o'clock. Because it's 3 o'clock, I would like to call this meeting to order.

My name, as you may know, is Ric McIver, MLA for Calgary-Hays and the chair of this committee. I will now ask members and those joining the committee at the table to introduce themselves for the record. I will then call on members joining the meeting remotely to introduce themselves. In the spirit of going clockwise, MLA Gray, would you – do we have the staff do that, too, here? Okay. Madam Clerk.

Ms Dean: Good afternoon. Shannon Dean, Clerk.

Dr. Ludwick: Good afternoon. Dave Ludwick, executive director, corporate services.

Mr. Koenig: Good afternoon. Trafton Koenig, Law Clerk.

Ms Tischer: Good afternoon. Lyndsay Tischer, director of human resources, LAO.

Ms Gray: Good afternoon, everyone. Christina Gray, MLA for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

Ms Hoffman: Hi. I'm Sarah Hoffman, Edmonton-Glenora.

Mr. Langley: Good afternoon. Terry Langley, Sergeant-at-Arms.

Ms Cleminson: Hillary Cleminson, Speaker McIver's chief of staff.

Mr. Rowswell: Garth Rowswell, MLA, Vermilion-Lloydminster-Wainwright.

Mr. Sinclair: Scott Sinclair, MLA for Lesser Slave Lake.

Mr. Roth: Aaron Roth, committee clerk.

The Chair: Okay. Well, thank you.

For the record Mr. Dyck is substituting for Mr. Yao as deputy chair. Mr. Sinclair: it says for Mr. Wright, but my list doesn't show that Mr. Wright is on the committee. Anyways, you're here. We welcome you.

Folks online, we'll go – MLA Dyck, go ahead, please.

Mr. Dyck: Nolan Dyck, MLA for Grande Prairie.

Mrs. Petrovic: Chelsae Petrovic, MLA for Livingstone-Macleod.

Dr. Metz: Luanne Metz, MLA for Calgary-Varsity.

Mr. Sabir: Irfan Sabir, MLA, Calgary-Bhullar-McCall.

Mr. Getson: MLA Shane Getson, Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland, but it's God's country.

Mr. Singh: Good afternoon, everyone. Peter Singh, MLA, Calgary-East.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you, everybody. I don't think I've missed anybody, but if I have, this'd be a good time to make yourself known.

Before we turn to the business at hand, a few operational items. Please note the microphones are operated by *Hansard* staff, so none of us ever need to touch the buttons in front of us to make our

microphone turn on. Someone will do that for you. Committee proceedings are live streamed on the Internet and broadcast on Alberta Assembly TV. The audio- and videostream and transcripts of this meeting can be accessed via the Legislative Assembly website. Those participating remotely are encouraged to please turn on your camera while speaking and mute your microphone when not speaking. Members participating virtually who wish to be placed on the speakers list are asked to e-mail or send a message in the group chat to the committee clerk. Members in the room are asked to please signal to the chair in whatever way you think you can get my attention. Please set your cellphones and other devices – I'm going to double-check now – to silent for the duration of the meeting.

The first item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Are there any proposed additions or revisions for today's meeting agenda? Seeing none, hearing none, is there someone willing to move the agenda as presented? MLA Rowswell. If you're in favour, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no. Any opposition online? Now would be the time. Okay. That's carried.

Approval of the minutes from the last meeting. Are there any amendments to the minutes from our last committee meeting? I'll just leave a little time here for someone to speak up or signal if they have an amendment or a change. Going twice, seeing none, is someone willing to move approval of the minutes from the last meeting? MLA Rowswell. Let me go this way. Are there any opposed to approval of the minutes from the last meeting? Hearing and seeing none, carried.

That takes us to item 4 on the agenda, request for supplementary funding, Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries. Hon. members, the committee received a request from the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries on May 13, 2026, requesting supplementary funding in the amount of \$450,000 for the Legislative Assembly Office for the '26-27 fiscal year to support the committee and the independent advisory panel that will be reviewing Alberta's electoral boundaries. When the committee approved the budget for the '26-27 fiscal year on January 28, 2026, the Legislative Assembly Office was not aware that this additional funding would be needed. The funding being requested would enable the independent advisory panel to defray the cost of panel members' remuneration and expenses, deliberation, meeting costs, report writing, et cetera. As in other similar instances, if the panel does not utilize the full amount of funding being requested, the remaining funds would be returned to the general revenue fund.

At this point I will open it up to a discussion on this request and would invite any comments, questions, or motions. MLA Hoffman.

Ms Hoffman: Thanks very much, Mr. Chair. I want to begin by saying that I know a committee met earlier today to prepare this motion for this afternoon and that our Official Opposition proposed an additional motion around ensuring that the members of the new commission – well, not really commission. Previously their electoral boundaries review – where do I want to start? Sorry. I'm going to pause for a second. This is my brain trying to process while I'm talking, so instead I'm just going to talk.

When we had the original report come forward as an interim report, we saw a unanimous report from the committee members. I want to thank the folks who work in the Clerk's office, particularly Mr. Roth, for attending and supporting the work of that committee over a year. It was a big process, and that process over that full year cost \$1 million. What we're seeing today is a proposal for half that amount of money for I'm not sure what, and I think it would benefit all Albertans, particularly those of us who were asked to make this decision, to know what the committee plans on breaking its budget down into. This is a significant amount of public money, half a

million dollars for I'm not clear about what the expenses are. I don't know if it's appropriate or if it's reasonable without knowing what it's proposed to be spent on, Mr. Speaker. That's one of the things I wanted to say in that regard.

Then I also – reflecting on the process to date, the actual commission did consultations across the province. They had extensive public interactions, including with many MLAs, and I really appreciated the formal process that we had to be able to give feedback, for it to be heard, to be able to respond to questions that were asked by the commission members. I certainly would have said other things in my public report had I known that two more seats were on the table. We know that the vast majority of increases to the population have been in the large urban centres of the province, so I would have specifically asked for at least one additional seat to come to Edmonton and those types of things.

Not being clear about what the money is being spent on, knowing that the process that we had for public engagement does not take into consideration the new information that is coming forward about the new bill, now that it's being proposed to increase from 87 – we already passed a bill increasing it to 89, and now it's being increased to 91. It leads to more concerns, I think, for the public, that we already spent a million dollars on a process that had been unanimously supported through the interim report and then did have support from both party representatives when the final report came forward, one UCP appointee and two NDP appointees. There was bipartisan support for that, and now the government is proposing to spend more money and restart this process, possibly.

So the main question is around that half a million dollars and specifically getting clarity on what it's actually going to be spent on. Are there going to be public hearings initiated again? Are there going to be any salaries paid for the appointees or others? This is significant money, and I think it's important for us to do our due diligence in asking those questions.

I'll leave my comments to that for now, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you. I've got on the speakers list after you MLAs Rowswell, Sabir, and Metz, but Committee Clerk Roth, I think, has some context intended to try to answer some of your questions.

3:10

Mr. Roth: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. Just looking at the mandate of the committee and the independent advisory panel based on Government Motion 37, we did a calculation of resources that might be needed. The committee today – over the course of a couple of meetings the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries has agreed to a series of remuneration grids, for lack of a better term, for the panel members, the chair. The funding would also cover things like, for instance, hotel rooms if there were travel expenses of the panel members meeting, deliberation, also things like Elections Alberta to off-set GIS staff and mapping, which is an expense. If the panel is coming up with new maps, there will be a need for staff support from Elections Alberta. It would be those types of things that would be included within the funding request that came forward.

Ms Hoffman: May I ask one follow-up?

The Chair: Go.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you. Would it be possible to get a breakdown even if it's a percentage of the total budget? Like, what percentage are we looking at for salaries, what percentage are we looking at for accommodations: those types of things.

The Chair: Might I just say, intending to be helpful, your breakdown might be an estimate, but nonetheless a best guess at this date. Okay? Is that acceptable to you?

Ms Hoffman: Yeah.

The Chair: Okay, because I'm not sure we – as the committee unfolds, the actual numbers will unfold with that, but to give you what we expect that'll turn out to be roughly.

Okay. Anything else?

Ms Hoffman: Just when would we expect to get that information?

The Chair: Very quickly, apparently. Maybe before the meeting ends. That's not a promise, but it could happen. Okay?

Ms Hoffman: Thank you.

Mr. Rowswell: I would like to make a motion if I could.

The Chair: Okay. Please do.

Mr. Rowswell: Okay. I'd like to move that . . .

The Chair: On the agenda or a different motion?

Mr. Rowswell: No. On agenda. Yeah.

The Chair: Okay. Go ahead.

Mr. Rowswell: That

the Special Standing Committee on Members' Services approve the supplementary funding in the amount of \$450,000 for the Legislative Assembly Office for the '26-27 fiscal year to support the work of the independent advisory panel reviewing Alberta's electoral boundaries.

The Chair: And the request . . .

Mr. Roth: Sorry. I'm just bringing it up on the screen, Mr. Speaker.

The Chair: Oh, okay. All right. You're going to put it on the screen and make sure that you're adopting what's going to be on the screen when the screen happens.

There it is. Not to be intending to be anything but helpful, are those the words that you would adopt as what you just said?

Mr. Rowswell: I guess the last few words there are additional to what I read.

The Chair: Yeah. It's, processwise, that the chair on behalf of the committee forward the request to the President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance because that's the method by which the money can be made to move if – only if – the motion passes.

Mr. Rowswell: Yeah. You bet.

The Chair: Okay, so that's your motion?

Mr. Rowswell: Yeah.

The Chair: Okay. Any other comments before we move down the speakers list?

Mr. Rowswell: Just that the request originated from the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries. The funding will be used for operational, administrative, research, consultation, logistics requirements. Approval will help ensure the electoral boundaries

review process proceeds efficiently and without resource constraints. That would be the reason.

The Chair: Okay. Next speaker is MLA Sabir.

Mr. Sabir: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be speaking against this motion, and there are a number of reasons that I will be speaking against it. The first thing is that we just recently went through the whole process of mapping electoral boundaries. That cost Albertans a million dollars. Albertans at large were consulted – in fact, the most consultation ever in the history of this kind of work – and that report, of course, was rejected by the government. I think that even if we approve this funding, there is no guarantee that unless and until the government likes these maps, the government will accept this committee's work. It's a complete waste of taxpayer money. It's a complete waste of the Legislature and its committees' time.

Also, we don't see that process as legitimate. Across provinces, different jurisdictions that's the process. There is a sitting judge or some justice from the bench who has this commission that's independent of the government. They do their work and, I guess, historically the government accepts it whether they like it or not. In 2017-18 we went through that process, and when the work of the committee panel came back, I remember that two seats from the Minister of Finance then, the minister of energy then completely disappeared from the map. We didn't like the map, but that was the process that we were supposed to follow and believe in, that was independent, and we did follow and accepted those results.

I think that instead of accepting the result of the hard work of the commission, where we spent under \$1 million of public money, government is just now asking for another slush fund so that, I guess, the UCP-dominated committee can come up with maps they like. I think that's a complete waste of money. That's not something that we should be approving. That's not how we should deal with public money, and I urge everyone to think about it, whether that's how you will spend your money. That's public money. You are entrusted with that money, and as trustee of that money we shouldn't be wasting public money on pet projects of the UCP like this.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you, MLA Sabir.

The next speaker on the list is MLA Dr. Metz.

Dr. Metz: Thank you. I also cannot support this bill. I don't believe and we don't believe that this whole process is necessary. I guess what I'm saying is that I don't support the motion to allow more money of taxpayer dollars to be spent on something that's been done and solved and should have been accepted. We already had a commission cost a million dollars, hours and hours of time of constituents, from all of us across the whole province. Never before has there been so much feedback, input to this.

The initial report was accepted unanimously. Suddenly there was a change at the end by a minority of the members.

Mr. Rowswell: Point of order.

The Chair: Dr. Metz, there's been a point of order raised, so just hang with us here, please, a minute.

Mr. Rowswell.

Mr. Rowswell: Yeah. Under 23(b). Government Motion 37 was passed. There's another committee that has passed the request for this. We don't need to relitigate all those again. Like, they've asked us to support this, and it's come from another one. There's a budget that was done there. So I just think to relitigate the reason we're here is not what this committee is doing. We're here to argue the

point of funding something, not to relitigate the reason that we're on this issue.

The Chair: MLA Gray.

Ms Gray: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is not a point of order. While perhaps the members opposite are uncomfortable and do not like to hear the reasons, I think that should each member of this committee vote for a half million dollars to support the new Government Motion 37 boundaries commission, every member here can and should have the opportunity to weigh in as to their reasoning for why they would or would not support this motion. The reference to 23(b) doesn't make sense to me. I don't think this is a point of order. At this point we are hearing initial comments from people and not in any way belabouring the point. I don't think this is a point of order; I think this is exactly what this committee should be talking about.

I look forward to what you have to say, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Okay. Well, MLA Rowswell, I agree that we don't relitigate things at the committee that have been decided. On the other hand, members of the committee do, I think, have the right to express why they do or don't support the motion in front of them, and a part of that is a little walk down memory lane, I suppose, about how we got here, which I think is what MLA Dr. Metz was doing. Now, if the MLA was to go on in the same vein for a long, long period of time, then you may well have a point of order, but I don't think we have one yet. I think the MLA was properly expressing her reasons to support or not support what's in front of us.

At this point I will invite Dr. Metz to carry on.

3:20

Dr. Metz: Thank you very much. Really, I am saying why I cannot support spending another \$450,000 on a process that should have already been concluded. This is a waste of taxpayer money. We've spent a million dollars. That was needed. If the information given to the true boundaries commission was given in error and they should have been given an ask to put more seats out there, then that should have been done, and that was a mistake made by this government. I cannot go back and say: well, gee, we now need to spend \$450,000 more because we have to redo all of this. That is my feeling on this.

I will pass to the next speaker.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

For those watching on YouTube, I understand there's a problem with the audio. Now, obviously, if that's still there, you can't hear me, so there's no point in my talking except for the fact that if you've got closed caption on, hopefully you can read what I'm saying and at least read that we understand we're having trouble with the sound and we have people working on it. My advice is to stick with the closed caption until we get the sound back on, if indeed we do.

Having said that, MLA Gray is now on the speakers list.

Ms Gray: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes. I'm happy to speak to the motion in front of this committee to approve an extra half million dollars for the work that the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries has requested. While it is accurate that the request has come from the committee, I will note that that request was supported by UCP members and opposed by Alberta NDP members. The Official Opposition has been really clear from the beginning that this process is not legitimate and is likely unconstitutional.

We have spent a million dollars to do a full electoral boundaries process, as per the legislation, that included some of the most consultation that has ever happened with an electoral boundaries commission. I believe this was the highest amount of public participation. We had a unanimous interim report, a clear majority report, and because this government is rejecting that, we now have this extra \$500,000 cost, or \$450,000 to be more precise.

The challenge is that the Official Opposition watching this process are not the only ones concerned that this may be unconstitutional, the way that this is happening, especially with the very apparent gerrymandering that's been baked into this. We authorize \$450,000 to continue this process; then perhaps there are additional court challenges. Like, the taxpayer is going to continue to throw, hand over fist, money at this because the government has rejected the majority report, something that no other government has ever done. As we talk about the expense of this \$450,000, it's not just this because it's likely to be even more. Again, that's going to come from the taxpayer. When a clear majority is sitting there waiting to be reviewed, how far will this process go?

One of the ways we make it less unconstitutional or less likely to be problematic is to try to do this well, to try and do it with transparency, to try and do it with an appropriate look at what's happening, and to try to improve the level of public trust in this process. But for the members of this committee who are not a member of the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries, I will tell you that absolutely every effort to improve transparency, every potential motion to try and bring some daylight into what's going on or even just put on the record what government members have said out in the public record has been met with resistance, so my hope for this process could not be lower.

Not only is the Official Opposition concerned; the Acting Chief Justice declined to participate in the process. For anyone who hasn't seen that detail, this is really significant because normally the Acting Chief Justice, through the normal process, is requested to help select the chair and has done so and in this case because of the irregularities of the process declined to participate, followed by the Canadian Bar Association declining to participate and the Law Society of Alberta. As a result of that, we only had two applicants for chair, and of those two the one with the best qualifications is a partisan UCP donor, so we can't even give the public that appearance of neutrality. It's deeply concerning.

Today the government appointed their two panel members. One is a lobbyist, a registered lobbyist, with deep ties with this government. The second is someone who created a submission to the previous panel with some of the worst examples of the gerrymandering we are concerned about, that had Calgary ridings that went all the way to the border of Alberta in a way to dilute urban votes, to disenfranchise Calgary voters so that in the next election if 50 per cent of Calgary were to vote for UCP and 50 per cent for NDP, let's just say, it wouldn't be that half gets the seats and the other half goes to the other party; it would be that three-quarters would go to the UCP because of the gerrymandering. That's the example of what that panel appointee put forward.

Half a million dollars to continue to support a panel that I think is vulnerable to political pressure and manipulation. Our efforts to pass motions that would suggest that perhaps MLAs should not be contacting panel members or Premier's staff shouldn't be contacting panel members were rejected.

I cannot support the motion here, just like I did not support a similar motion at the original committee. I think that this committee is an opportunity for sober second thought. I realize not all MLAs and members will have been paying attention to what's going on there, but trust with the Alberta public has been broken because of this. The expenses are piling up, and I absolutely object to this

misuse of taxpayer dollars for political purposes on behalf of the government.

I did have the opportunity to speak to some of these issues at that committee, and I'm very pleased to repeat some of my concerns here at this committee. I appreciate an opportunity to register some of my initial concerns, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you.

On the motion before us are there any other speakers? MLA Hoffman.

Ms Hoffman: Yeah. Happy to wait if any UCP members want to speak, but I do want to respond to the budget documents, so if there are none, I go for it?

The Chair: You're recognized.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the clerk responding with this budget so quickly. I want to make sure that we know what we're being asked to vote on here today. What's being proposed is \$800-a-day compensation for each of the panel members, including the chair. Just for context, if you make minimum wage, you make \$120 a day. A quick Google search said that the average Albertan makes \$300 a day. We're proposing nearly triple that per day for each individual committee member. I can't in good conscience vote for a budget that is based on that assumption.

Also, for the GIS staff, staff being compensated to be able to create these maps: \$190,000. Again, this is work that's already been done through the typical process twice, through an interim report and a final report, and the final report did have majority support. This seems like an exorbitant amount to be spending. If you think about it in the context of how many educational assistants you could hire with that \$190,000 plus the \$180,000 for the committee member compensation, it would go a long way to helping kids in my riding be able to catch up on learning gaps that they have. Those are probably the most egregious parts of this budget, in my opinion, and the lion's share of the budget, and then what's being asked for is an additional \$20,000 over the amount that even what I think is already a very generous budget is asking for.

3:30

So I do have some significant concerns around this not being reflective of the folks that we're representing and what typical Albertans expect us to be doing with the money that they pay in taxes, that we collect from their royalties. I would have a very hard time defending this to my voters. Therefore, I feel like we owe it to them to vote against this and to at least send people back to the table to come up with a more reasonable budget.

This is a process that I feel has been already fraught with problematic foundations going into it, and as my colleague Member Gray said, showing that we're at least doing things in good faith moving forward would make it less likely to be overturned through court decision. So I think that for even just that rationale around the budget we should oppose this and ask the committee to at least come back with something more defensible when it comes to our constituents. We've already spent a million dollars on this. Now we're being asked to approve another half million. I don't think that people who are struggling to buy groceries or pay for their gas or pay their electricity bills or pay for their insurance or their rent would feel good knowing that we spent more of their tax money on this process, particularly paying folks at those rates when they're really struggling to make ends meet themselves.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Are there any more speakers on this motion? Going twice.

Okay. Then it's time to vote on the motion since we're out of speakers. I'm going to just start with: does anybody object to the motion on the screen? Okay. MLA Gray objects.

Ms Gray: Yes. I would vote no.

The Chair: You vote no.

Any others? MLA Hoffman votes no on this.

Sorry. Oh, all right, then. I was just advised we should do it the other way, so we'll start with in favour, okay? I'm just trying to save us time, but we don't want to get accused of not following the process, so let's start with: those in favour, please say aye.

Are you going to ask for a recorded vote?

Ms Gray: Yes.

The Chair: Then let's do that.

We've got to wait for that till we go through the other process. Who's opposed?

That is carried.

MLA Gray, if you were going to ask for that recorded vote, now would be the time.

Ms Gray: Yes. Recorded, please.

Mr. Getson: Just a clarification, Chair. What did you just rule on? I'm not sure.

The Chair: The motion carried, but a recorded vote has been requested, and we always say yes to that, so we're going to do a recorded vote.

All right. First of all, now, finally, those in the room in favour, please raise your hands.

Mr. Roth: Mr. Rowswell.

The Chair: Okay. On the screen raise your hand so I can see it, please, if you're in favour. I see MLAs Petrovic and Dyck, MLA Singh, and MLA Getson in favour.

Okay. In the room, those opposed, please raise your hand. That's MLA Gray and MLA Hoffman. Those on the screen, if you're opposed, please turn on your camera and raise your hand. MLA Metz and MLA Sabir.

Mr. Roth: Mr. Chair, total for the motion, five; total against, four.

The Chair: Okay.

That is carried.

Okay. That takes us to item 5 on the agenda, a report on the feasibility of micromobility vehicle expenses under the transportation order and caucus expenditure guidelines. Hon. members, the committee received the Report on the Feasibility of Micromobility Vehicle Expenses under the Transportation Order and Caucus Expenditure Guidelines prepared by the Legislative Assembly Office on May 22, 2026. This report was prepared at the direction of the committee at our last meeting, asking the Legislative Assembly Office to examine the feasibility of permitting claims related to the rental of e-scooters and e-bikes under the transportation order. The Legislative Assembly Office included in its report a crossjurisdictional analysis of whether such claims are permitted in other jurisdictions in Canada as well as matters pertaining to insurance liability regulatory considerations.

I would now like to invite Dr. Dave Ludwick, executive director of corporate services with the legislative office, to provide further remarks. Dr. Ludwick, if you will.

Dr. Ludwick: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Members, the Legislative Assembly Office conducted a preliminary review of the feasibility of eligibility of e-scooter- and e-bike-related expenditures under the transportation order and the caucus expenditure guidelines, and our findings can be summarized as follows. E-scooters and e-bikes are an increasingly prevalent mode of short-distance transportation in Alberta. Their relative availability, relative cost-effectiveness, and speed make them an attractive mode of transport when other modes such as taxi, bus, or ride-hailing services are not available. Currently certain forms of transportation are expressly identified as eligible expenses under the transportation order. Micromobility vehicles are not listed or otherwise contemplated as an eligible mode of transportation by members. The caucus expenditure guidelines also do not support expenses related to these modes of transportation.

In preparing the report, we explored how other jurisdictions treat such expenses and also examined insurance liability and safety factors. Generally jurisdictions indicate that micromobility vehicle expenses are not expressly authorized in their rules and that there is limited precedent or policy development in this area. Approximately half of responding jurisdictions indicated that their rules are silent on the eligibility of these expenses while the remainder indicated that such expenses are not currently permitted. Jurisdictions also reported that insurance considerations specific to micromobility vehicles have not been formally assessed.

To understand the insurance and liability factors, we examined the terms and conditions of the standard user agreements for three of the more popular micromobility service providers. The standard user agreements require riders to assume full responsibility for all losses and to release and indemnify the provider and, in many cases, municipalities even where the loss arises from the provider's own negligence. Risk management and insurance, RMI, has advised that the public service's self-insurance program does not generally absorb losses that arise solely because a participant has waived another party's legal liability through contract. As a result, although micromobility vehicles are not categorically excluded from RMI coverage, a member's or employee's agreement to standard rental terms may in practice limit or eliminate the availability of the fund coverage in certain specific circumstances.

This circumstance would bear real risk for members and caucus employees. While members may be afforded protection through RMI for third-party liability, members may not have first-party coverage in certain circumstances. For caucus employees it's unclear whether any insurance coverage would be available, leaving such liability risk in the hands of the employee personally. From a safety perspective, studies and media reports indicate that injury and hospitalization rates associated with the use of micromobility vehicles have increased in recent years. Presentations at health care facilities commonly involve head, neck, facial, dental, spinal, and other injuries resulting from falls as well as collisions with pedestrians, vehicles, and property. Thus, the risks cited above are tangible.

Mr. Speaker, the report recommends that the committee refrain from adding micromobility vehicles as an eligible expense under the transportation order and the caucus expenditure guidelines at this time. There are tangible liability risks for members and staff. Any mitigation of liability risk would likely require the negotiation of corporate agreements with approved service providers. If such agreements are feasible, members and employees would be required to exclusively use those controlled corporate accounts. If these are not feasible, the LAO would need to source supplemental insurance.

3:40

The Chair: Okay. Thanks, Dr. Ludwick. I would now open the floor to any comments, questions, or motions in relation to this agenda item.

Mr. Dyck: Chair, I have a . . .

The Chair: MLA Dyck, go ahead.

Mr. Dyck: Awesome. I'll speak to this here real fast, and then I would like to move a motion here. I appreciate the context. I read the reports as well, so thank you, Dr. Ludwick, for all the context and the research up to this point. I recognize there are some concerns on this, but I do believe that we have an opportunity to also utilize another mode of transportation, which is important.

Maybe I'll move my motion and then make some comments afterwards, if that's okay, Chair.

The Chair: Yes. You have the floor. You just do that.

Mr. Dyck: Okay. I would like to move a motion. It was put on notice, I believe, so maybe I'll just wait for it to get up there. I'll move the motion that

the Special Standing Committee on Members' Services direct the Legislative Assembly Office as follows: (a) to identify existing micromobility service providers operating within Alberta that have the widest geographical availability; (b) assess the feasibility of establishing corporate service agreements with one or more of these micromobility service providers to provide business access to members and caucus staff, including (i) the negotiating of contractual terms that address or mitigate liability risks, including the modification or removal of standard indemnity and waiver provisions, and (ii) the identification of potential options for procuring supplemental insurance coverage to address legal exposure for members, caucus employees, and the Legislative Assembly Office; (c) report to the committee by Friday, June 19, 2026, at 3 p.m. with findings and recommendations, including whether corporate service agreements adequately address identified insurance, liability, and safety concerns; and (d) if the findings under clause (c) indicate that corporate service agreements are not feasible or do not sufficiently mitigate the identified insurance liability and safety concerns, provide recommendations, if possible, for alternative measures to address these concerns.

I appreciate the opportunity to move that motion. A little bit of rationale. I've heard the concerns. I think this allows the LAO to be able to look into and partner with potential conversations with some of the e-scooter companies. This is a pretty common modern transportation option we see right across the province, and this is often a way of actually getting places both faster within the larger centres as well as more affordably. Also, this motion isn't about approving it right now. This isn't just changing those expenses, but we are looking at those liabilities, those safety and operation considerations, and we're looking for more info.

That's my rationale, and I would love the support of the committee on this motion.

The Chair: Okay. The motion is on the table and the motion is also on the screen. Are there any comments? MLA Gray.

Ms Gray: I understand that this motion will just ask for more information and feasibility information, so I imagine we'll get a chance to review what comes back.

The Chair: It says by June 19. May I, MLA Dyck and MLA Gray, ask Dr. Ludwick: do you think there's any chance you could have that answer by June 19?

Dr. Ludwick: In order to be able to answer or address these items, Mr. Chair, the organizations, the companies would have to be willing to play ball in that timeline. I've already opened up

conversations with them. The response has been lackadaisical so far, but we'll continue to make our efforts.

The Chair: Okay. So you'll attempt to do so.

Dr. Ludwick: We will.

The Chair: And also potentially, I suppose, look at other insurance options if the companies themselves won't, as you used the words, play ball.

Dr. Ludwick: Indeed.

The Chair: Okay. MLA Gray, you've still got the floor. I just thought that was context that would be worthy of your attention.

Ms Gray: No. That's helpful to me. Thank you. That solves that.

The Chair: Any other comments on the motion before this committee? I see none.

On the motion before us, if you are in the room and in favour, please raise your hand or say aye. I guess we'll do it that way, as long as we vote. MLA Gray, MLA Hoffman, and MLA Rowswell. Three. If you are on the screen and you're in favour, it might be easier to turn on your camera and raise your hand. Apparently the clerk wants me to have you say aye, so please say aye. See, I don't know who said aye, and that's the problem, why we wanted you to raise your hand. I don't know who said it and who didn't. Is there anybody opposed? On screen? No one's opposed. Okay. No objections.

That's carried.

We'll do the best we can by June 19. I don't think anybody will object if we can't get all the information that we think will be helpful by June 19. We will share with you what we have and continue to try to get enough that it feels like it might be useful and helpful to the committee. I don't imagine anybody will object to that.

That takes us to item 6 on the agenda, constituency services amendment order. Hon. members, on January 28, 2026, the committee approved the 2026-27 Legislative Assembly estimates. The committee will need to reconsider some consequential amendments to the constituency services order as a result. The decisions arising from the budget approved earlier this spring resulted in the member's services allowance formula being changed effective April 1, 2026, and this amendment simply gives effect to that change, which has already been made and passed by the Legislative Assembly of Alberta. The component elements include updating the staffing component to reflect the 4 per cent merit plus 3 per cent cost-of-living increases, which reflects the equivalent of the Alberta public service market adjustment; applying of 1.6 per cent inflationary increases to operations, supply, communications, and postage; and adjusting the \$6,000 member's services allowance component based on a blended staffing cost and operational factor.

At this time I would like to open the floor to any comments, questions, or motions in regard to this agenda item. I see MLA Rowswell has his hand up.

Mr. Rowswell: I'd like to make a motion.

The Chair: MLA Rowswell, if you want to make a motion, this is a time to do that.

Mr. Rowswell: Okay. Great. I'd like to move that the Special Standing Committee on Members' Services approve the Constituency Services Amendment Order, 2026, effective April 1, 2026.

The Chair: Okay. I think that's going to pop up on the screen here. At least I think it is. There it is. Just to be clear, that's what you moved, MLA Rowswell?

Mr. Rowswell: That's right.

The Chair: Okay. The motion is there before us. Is there any further discussion, debate? Or, MLA Rowswell, did you want to continue?

Mr. Rowswell: Yeah. Well, I just think, you know, just approve this and get to ensure the constituency services order accurately reflects current funding levels and formula calculations. We just need to catch up to what we've already approved.

The Chair: Any other comments, questions, debate on this item? Going twice.

Okay. If you're in the room and you are in favour of this motion, please say aye. Three ayes in the room. If you are online and you

are in favour of this motion, please say aye. If you are online and are opposed to this motion, please say no. Hearing none.

That motion is carried.

That takes us to agenda item 7, other business. Do members have any other business to raise at this time? Going twice. Okay. That disposes with that item.

The date of the next meeting is item 8. That'll be at the call of the chair, and we'll try to give you adequate notice.

The next item is adjournment. Who would like to move adjournment?

Mr. Rowswell: I would move adjournment.

The Chair: MLA Rowswell. Are there any opposed to adjournment, online or in the room? Seeing none. This meeting is adjourned.

I thank all the members and I thank particularly the staff for your wonderful service to this committee and look forward to seeing you all at the next scheduled time that we all meet. Thank you.

[The committee adjourned at 3:49 p.m.]

