



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
Fourth Session

Standing Committee
on
Resource Stewardship

Bill 211, Alberta Underground Infrastructure
Notification System Consultation Act
Stakeholder Presentations

Tuesday, February 26, 2019
9 a.m.

Transcript No. 29-4-16

**Legislative Assembly of Alberta
The 29th Legislature
Fourth Session**

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Loyola, Rod, Edmonton-Ellerslie (NDP), Chair
Drysdale, Wayne, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (UCP), Deputy Chair
Shepherd, David, Edmonton-Centre (NDP),* Acting Chair

Babcock, Erin D., Stony Plain (NDP)
Clark, Greg, Calgary-Elbow (AP)
Dang, Thomas, Edmonton-South West (NDP)
Fildebrandt, Derek Gerhard, Strathmore-Brooks (FCP)
Hanson, David B., Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills (UCP)
Kazim, Anam, Calgary-Glenmore (NDP)
Kleinstauber, Jamie, Calgary-Northern Hills (NDP)
Loewen, Todd, Grande Prairie-Smoky (UCP)
Nielsen, Christian E., Edmonton-Decore (NDP)
Panda, Prasad, Calgary-Foothills (UCP)
Payne, Brandy, Calgary-Acadia (NDP)
Piquette, Colin, Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater (NDP)**
Rosendahl, Eric, West Yellowhead (NDP)
Schneider, David A., Little Bow (UCP)***
Schreiner, Kim, Red Deer-North (NDP)

* substitution for Rod Loyola

** substitution for Thomas Dang

*** substitution for Prasad Panda

Also in Attendance

Nixon, Jason, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre (UCP)

Bill 211 Sponsor

Schneider, David A., Little Bow (UCP)

Support Staff

Merwan N. Saher	Clerk
Shannon Dean	Law Clerk and Executive Director of House Services
Stephanie LeBlanc	Senior Parliamentary Counsel
Trafton Koenig	Parliamentary Counsel
Philip Massolin	Manager of Research and Committee Services
Sarah Amato	Research Officer
Nancy Robert	Research Officer
Corinne Dacyshyn	Committee Clerk
Jody Rempel	Committee Clerk
Aaron Roth	Committee Clerk
Karen Sawchuk	Committee Clerk
Rhonda Sorensen	Manager of Corporate Communications
Jeanette Dotimas	Communications Consultant
Tracey Sales	Communications Consultant
Janet Schwegel	Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Participants

Alberta One-Call Corporation

Mike Sullivan, President

Alberta Common Ground Alliance

Ron Glen, Chief Executive Officer, Alberta Roadbuilders & Heavy Construction Association

Al Kemmere, President, Rural Municipalities of Alberta

Melissa Pierce, Edmonton Area Pipeline and Utility Operators' Committee

Michelle Tetreault, Executive Director

Telus Corporation

Darcy Hurlock, Operations Manager

Shaw Communications

Ian Phillips, Manager, Government and Regulatory Affairs

BCE

Philippe Gauvin, Assistant General Counsel, Consumer and Retail Business Regulation

TransCanada Corporation

Armand Cardinal, Aboriginal and Community Relations

9 a.m. Tuesday, February 26, 2019

[Mr. Shepherd in the chair]

The Acting Chair: Well, good morning, everyone. I'd like to call this meeting to order. Welcome to the members, staff, and guests in attendance for this meeting of the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship.

My name is David Shepherd, MLA for Edmonton-Centre and substituting for today as chair of this committee. I would ask that members and those joining the committee at the table introduce themselves for the record, and then I'll call on those joining in via teleconference.

Mr. Drysdale: Wayne Drysdale, MLA for Grande Prairie-Wapiti.

Mr. Nixon: Jason Nixon, MLA for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre.

Mr. Hanson: David Hanson, Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills.

Mr. Schneider: Dave Schneider, Little Bow.

Mr. Rosendahl: Eric Rosendahl, West Yellowhead.

Mr. Kleinsteuber: Good morning. Jamie Kleinsteuber, MLA for Calgary-Northern Hills.

Mr. Piquette: Hello. Colin Piquette, MLA for Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater, substituting for Thomas Dang.

Ms Payne: Good morning. Brandy Payne, MLA for Calgary-Acadia.

Mr. Nielsen: Good morning, everyone. Chris Nielsen, MLA for Edmonton-Decore.

Mr. Koenig: Good morning. I'm Trafton Koenig with the Parliamentary Counsel office.

Dr. Massolin: Good morning. Philip Massolin, manager of research and committee services.

Mr. Roth: Good morning. Aaron Roth, committee clerk.

The Acting Chair: Excellent.

And on the phones we have Member McPherson. Not yet? Okay. My apologies.

Mr. Clark: Good morning. Greg Clark, MLA, Calgary-Elbow.

Ms Kazim: Good morning. Anam Kazim, MLA for Calgary-Glenmore.

Mr. Loewen: Todd Loewen, MLA, Grande Prairie-Smoky.

Mrs. Schreiner: Good morning. Kim Schreiner, MLA for Red Deer-North.

The Acting Chair: Excellent. Thank you.

I'd like to note for the record the following substitutions: of course, myself today, Mr. Shepherd, for Member Loyola as chair, Mr. Piquette for Mr. Dang, Mr. Schneider for Mr. Panda.

A few housekeeping items before we turn to the business at hand. Please note that the microphones are operated by *Hansard*. Committee proceedings are being live streamed on the Internet and broadcast on Alberta Assembly TV. Please set your cellphones and other devices to silent for the duration of the meeting.

This brings us to our first item, then, the approval of the agenda. A draft agenda for the meeting has been distributed. Does anyone wish to propose any amendments to that agenda?

Mr. Drysdale: Mr. Chair, if I could.

The Acting Chair: Mr. Drysdale.

Mr. Drysdale: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to add 5.1. I'd like to have a discussion on

the presentation from the government departments.

I think you remember that at the last meeting, for those that were here, I was a little bit, you know, forceful or I went on too long about making sure that they had a commitment about who was going to be responsible for this. In the end we decided not to add it in the motion, but reading the report, nobody has taken responsibility, so I'd just like to have a discussion about that under 5.1 if we could. I think everybody remembers. I was a little belligerent about it. Sorry. Obviously, I should have been tougher because it didn't result.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Drysdale.

Mr. Drysdale has proposed to amend the agenda to include an item at 5.1 as indicated. Is there any discussion on Mr. Drysdale's motion? Seeing and hearing none, I'll call the question on the amendment to the agenda. All those in favour of amending the agenda as suggested by Mr. Drysdale, please say aye. Any opposed? On the phones, anyone opposed?

That motion is carried.

Do we have any further amendments to the agenda? Seeing and hearing none, is there a member that would move a motion to accept the agenda as amended?

Mr. Nielsen: So moved.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Nielsen.

I'll call the question. All those in favour of the amended agenda, please say aye. On the phones? Any opposed? That motion is carried.

That brings us, then, to the meeting minutes. We have the minutes from the January 23, 2019, and January 25, 2019, meetings. Were there any errors or omissions to note?

Mr. Drysdale: Mr. Chair.

The Acting Chair: Mr. Drysdale.

Mr. Drysdale: No errors, but I guess the omission was there about my – I mean, you captured the motions. The minutes are correct. I'm fine with that. It's just that it seems we made such a point. I wish the minutes would have captured now the fact that we asked for a commitment. That's all. The minutes are correct. I just wish they would have – there was some omission there on that.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Drysdale. So if I understand you correctly, you just wanted to note your thoughts on that; you're not proposing to amend the minutes.

Mr. Drysdale: Correct.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Drysdale.

Are there any errors or omissions anyone would care to note? If not, is there a member that would move a motion to accept the minutes as distributed . . .

Mr. Rosendahl: So moved.

The Acting Chair: Mr. Rosendahl, thank you.

... for January 23rd? We'll begin with the January 23rd minutes. All those in favour of accepting those as distributed, please say aye. Any opposed?

Mr. Drysdale: One opposed.

The Acting Chair: Okay. We have one opposed. That motion is carried.

Then we have the minutes from January 25th. Do we have a motion to accept those as distributed?

Mr. Nielsen: So moved.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Nielsen.

All those in favour? Any opposed? That motion is carried.

That brings us to the substance of our meeting today, the review of Bill 211, the Alberta Underground Infrastructure Notification System Consultation Act. Hon. members, at the committee's January 25, 2019, meeting the committee agreed to receive written submissions from stakeholders by February 15, 2019. The committee received 15 written submissions from identified stakeholders. In addition, the committee also received a written submission from the sponsor of Bill 211, the Alberta Underground Infrastructure Notification System Consultation Act, Mr. David Schneider, MLA for Little Bow; a written submission from Mr. Colin Piquette, MLA for Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater; and a written briefing from the Ministry of Energy. Research Services has prepared a summary of the written submissions received by February 15, 2019. This document was posted to the committee's internal website on February 20, 2019. I'd like to invite Dr. Massolin to just provide a quick overview of the written submission summary.

Dr. Massolin.

Dr. Massolin: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd be pleased to do so. I hope everybody has had a chance to refer to the document. It's the summary of written submissions on Bill 211. There were 15 written submissions from stakeholders that have been received by the committee as well as a briefing from Mr. David Schneider. Those were all posted and received before the February 15 deadline, and all the material included in those has been summarized in this document. As you are aware, there are other written briefings from the government and Mr. Piquette that have also been posted to the committee's website but have not been summarized in this document.

This document deals with the submissions in kind of a two-part situation. It prioritizes the submissions that have to do with the bill itself in terms of proposing recommendations; in other words, on the consultation piece and on the report. As you can see on pages 6 and 7 of the document, you have issues relating to the general consultation process, consultation regarding municipal matters, and consultation pertaining to the construction industry.

As an example of that, as the committee members can see on page 6, the rural municipality association is concerned with consultation on the following matters should Bill 211 pass, and those are: how underground infrastructure related to irrigation and also other underground infrastructure such as power lines will be addressed in the program when underground infrastructure and land are owned by the same person; secondly, the financial costs of registering a dissolving municipality's underground infrastructure; thirdly, locating and registering old and/or disused underground infrastructure for which there are no records.

The Alberta Roadbuilders & Heavy Construction Association recommended that as part of the committee's consultation process

"the system of costs and incentives that influence or hinder an efficient service" be reviewed.

Concerning the report that Bill 211 proposes, Trans Mountain requested that if Bill 211 is enacted, once the committee completes the consultation process proposed or outlined in the bill, it should provide a copy of the draft report to those stakeholders that are listed in section 3 of the bill for review and for comment.

Now, the second part of the submission summary pertains to a more general treatment of the underground infrastructure notification system, and it can be summarized basically in a threefold way. These submissions are concerned about damage to the underground infrastructure and the associated costs. There are also a number of submissions that had to do with and talked about sort of the cost delays that are associated with the notification system, registering, and so forth for contractors who may have to put their projects on hold as a result of this. Thirdly but not least, of course: the safety issue that is associated with registering underground infrastructure.

9:10

I'll end off just sort of by reiterating some of the key elements to be included in the legislation, should legislation come forward, on a notification system, and those are listed in the executive summary of this document. There are comments about sort of the need to implement robust enforcement provisions; also, that there is a need for a gradual implementation approach to allow municipalities to meet the requirements of the legislation; that provisions for different methods of notification should be provided for; and lastly, that provisions should identify and address the differences between registered and unregistered underground infrastructure.

I will stop there, Mr. Chair, and answer questions if there are any.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Dr. Massolin.

Do any members have any questions for Dr. Massolin regarding the submissions summary document? Anyone on the phones?

Seeing and hearing none, we'll move on to the next section. It has been the practice of this and other committees to make a decision on whether or not to publicly post written submissions received during inquiries and reviews to the committee's public website. I will note for the record that the correspondence inviting these submissions explicitly mentioned that the committee may make the submission and the identity of its author public. I would now like to open the floor to a discussion regarding making public the written submissions received as part of the committee's review of Bill 211. Mr. Rosendahl.

Mr. Rosendahl: Yes. I would like to move that

the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship make all written submissions and written briefings received by the committee as part of the review of Bill 211, Alberta Underground Infrastructure Notification System Consultation Act, available on the public website with the exception of personal contact information, if any.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Rosendahl.

We have a motion on the floor, then, to make these submissions and written briefings public. Do we have any discussion on the motion? Anyone on the phones? If not, then I will call the question. All those in favour of the motion, please say aye. Any opposed?

That motion carries.

That brings us, then, to the directions for the committee report. Hon. members, at the committee's January 25, 2019, meeting the committee agreed to hear oral presentations from identified stakeholders in relation to its review of Bill 211, the Alberta Underground Infrastructure Notification System Consultation Act.

As part of that, then, our first presenter today is Mr. Michael Sullivan from Alberta One-Call. Mr. Sullivan, we've allotted you 10 minutes, then, to make your presentation, after which committee members will have an opportunity to ask questions. I do see that you have a couple of others with you. If you wouldn't mind introducing them as well, and then please go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Sullivan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. On my left I have Mr. Tom Kee. He's the executive director of the Federation of Alberta Gas Co-ops. On my right I have Mr. Perry Ellis. He's one of the board members for Alberta One-Call, representing the Federation of Alberta Gas Co-ops.

Thank you very much for having us here today. Appreciate the invitation. I'm going to jump right into it. There's a vast energy and utility network, hundreds of thousands of kilometres of length, across Alberta. This complex system transports hydrocarbons, energy, water, data, and communications throughout the province to neighbouring Canadians and to customers in the United States and beyond. Undeniably, this network provides a constant, reliable support to Alberta's economic engine, and as a province all available means to protect it should be engaged.

On March 2, 1979, almost 40 years ago to the day, a young man by the name of Peter Clark unknowingly drove a glass delivery truck through a plume of propane gas in Mill Woods, Alberta. The plume ignited, severely burned Mr. Clark, who spent months recovering in the Edmonton burn unit. Nineteen thousand people were evacuated in Mill Woods and the surrounding area that day. The cause of the incident was traced back to a leaking propane pipeline that had been damaged by mechanical excavating equipment. Now, whoever had damaged the pipeline had tried to repair it and covered it up. As time passed, the repair failed, and the heavier-than-air propane escaped, following the path of least resistance, into ditches, sewers, basements, and migrating across the road, where Peter Clark, unfortunately, drove through it.

[A video was shown from 9:15 a.m. to 9:17 a.m.]

That incident was a catalyst for creating Alberta One-Call. It can be traced back to the beginning of the damage prevention movement across Canada. Alberta One-Call Corporation is a nonprofit corporation and since October 1, 1984, has provided the communication service between the digging community and the owners of buried facilities to identify, locate, and mark those facilities before a ground disturbance takes place. There is no cost for those placing a locate request to Alberta One-Call. Our revenues are generated from notifications to our members. The service is governed by a 14-member board of directors comprised of the buried-utility companies that incorporated the service in 1983. These member companies knew then that a better system was needed to protect public, worker, and community safety as well as a network of underground infrastructure across Alberta from uncontrolled excavations.

Alberta One-Call's services are simple. Buried utilities register the location of their assets with Alberta One-Call, excavators submit a locate request to Alberta One-Call prior to digging, Alberta One-Call processes the locate request in relation to its mapping system and notifies its members of the proposed excavation in the vicinity of their buried assets. Those member companies will either locate and mark their buried utilities prior to excavation with the universal colour code, deliver an all-clear to proceed with the excavation, or request to meet the excavating party on-site to review the proposed digging activity in more detail.

Prior to the existence of Alberta One-Call a diligent excavator would have pulled title from the land titles offices to determine

whether or not buried utilities were present in the vicinity of their planned excavation and then would have had to contact the owners of those utilities directly with a request to identify them prior to excavation, or the diligent excavator would have had to conduct a sweep to identify the presence of any underground infrastructure. Either way, the process took a considerable amount of time and resources, and the risk of hitting and damaging underground infrastructure was high.

The integrity of the damage prevention process was significantly enhanced with the introduction of a one-call service in Alberta. From a design and operations perspective there is a tremendous level of confidence shared by the owners, operators, and regulators of those utilities. When these buried assets are encroached on by uncontrolled excavation, however, public safety, the integrity of the energy and utility network as well as the integrity of Alberta's brand are exposed to unnecessary risk and consequence, resulting in damaged underground infrastructure, interruption of service, environmental damage, serious injury, or even death.

Thirty-five years after Alberta One-Call took its first locate request, the core function of our service remains the same, but how the process is carried out has changed considerably. Today, with over 850 individual buried-utility members subscribing to our services, up from the original 14, Alberta One-Call is recognized as one of the most progressive one-call notification centres in North America.

9:20

Since October 1984 the corporation has processed over 10 million locate requests and notified its members across the province of proposed excavations near their assets over 40 million times. The corporation continues to seize technology to enhance and improve its services and has reinvented itself with the passage of time, always moving the damage prevention needle closer to its ultimate safety objective: all buried utilities registered and a locate request secured before every ground disturbance.

As an example of how we are staying relevant, seven years ago Alberta One-Call changed its long-standing call to action from Call Before You Dig to Click Before You Dig, and in doing so, it initiated a dramatic and lasting shift in the way the public accesses its services. As recently as 2010 over 80 per cent of all locate requests were made by phone, with the balance originating by way of the web and fax. Today fax has been eliminated, and over 80 per cent of all locate requests now originate on the web. The shift to the web has improved user interface, simplified the locate request process, and reduced wait times. All of these factors improve user experience and help Albertans request a locate before every ground disturbance. Earlier this month Alberta One-Call along with B.C. One Call and Click Before You Dig MB launched one-call access, a new locate request software that further capitalizes and simplifies the web locate process.

With such a robust history in serving and protecting Albertans and improving the integrity of Alberta's underground network, upon which our economy relies, why is legislation necessary? Despite our history of growth in membership and use and the advances in technology improving access to the damage prevention process and its integrity, damages to underground infrastructure continue to occur. The root cause in the majority of these cases remains the failure to request a locate prior to excavation. For example, over 3,500 damages to underground infrastructure were voluntarily reported to the Alberta Common Ground Alliance in 2017. In 51 per cent of those cases failure to request a locate prior to excavation was identified as the root cause. In contrast, when a locate request is made to Alberta One-Call, the risk of damage is less than 1 per cent.

Beyond the obvious danger to public safety and environment, societal costs as a result of these damages such as emergency response, evacuation, repair, loss of business/revenue, and loss of essential safety services such as 911 are costing taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars every year. A recent report by the Canadian Common Ground Alliance estimates the societal costs associated with damage in Alberta at a staggering \$350 million in 2017 alone.

Alberta One-Call's damage prevention education, advocacy, and awareness budget ranges between \$400,000 and \$500,000 annually, and we're not alone in this endeavour. Combined, our buried-utility members spend millions of dollars every year promoting Click Before You Dig on radio, television, sporting events, social media campaigns, on countless pens, mugs, mouse pads, ball caps, jackets, shirts, trucks, billboards, even on the side of an Enbridge tank at the Sherwood Park terminal facing the intersection of Baseline Road and the Anthony Henday. Together we will continue to promote the message and to educate the public to reduce damages, but there is a strong sense that our collective damage prevention awareness and education has reached its limit.

The Acting Chair: Mr. Sullivan, I'll just note that we have reached the 10-minute mark, but I'll give you a moment just to wrap up your remarks.

Mr. Sullivan: Thanks. One of our more famous ads states: click before you dig costs you nothing; not clicking before you dig could cost you everything. It's our responsibility to keep our citizens safe. When imposed, the legislation being considered will once again underline Alberta's leadership and commitment to public, worker, and community safety, environmental protection and stewardship and provide the last ingredients to ultimately secure a reliable and comprehensive, end-to-end damage prevention process for Alberta.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Sullivan.

With that, then, I'll open the floor now if there are some questions from committee members. Mr. Schneider, please go ahead.

Mr. Schneider: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through you, I'd just like to ask a couple of questions of our guests this morning. This bill, Bill 211, kind of is more to ask the Legislature if they would be prepared to move ahead with legislation. If this committee determined in their report to the Legislature that this is how this should proceed, how do you see this affecting Alberta One-Call operations?

Mr. Sullivan: Quite simply, it would be more of the same, really. With 80 per cent of all locate requests originating on the web, with the new software we have, a human doesn't even touch the processing anymore. The software will automatically process a locate request and notify our members. So there's no human intervention there. There would be very little impact to Alberta One-Call's ability to provide services, if any.

Mr. Schneider: Through the chair, if I may, how many members are actually registered with Alberta One-Call, and what kind of a percentage of the overall would that be?

Mr. Sullivan: Right now roughly 875 members are registered with Alberta One-Call. In terms of those who are not registered, the estimate has been perhaps half. We have half in the province. There are a lot of smaller utilities that would comprise that number as well, but there are also some major utilities extending across the province that Albertans rely on every single day that are not registered.

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chair, another question?

The Acting Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Schneider.

Mr. Schneider: So there is no law requiring registration? This is voluntary other than with the AER and the NEB?

Mr. Sullivan: That's right. Other than with the AER and the NEB, it's completely voluntary.

Mr. Schneider: Okay. Any idea who may be opposed to legislation like this?

Mr. Sullivan: Yes.

Mr. Schneider: Oh. Do you care to elaborate?

Mr. Sullivan: Sure. There are a couple that are opposed. One that comes to mind is Shaw cable. There has been history, going back to the Wheatland county decision with the CRTC, where they chose not to be a member of Alberta One-Call even when that was a condition of placing facilities in a Wheatland county right-of-way. They have their own Dig Shaw service, 1.800.DIG.SHAW. I know the data in terms of the number of relocate requests we receive relative to what they receive, and it's not comparable.

Mr. Schneider: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Acting Chair: Thank you.

I have Mr. Rosendahl.

Mr. Rosendahl: Well, thank you for your presentation. I recall meeting with you with our rural caucus, and it was great to see you again today, for sure.

We know that severing underground infrastructure is economically damaging. Do we know how often people are injured when this happens?

Mr. Sullivan: It's infrequent. Injuries are, thankfully, infrequent. However, there are upwards of 3,000 to 4,000 voluntarily reported damages every year, and the potential for injury is always there because if a person is not requesting a locate, you're effectively digging blind. You have no idea what you're going to be digging into. That possibility of injury is always there. Thankfully, Mr. Rosendahl, that doesn't happen often, but in 51 per cent of the cases that we are seeing, it could have.

Mr. Rosendahl: Okay. Thank you for that.

Can I . . .

The Acting Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Rosendahl.

Mr. Rosendahl: Okay. You mentioned in your presentation about some of the utilities. Do you have a full list of all the utilities that you're responsible for under Alberta One-Call?

Mr. Sullivan: Yes.

Mr. Rosendahl: Can you expand on that?

Mr. Sullivan: It's a long list, obviously. We receive their data. We put it into our mapping system. We send it back to them for confirmation that it's accurate, and this is done for all of our members. Some members that have a vast network – I'll use Telus or ATCO Gas as an example – are updating their buried infrastructure on a routine basis. They will qualify their data perhaps monthly. Other members don't expand their assets very often, once a year.

I'm not sure how you want me to qualify that, but we have everything from transmission pipelines to distribution, gas, telecommunications, water and sewer, municipal services. They run the complete gamut across the province.

Mr. Rosendahl: Okay. Thank you.
Do you want me to continue?

The Acting Chair: You have a follow-up, Mr. Rosendahl?

9:30

Mr. Rosendahl: Sure. In your presentation I'd like to ask about the term "the integrity of Alberta's brand" on page 3 of your report. By that do you mean a sort of reputational risk? Can you clarify that statement?

Mr. Sullivan: I do. Thanks for bringing that to everybody's attention. That was intentional to put it in there. There's no question that Alberta's economic engine is supported by the vast array of underground assets across the province. They provide the means for everyday life, and I do mean that we need to take every reasonable means to protect it. If we don't, then there is a risk to Alberta's brand. We've seen in the news when there is damage, whether it's a pipeline or it's a telecommunications underground asset that is damaged, that's news, and it gets in the news, whether it's a business owner who may have lost \$30,000 in revenue or it's an environmental catastrophe. We don't need that. We need to take every reasonable means to protect it. It's not only the public community workers' safety, but it is Alberta's brand, and I firmly believe that.

Mr. Rosendahl: Okay. Thank you.

The Acting Chair: Thank you very much.

I have a couple of speakers in the room coming up. I just quickly want to check in. Is there anyone on the phones that would wish to be on the speakers list?

Hearing none, I'll continue with those in the room. Mr. Hanson.

Mr. Hanson: Thank you, Chair. I just have a couple of questions. I used to use your service probably on a monthly or sometimes a weekly basis in my previous job in the oil and gas industry, and we had pretty severe penalties within our corporation. Probably the quickest way to exit your job was to hit a line strike even after One-Call. What are the current penalties? Are there any penalties out there? Who pays for a line strike in the event that somebody has used your service or not used the service? Is it just basically decided in court, or is it something that we should be looking at putting in this legislation?

Mr. Sullivan: There are very few enforcement tools, monetary penalties. The only one that comes to mind right now, which is fairly recent, is the administrative monetary penalties under the National Energy Board, which is fairly recent, within the last five years. They have the authority to impose a monetary penalty on somebody involved in that damage, but that's on the NEB-regulated facilities only. For all other utilities there is no penalty. There is a civil action. Many of the utility owners will embark upon that path. Alberta One-Call, we often get pulled into that as well to testify or provide feedback on our process. In terms of claims against Alberta One-Call, just like everybody else, when there's a damage, we get named, and once they realize what our role is in the process and they were notified, the utility was notified, then we just get pulled out of it.

But there are perilously few penalties. Should that be in the proposed legislation? I believe there should be an enforcement

ladder. What I mean by that is that education awareness should always be part of that first element of that enforcement ladder. If you have repeat offenders, if you have parties that fail to be diligent, for whatever the case may be, on a routine basis, then that hammer has to come down eventually. There is a document that I took part in writing. It's the damage prevention elements for legislation in Canada by the Alberta Common Ground Alliance, and there is one section in that document with regard to enforcement and penalties, that having that escalation enforcement ladder is critical.

Mr. Hanson: Okay. Thank you.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Hanson.
I have Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Nixon: Well, thanks, Mr. Chair. Through you to our guests, thanks for taking the time to come and spend some time with us today. I have one question and a follow-up if that's okay. I have a technical brief in front of me that I recognize, probably, that I guess I have not seen, a technical brief from the government, from Municipal Affairs. Inside this technical brief they provide us a line that says that the utilities have advised Municipal Affairs that it's easier and more cost-effective to repair damaged underground infrastructure than to identify it and map it. I'd like to know what your thoughts are on that statement. I mean, do you think that that is true, that it is more cost-effective to just repair these types of damaged underground lines, or is it more cost-effective to map it and do what you're presenting or what this bill would ask for?

Mr. Sullivan: An ounce of prevention is always where the value is, and I disagree that not registering and risking damage makes financial sense. It doesn't.

Right now on the Alberta One-Call board of directors I have the city of Edmonton and the city of Calgary, two of the largest municipalities in Alberta, that are part of Alberta One-Call. They were part of the board members that created the Alberta One-Call Corporation. They're very active on the board, and their engagement tells me everything I need to know in terms of that it's far more equitable, far more safe, far more integral to the buried infrastructure as well as your citizens to register the underground infrastructure and locate. Over time you can begin to make that data more precise and not be overnotified, absolutely. But when a notification is \$2.35 or \$2.40 versus heavy yellow equipment sitting on-site for \$1,000 a day, the economics get pretty clear.

Mr. Nixon: Then my follow-up, Mr. Chair, is that the provincial government, as you know, does not have jurisdiction over telecommunication service providers. My understanding is that their infrastructure is one of the key concerns usually when I hear about this, so I don't know if you have any thoughts on how the government or this committee or the Legislature while looking at this bill could approach that issue.

Mr. Sullivan: Well, telecommunications underground infrastructure quite often predominantly is located in public rights-of-way, where you do have jurisdiction. Making it a requirement for all underground infrastructure within a public right-of-way to register with Alberta One-Call would be one way to tackle that.

Mr. Nixon: Thanks, Mr. Chair. That's all I have.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Nixon.
Mr. Rosendahl, you had further questions?

Mr. Rosendahl: Sure. When I was reviewing your presentation, root cause of damage, we can see that all damage has happened

because either people don't phone or whatever. Can you maybe give us a little bit more information about what kind of public education programs that are under way so that people are actually making use of the service?

Mr. Sullivan: Sure. I look at public education like layers of an onion. On the outside we have the vast, whether it's radio or television, campaigns that we've had in the past, then drilling down to education seminars or open houses, that type of thing, or conferences, exhibits, or we meet with the digging community at their location. We have two what we call Dig Safe ambassadors, one in Calgary and one in Edmonton, and one of the gentlemen is here with us today. Their primary role is to meet people, boots on the ground, the parties who are digging in the major urban centres of Calgary and Edmonton. We have our social media campaigns, where Alberta One-Call actually has the most followers of any one-call centre in Canada, perhaps in North America. We make great use of that social media campaign with our annual uptick in terms of followers. People viewing our information is always extremely high.

Then our members as well. You'll see Click Before You Dig on pamphlets, in presentations, on vehicles, business cards. It's everywhere. Their spend on education awareness in this province alone that is so pipelinecentric, the total sum of the cost of our education awareness program, not just Alberta One-Call but along with our members, whether it's TransCanada or Enbridge or Atco Gas or Telus, is in the multiple millions of dollars. I don't think there's anybody in Alberta worth their salt whose job is to dig for a living that hasn't heard of us.

Mr. Rosendahl: Well, thank you very much for that. I have a follow-up question if I may.

The Acting Chair: Please go ahead.

Mr. Rosendahl: Do you have any insight as to why people are reluctant to pick up the phone or head to the website and ask for locating services? Do you have any comments that you could make?

9:40

Mr. Sullivan: Sure. Yeah. The damage prevention process is only triggered when somebody makes that locate request. Once that process begins, then there's a series of other processes that have to follow. In Alberta, particularly, and the rest of Canada, really, big time here and across the prairies, we jam 12 months of construction into about six or seven months. When that happens, if we have a late spring, then we might be seeing that wall of locate requests coming very quickly, and the locating community that is required to physically go out and locate and mark the underground infrastructure is going to be overtaxed, and they will get behind.

When that process starts to slow down, then people are getting frustrated. They may take their chances and not request a locate. Adversely, if we have an early spring, then sometimes the locating contractors aren't ready yet because their training hasn't been completed or whatever the case may be, and they're behind again. It's very time sensitive. I'm not, you know, looking at the locating community as being the culprit here, but there is a series of processes that have to go along in a very timely fashion to maintain the overall damage prevention process on that clock, and when one of those starts to fall back, then the confidence in the system begins to wane. If that happens, there are people who are saying: "You know what? I'm just going to go out and do my excavation without a locate."

The other part is the economy. Right now there are a lot fewer projects to bid on, and bids are coming in lower and lower. Perhaps

there'll be some, "I'm going to take my chances and not do a locate request because I might have a delay," and if that's the case, they might get the job sooner than somebody else because they don't have delays. But the risks are higher. Fifty-one per cent of the time there is no locate request, and that means 49 per cent of the time there is, but in 1 per cent of the damages there's always – always – a locate request 99 per cent of the time.

Mr. Rosendahl: Okay. Well, thank you.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Rosendahl. I do have another speaker, but we can come back to you if you like.

Mr. Hanson.

Mr. Hanson: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Thanks again for coming. Just a question on the current criteria, especially when it comes to farming. Is there a depth requirement for excavations or fencing? I know that there was an incident up by Bonnyville years back where a fellow was digging a rock out in the middle of his field and hit a fibre-optic line that knocked out the whole northeast quadrant of the province. How do we reach out to the farming community and make sure that they're aware of what their requirements are?

Mr. Sullivan: For the farming community, the agricultural community, we've had actually specific advertisement on the radio. In fact, my colleague beside me, Perry Ellis, said, you know, "I don't know how you guys do it," but I hear it when I'm out working in the field. I'll hear the Alberta One-Call ad specific for agricultural.

In terms of depth, I don't like to go there. The reason why – I mean, people go: if it's less than 30 centimetres, then, you know, you don't have to make a locate request. But the bottom line is that you don't know. Until you see it, you don't know if it's 30 centimetres below ground. Always request a locate. It just takes a second, a couple of minutes, and then you know for sure. Then you're not going to take out a fibre optic that's going to take out all services in the northeast part of a community or the province. Until you know the depth, until you've exposed it, you have no idea how deep it is.

Mr. Hanson: If I could just follow up. So basically it's just further education?

Mr. Sullivan: We also work closely with the Canadian Association of Energy and Pipeline Landowner Associations, CAEPLA. We advertise in their magazine that goes out to their farm, landowner base, 50,000-strong across the country. We have a great working relationship with them through the Canadian Common Ground Alliance. CAEPLA is on the CCGA's board of directors.

Mr. Hanson: Okay. If I could just follow up with that. Is there any requirement or do you see the need for any requirement, for signage, you know, in the case of a fibre-optic line that is crossing multiple quarter sections or sections of land and, being that land changes hands quite often, just letting people know, some way of indicating that there's something there?

Mr. Sullivan: Signage or markers of some kind are prevalent for pipelines across the province, whether it's distribution or transmission. Coming to fibre optics, telecommunications, there are markers out there for certain. My view of markers: that's your last-ditch approach.

If we had legislation that required all buried infrastructure to register with Alberta One-Call and all parties to request a locate

prior to, I would hope that that last-ditch effort for signage would not be that necessary.

Mr. Hanson: Okay. Thank you.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Hanson.

We've reached about 20 minutes for questions. Of course, I'm not aware that there was a specific decision made by the committee in terms of how much time to allot for questions.

Mr. Rosendahl, you had one further that you had wanted to ask?

Mr. Rosendahl: Sure. I certainly could.

The Acting Chair: Okay.

Mr. Rosendahl: Being that Alberta One-Call has been providing its service for years – we gathered that from your presentation and that kind of thing; you know, you talked about the educational side of it – in your experience has the issue been getting better or worse? Can you comment on it, say, in comparison to what it was like 10 years ago?

Mr. Sullivan: Absolutely. I've been doing this for 25 to 30 years in various capacities. I've worked with the National Energy Board, I've worked with transmission pipelines companies, I've worked with project management for major infrastructure, and now I'm president of Alberta One-Call Corporation, a nonprofit. I've got a lot of history on this, and it has gotten better, I'd say. Maybe we reached our peak 15, 10 years ago in terms of, you know, you have that push to get to about 80 per cent. It doesn't take a lot of effort to get there, but for that extra 20 or 25 per cent – it takes an enormous amount of energy to reach that 100 per cent. We've been there and hitting ourselves against that glass ceiling for 10 or 15 years.

In terms of awareness and focus on what the objectives are, we've gotten a lot better at it. The Alberta Common Ground Alliance is a major part of that. Their objectives are very similar to ours. We have the service; they have that Rolodex of all damage prevention stakeholders across the province, not just utility owners. Together we walk that parallel path. Without the Alberta Common Ground Alliance we wouldn't be where we are today, but now we're at that point, the two of us together, where we can't seem to get any further. We've reached that point where legislation, we believe, is the last remaining element, ingredient, to bring us to that holistic damage prevention, end-to-end process.

Mr. Rosendahl: Oh, okay. If I may, do you have anything further to add on that, when you talk about the legislation, by chance?

Mr. Sullivan: I don't know if now is the time to go through the legislation, what I would perceive it to be, except that its most succinct element would be that all underground infrastructure that is for public use be registered with Alberta One-Call and a locate request be required prior to every ground disturbance. Right now only with the National Energy Board and the Alberta Energy Regulator is there a requirement when digging within 30 metres, 100 feet, of their pipeline. Nobody knows, when you're standing beside a transmission pipeline, whether you're 30 metres or 32 metres from it.

If legislation like this was imposed, that required a locate request before every ground disturbance, the playing field is levelled. It doesn't matter where you are in the province. You have to request a locate to know what's below, to identify the buried infrastructure. When that happens, a damage prevention process is initiated – it's triggered – and one by one by one the procedures that follow to

protect the underground infrastructure, the integrity of Alberta's brand, as I spoke about earlier, and public, worker, and community safety are going to be enacted. The results, as we've seen, when that process is triggered are phenomenal, and there's no reason at this point in our existence, 35 years later, that we should not be adopting and bringing in this type of legislation.

Mr. Rosendahl: Okay. Thank you.

Do we have more time? I don't know.

The Acting Chair: I think, out of respect to the other presenters that we have, that we should probably move forward.

Thank you, Mr. Sullivan. I appreciate your coming and making this presentation to the committee today.

9:50

With that, then, I think we'll call on our next presenter, from the Alberta Common Ground Alliance.

Excellent. Our next presenter, then, is the Alberta Common Ground Alliance, represented by Ms Michelle Tetreault, Ms Melissa Pierce, Mr. Al Kemmere, and Mr. Ron Glen. Again, we've allotted 10 minutes for you to make your presentation, after which committee members will have the opportunity to ask some questions.

With that, I'd ask you to please go ahead.

Ms Tetreault: Thank you very much, Chair Shepherd and committee members. Thank you for inviting us to present today on Bill 211. The Alberta Common Ground Alliance is a nonprofit organization dedicated to improving worker safety, public safety, and protecting the environment. This is achieved through identifying and validating and promoting the adoption of effective ground disturbance and damage prevention practices.

The prevention of damage to buried facilities has many stakeholders who are mutually dependent upon the successful execution of one another's roles and responsibilities in the overall process. The exchange of accurate and timely information during the damage prevention process together with the genuine interest by all stakeholders for a successful outcome is critical. Prevention of damage to buried facilities is a responsibility shared amongst all stakeholders.

We are a unique organization that represents the interests of the stakeholders demonstrated by this slide. I want to take a moment to recognize some of my colleagues in the gallery today who have taken the time out of their busy work schedules, travelling across the province to provide support today. They represent those 13 stakeholders that you see on the screen before you. We work together to develop best practices and training standards that are shared and practised amongst all stakeholders.

Our members also voluntarily report damages to buried infrastructure called a DIRT report. As Mike earlier reported, we receive over 3,500 reports annually. These damages are costing Albertans approximately \$960,000 a day. This is to taxpayers; this is to utilities; this is to contractors' work. If the damage prevention process is followed, as Mike mentioned, these costs would drastically decrease. Eighty per cent of damages cause a service disruption, and 99 per cent of the time the damage is avoided when a locate request is required. Our members represent a variety of industries. However, we all share one common goal: damage prevention legislation that levels the playing field for the asset owners, the locators, and the excavators.

I'd like to take some of my 10 minutes to introduce three of our stakeholders who are better prepared to talk about Bill 211 than I am: Melissa Pierce with the Edmonton Area Pipeline and Utility Operators' Committee, which is considered EAPUOC; Al

Kemmere, president of the rural municipalities association; and Ron Glen, executive director of the Alberta Roadbuilders & Heavy Construction Association.

Melissa.

Ms Pierce: Good morning, everyone. I've been involved with EAPUOC for over six years and am the environment and regulatory lead for the pipelines group at Suncor Energy.

As we have been discussing, the urban subsurface plays a key role in accommodating services and other essential resources to meet our communities' ability to grow safely. Be it water, telephone, Internet, utilities, petroleum or industrial products, there are many complex and integrated networks underfoot that require our careful attention. Companies that operate underground pipes and cables work hard to remind developers, construction companies, contractors, and residents to prevent damages to critical structure and infrastructure. Hitting an underground utility line while digging can cause serious injuries or fatalities; disrupt the entire neighbourhood, including 911 emergency services; and potentially result in fines and costly repairs. Even minor marks or dents can compromise a buried utility's overall integrity and lead to problems many years later.

The historic Mill Woods incident, that Alberta One-Call has already referenced, is why the Edmonton Area Pipeline and Utility Operators' Committee, or EAPUOC for short, exists. EAPUOC was created in the weeks following this event, and four decades later we continue operating today. We are a not-for-profit society comprised of nearly 40 member organizations of industry, municipalities, and regulators committed to promoting safety around buried infrastructure. We collaborate to educate the industry as well as commercial and residential contractors on safe digging practices around the extensive infrastructure systems that underpin the capital region.

We have achieved many significant milestones in our history. Every two years we host a safety seminar and trade show to promote safe digging practices as well as highlight the findings from near misses and other incidents. This year the safety seminar falls in the same year as the 40th anniversary of the Mill Woods incident. It takes place April 16 in Sherwood Park, and we invite all members of the standing committee to attend.

EAPUOC developed Guidelines for Working Near Buried Facilities, an informative and user-friendly manual to facilitate the safe execution of work around buried facilities for industry and the digging community. This manual has been in circulation for over 30 years, and we distribute up to 15,000 copies annually.

Our close relationships and partnerships with the digging community have improved procedures for locating and have allowed better communication and co-ordination between municipalities, regulators, and buried-facility owners during emergencies. We engage in a broad range of public awareness and education activities, including attendance at public events and at school sessions for elementary-aged children. Prevention of incidents like the Mill Woods incident starts with education and awareness.

These are just a few of the reasons that EAPUOC supports Bill 211. Making it mandatory for anyone digging near utilities to call for a locate request and for utility owners to register their assets with Alberta One-Call Corporation is a huge step in prevention. This is important legislation. So many of our day-to-day needs are met from this critical infrastructure. Just one incident can impact thousands of people in our community. For these reasons, we encourage the standing committee to endorse Bill 211.

Thank you.

Mr. Kemmere: Well, good morning. I know that I've had the chance to meet with most of you at one point or the other, but I am a councillor of Mountain View county and president of the Rural Municipalities of Alberta.

As most of you are aware, we are the association that represents about 85 per cent of the land base in this province, so this is a big item in the landscape of our world and those that we represent. This will have a great implication in the future on a lot of the land that we cover. RMA appreciates the importance of protecting underground infrastructure and workers to complete the work which causes underground disturbance. However, I will emphasize that the devil will be in the details when the legislation is written to make sure that it provides a good balance. The development and implementation of a mandatory centralized notification system requires careful planning to balance consistency around the notification process and understanding the impacts the system will have on the owners of underground infrastructure.

While it is understood that there are long-term benefits to having underground infrastructure registered, doing so will cost municipalities some dollars. To offset this cost, a phased-in and gradual registration approach or one prioritized to certain infrastructure types could be used. We have a tremendous amount of infrastructure that has been put in over the years, prior to good, accurate mapping situations, and the as-built on-sites are not always available, so there will be a big challenge to make sure that we can identify those that we have to and then those that we cannot reasonably register in the process.

RMA welcomes the opportunity to bring forward issues of discussion, including whether water and power supply lines associated with irrigation will be included. I think that you've identified this earlier in your commentary, so I won't go into that too deeply. It is the irrigation systems that have voiced some concerns. The old water lines or the disused water lines within municipal infrastructure: counties were in a rather interesting situation where as viability is a challenge for many small communities, they dissolve. Along with them is a loss of a lot of the paperwork that could help us deal with this in that small, hamlet-type environment. So that needs to be covered in this process also.

There are a few examples of issues that will have to be discussed prior to the implementation of a notification system. RMA supports the passage of Bill 211 as it provides the government of Alberta with the time and resources it needs to undertake meaningful research and recommends that the notification system model be covered in all aspects.

10:00

I had the opportunity to comment on similar legislation through the Canadian Common Ground Alliance, and there are a few things that came up that go back to my roots in agriculture and as a municipal operator. In the situation there initially the way the wording went was that if a farmer was going to be doing any work in the field, they were going to have to notify. So regular everyday practices required notification. Those items were modified to address the reality that farming takes place in the landscape.

Another item that came up was municipal roads, any time a grader would be actually grading on the road. There was an opportunity in the original that you would have to do notification if you were going to do regular grading to the road. That's why I get into that the devil is in the details on this.

Then the other item, talking to my municipalities, that seems to bring the most frustration in this situation is that there are obligations to identify, but there are also obligations for the people who are doing the marking of the assets to respond. We've got many great operators that do respond and do respond on a very

timely basis. The 48-hour threshold is important, but we also have the same problem where we get 10 days for response times. I think that if there's going to be a strong obligation in this for the marking of assets and the notification of One-Call, which I think is a great tool, there needs to be reciprocal responsibility on responding in a timely manner for the identification of those assets. I'll leave it at that.

The Acting Chair: I apologize for interrupting, Mr. Kemmere. I should just note that the 10 minutes set aside have elapsed, if you would like to conclude your remarks. If there is anything further from the other members, then we could wrap it up.

Mr. Kemmere: I'll go to questions if there are some later.

The Acting Chair: Thank you. Sorry about that. Were there any further remarks from any other members? The panel? Quickly, please.

Mr. Glen: Ron Glen with the Alberta Roadbuilders & Heavy Construction Association. Our membership is composed of about 900 member companies, a voluntary business association. Sixty per cent of those are the contractors that are out there doing the work every day, employing tens of thousands of Albertans in the work. We are the front line of all the actual on-the-ground interaction with the utilities. I'm very happy that you're taking an interest in this because, at the end of the day, the liability for making contact with any underground infrastructure falls on the contractor. That's why in our submission we said that if you're looking at this situation, you must look at the entire economic system that drives the potential taking of risk by excavators and why that is occurring. If the service doesn't cost anything, why is that happening?

To be very brief, I would say that it was very interesting during the recent discussion of the pipeline difficulties we've had here that the concept of derisking, that those words came into our vernacular. That has not been the case with what has happened in the last number of years with respect to construction. The risk has increased, and it's put incredible economic burden on our member companies out there. That is something that we would really encourage that you would take a look at. You can't look at it in isolation of just parceling out responsibilities without looking at who's paying the cost because those economic incentives are more powerful, potentially, than legislation. Legislation is one tool, but if it doesn't recognize who's liable, who's paying for all of the strikes that are occurring, then it will not hit the mark.

We would be very happy as an association to organize site tours and visits for the committee so that you can come out and actually see what our workers are faced with every day and the pressures of the seasonality of the work and the pressures of the political community to ensure that projects come in on time and on budget. Those pressures are very real, and when you add to that the increased costs of how to do the excavation work, you may see that there's more to this than just with the stroke of a pen solving the issues.

Ms Tetreault: Mr. Chair, just to conclude, with the increased funding for new infrastructure projects in the province, aging infrastructure that's continually abandoned, and the increasing need for environmental protection, progressive legislation for preventing damages to underground infrastructure is more important than ever. We recently met with our members to discuss the merits of Bill 211 and what we would present today. Of those who attended those sessions over 100,000 Alberta employees were engaged in those conversations. They then presented this to us to present: why do you support Bill 211? This is the wording that these folks identified.

So this is representing a broad section of Albertans in terms of why we support Bill 211.

Thank you again for your time today.

The Acting Chair: Thank you.

With that, then, we'll open the floor to questions from members. I have a couple of people on the list already. Are there any other members that wish to be on the list? Anyone on the phones? Okay. Not hearing from any at this time, I'd say for those on the phones that if you do want to get on the list, you can also e-mail Mr. Roth. With that, we'll go ahead. I have Mr. Piquette.

Mr. Piquette: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you so much for an excellent presentation and for your engagement on that. I know that definitely education is key with this issue and credit because you've done an excellent job of educating us along the way. It's great to see the other members here as well. Maybe just for the record, I attended the AGM there in the fall and had the chance to speak to your membership, which was a wonderful opportunity. I'm just wondering. How comprehensive is your organization? When I go to the website, do you have to be a member to find out who the other members are?

Ms Tetreault: No. There's a list of the companies . . .

Mr. Piquette: No? I tried. It says that you have to put in your membership.

You have the list there. Are there any nonprofit organizations in particular? I guess what I'm really asking is: would there be any agricultural organizations or irrigation districts?

Ms Tetreault: There's none in specific, but we do have rural municipalities who would be engaged. Most of our work is really done through the Rural Municipalities association, so it's not that individual groups have to join. The fact is that the RMA is very active with us, so our communication normally goes through that group, but it's an open organization, nonprofit, that anybody can join. Off the top of my head I'm not sure if I know of an agricultural company per se that is one of our members.

Mr. Piquette: Okay. Are the irrigation districts members?

Ms Tetreault: No, there's no irrigation district that's a member.

Mr. Piquette: Okay. Something that actually struck me is that the irrigation – that's another issue that you might need to work to extend protection for.

Ms Tetreault: Yeah. I appreciate that.

The Acting Chair: Is there a follow-up, Mr. Piquette?

Mr. Piquette: I do, but I can go back and forth.

The Acting Chair: Okay.

We'll go then to Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. First of all, of course, to our guests: thank you for taking the time to come to Edmonton and spending some time with us. I know your time is valuable. Welcome to the Legislature.

I've got a question for my friend Al, who comes from the same county as me, Mr. Chair. In fact, back home they call him Big Al unless he's giving a speech with me, and then he's Medium Al. He's also, of course, the president of RMA and a long-time county councillor, so I would like to ask him about his submission, the RMA submission that I have here, where it talks about one of the

concerns, making sure that we get the cost aspect right for our municipalities, which I think we all agree is an important question. The submission goes on to talk about making sure we do just that, but then one of the suggestions is possibly through a phased-in, gradual registration approach and prioritization of registration of certain infrastructure types.

My question is: are there any other suggestions besides that on how we could tackle the cost issue for municipalities in your membership? Then if you could elaborate on that suggestion of a phased-in process.

Mr. Kemmere: I think that for the phased-in approach I'm going to work it kind of backwards because a lot of good technology has been used in the last 10 years and I think those records are readily available. So let's make that a mandatory process. Let's make that a very legislated process. Other records as we go further back – and I'm talking about in rural municipalities but also in the small villages and hamlets where they just don't have the records. They will come across items as they pursue records, but they may not meet a mandatory deadline because it's just too cost-prohibitive to try and track or dig in to find a lot of those records.

There could be a graduation approach to them so that they can register those assets as they do come across them. It's unfortunate that they are not mapped, but it is reality, so I think that would need to be recognized. This could have a substantial cost if we're going to have to identify the assets within a fixed period of time. My fear is that it's just not going to get done because some small municipalities are fighting for their lives right now as it is, and if they are not able to sustain their life, then they get handed down to the rural municipality like mine, and the issue is still not dealt with. So a gradual registration approach would be valuable that way.

10:10

Another item, if I could, Jason, just on a question that was asked earlier about: how can we deal with the fact that there are fibre-optic lines going across the field that the agricultural operator had no idea about? Well, I think that there are some great opportunities here to merge resources that are already there. The fact is that many of our big operators that are on the broad landscape have no fence markers anywhere near the fact that there's infrastructure there. Then let's do some map sharing. Every one of our farmers that is doing modern-technology farming has got the equipment and can do a map download that can link with their equipment and the likes of that. If it's not being done, I think we need to find a way to do it so that when that landowner is out on the field, he has at least another tool whereby he can even look on his hand-held device to see that, oh, there is a risk here and the likes of that. Land does change hands, and the one challenge that goes along with it is lack of corporate memory. That is always a challenge.

I will share with the room that I am a person who did hit an infrastructure piece at one point. That goes to answering one of the other questions: why don't people use first call? Well, sometimes when it's 35 below, as we've been right now, and you have a waterline break in the middle of your farm, you are trying to do something to stop that leak because it's now affecting all your other water systems throughout the whole area. You don't always think to make that response just like that, and that's when I hit a telephone line. I was trying to find the source of the leak, and we just started digging. We found the source of the waterline break, but in the meantime Telus had to come in, when it was nicer weather, to fix their phone line.

Mr. Nixon: One follow-up, if I could, Mr. Chair, through you to Al. I appreciate the answer. What I'm hearing you say, then, is that

from the RMA perspective, from your membership's perspective, you do see a need for some sort of legislation or for improvements around this issue but that you want to make sure we get the details right so that it's not going to cause unintended consequences to your membership.

Mr. Kemmere: Good summary. I think the first call, or Click Before You Dig, is a tremendous program that we need to throw as much weight behind, but at the same time let's not get into a system that's going to be punitive for everybody.

One of our big concerns – and I will reiterate it – is the responsiveness. If you want your assets protected, first call is the best tool, but we're not getting equivalent response times from all asset owners. Some are there within 24 hours, and they are allowing you to go ahead and do your stuff. Others: you wait 10 days, 14 days on the same call. I think there needs to be a strength in the legislation that also guides that approach so that the owners of the assets have to be as responsive as the excavators or the owners of the land.

Mr. Nixon: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I hear that there's a chinook that just started in Sundre. I heard it from my wife about an hour ago. I hope you brought it with you, Al, because we're tired of this.

Mr. Kemmere: Right now a chinook is still minus 20.

Mr. Nixon: That's right.

I'll yield the floor, Mr. Chair.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Piquette, you had another question.

Mr. Piquette: Yeah. Well, I guess I will very quickly comment. It's very valuable that you brought up the issues of dissolved municipalities in the report and that you put a point on that again. It just so happens that Athabasca just recently rediscovered that the first oil well in Alberta was actually drilled in Athabasca, but nobody knew about it until they came across a gas leak. You just wonder how much of this infrastructure we don't know about, and it's good that we don't compound the problem as we go forward. So good for that.

Now, in the presentations this number has been mentioned a few times, the cost of roughly about \$350 million a year in damages from failure to protect underground infrastructure properly. Where does that figure come from? How is that calculated?

Ms Tetreault: Through the Canadian Common Ground Alliance we are in a partnership with an organization called CIRANO who does economic impact assessments based on data that our members voluntarily provide to us. They would complete data in terms of: what happened, how long was the infrastructure damaged for, what were the estimations in terms of response costs, what were the estimations for downtime, et cetera? They then calculate the societal cost for this.

I want to just stress this. The \$350 million that is attributed to Alberta is based on the voluntary reporting only that we get. Again, of the reports we're estimating that 3,500 reports are voluntarily given to Alberta a year. We believe that's only 15 to 20 per cent of the reports in terms of line strikes that actually exist in Alberta. We believe the \$350 million is probably maybe representing 25 per cent of really what the damages are to Albertans, so we think it's much more significant. These are just the folks that voluntarily report their damages to us.

Mr. Piquette: Okay. So how do you estimate that it's only 15 to 20 per cent? I'm just curious.

Ms Tetreault: Again, as Mike is saying, if 50 per cent of those are registered with Alberta One-Call, we know that there are many utility owners out there that aren't registered with us, and there are line hits that are going on on a regular basis. Those aren't being reported to us. Even of all of our members who respond to Alberta One-Call and the Alberta Common Ground Alliance, not all of them are reporting their line strikes to us as well.

Mr. Piquette: Wow. That's pretty concerning.
How am I for – oh, the chair is engaged. Chair, am I . . .

Ms Tetreault: Go for it.

Mr. Piquette: I can go for it? Okay.

The Acting Chair: I'm handing the chair to Mr. Drysdale.

[Mr. Drysdale in the chair]

Mr. Piquette: Yeah. This is just very quick. It's a very interesting graphic that you guys have brought to the committee. I suppose that's called a word cluster. I wonder if you'd give us a little bit of insight into that process. You said that you managed to involve a hundred thousand employees coming up with this.

Ms Tetreault: Yeah. Thanks for the question, Mr. Piquette. We met the first week in February once this committee met in January, and we did an all call-out to our membership and asked them to sit down with us. We went through the bill in detail. We asked for our members' responses. We encouraged those who were given written submissions to send in their submissions. Those folks that were at the table, based on the employees or the membership that they represent in terms of the organizations or the employees represented, we asked them in terms of: how many members do you represent when you're speaking on their behalf? They gave us the information, and it came up to over a hundred thousand Alberta employees as what developed this word cloud. As you can see, safety and accountability are very much at the forefront of what we're talking about.

As Al was referring to, there does need to be an enforcement piece as per the roadbuilders' concerns as well, but there needs to be consistency and there needs to be a level playing field. I think where the Alberta Common Ground Alliance is a little bit different from Alberta One-Call is that we represent those 13 stakeholders. We represent the whole damage prevention process. We represent the utility owners, we represent the locators, and we represent the excavators. All together the one commonality they all share is that we do need to have comprehensive legislation that is fair and accountable to all of our stakeholders.

Mr. Piquette: Thank you for that.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you.

I think we'll move on. We have Mr. Clark on the phone on the list for the next question. Go ahead, Mr. Clark.

Mr. Clark: Thank you, Mr. Drysdale, and thanks to everyone for being here. I'd just like to ask, maybe, what might sound like a counterintuitive question. I'd maybe just like to ask it a bit backwards. Why are we not already doing this? I know we've touched on a few of the barriers here and a few of the questions. Mr. Kemmere, I think you mentioned some of them. But, you know, what are the objections that we could expect? Also, I'd appreciate your thoughts on overcoming those objections. I know, Mr. Drysdale, in your comments last meeting and earlier today, you have spoken about the role of government in all of this. I know

that's a bit of wide-ranging question, but maybe if you can just speak about what you see as some of the objections being to this and how you think that we can overcome them.

Thank you.

Ms Tetreault: Thank you for the question, Mr. Clark. I mean, I don't have a glass ball in front of me in terms of why government hasn't implemented it. We as an organization have been around, similar to Alberta One-Call and EAPUOC, for 30-plus years talking about damage prevention throughout Alberta. I think, as Mike alluded to earlier, Alberta has been fortunate that there hasn't been a fatality in Alberta.

10:20

Through this organization various times we've approached government before. I think the last time was 2004. We got to a task force process. But I think, as Mr. Drysdale was alluding to in some of his conversations in the past meeting, this bill would encompass several departments, and from a government perspective I think there have been challenges to who would own the process. It doesn't necessarily sit logically with one ministry or department, and with changes of governments and changes of ministries it sort of gets stuck on either that minister's table or the deputy minister's, and it's just never come to fruition.

I guess in our simplistic way we're saying that this isn't much different than the seat belt law. It makes good sense that you needed a law to enforce seat belt safety. Distracted driving is another one where, you know, it makes good sense, but, again, you needed some law for the enforcement. As Mike alludes to, Alberta One-Call has done a tremendous public awareness campaign in 40 years. EAPUOC, in the Edmonton area, if you're doing damage prevention in that industry – I think we all know that it exists, but there hasn't been that enforcement, as Mr. Hanson spoke about earlier. There is no penalty if you do not call One-Call and you don't do the process, and we're finding, through our detailed analysis, that 51 per cent of the damages that occur are because you haven't taken that first step to damage prevention, which is to pick up the phone or go to the website or go to your app and make the call. It's a free call for anybody to make in Alberta. That's all we're asking here, for that process now to be enforced.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you.

Next we have Mr. Schneider, followed by Ms Payne.

Mr. Schneider: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have a couple of questions, but I'm more than happy to share my time, however, with everybody. Everybody has lots of questions, I'm sure. Thank you very much to everyone who came in this morning to be part of our meeting. In some of the submissions that we've been given, we and certainly Member Rosendahl and Member Piquette talked about an incident at Grande Cache, the highway into their town. I think there were line strikes several times, so many times that Telus actually offered town council a satellite phone so that they wouldn't be out of communication with the rest of the world, which sounds wild.

At any rate, through some of the submissions that we've seen, Alberta Transportation isn't part of Alberta One-Call. Now, they talk about how anyone that works for Alberta Transportation actually has to have a permit, so they consider themselves – I wouldn't say exempt. I wouldn't say that. That's not the right word. But they consider themselves not to have to be a part of One-Call. They consider their cost would be extreme if they were to be part of it, and they consider their risks to be actually low. Is there any comment you'd have on something like that?

Ms Tetreault: Yeah. I could talk here for a while on that comment, but I'll summarize my thoughts on that. Thank you very much, Mr. Schneider, for your question. Also, please, on behalf of all of us here today we want to thank you again for tabling this bill. It's very important to us – again, 40 years for some of us in this industry – so thank you very much for your commitment to our cause.

Alberta Transportation, as Mike alluded to and some others, as Mr. Nixon said and, I guess, a comment from Municipal Affairs: some folks think that maybe the risk is lower by just taking the risk and not having to pay for the financial cost of it. We're not aware specifically why Alberta Transportation doesn't want to be a member of One-Call. I can surmise in that – we have had several meetings with them. We have asked them to partner with us and Alberta One-Call to do a pilot, to say: "Okay. Let's look at the cost estimate you're coming up with." We've heard numbers from them before from \$1 million to \$5 million in terms of the financial impact to Alberta Transportation's budget. Not my calculations but Alberta One-Call's calculations are more around the \$50,000 to \$100,000. It might be in terms of the number of notifications based on what they see from other projects, from other major utility owners in Alberta.

So we question why one of the departments, a main department within government, isn't even a member of Alberta One-Call as well. It goes back to what Mr. Drysdale is saying and what Mr. Piquette is. If some government departments themselves are not participating, it's very difficult for us, then, to pass that along to some of our members. I sat on the Alberta Transportation steering committee for their utility co-ordination committee, and at those meetings several times the utility owners asked the question to Alberta Transportation: "Why aren't you walking the talk? You ask us to go and do the process, you ask our contractors, you ask the excavators to all do it, but why don't you yourself register the assets?" As contractors it would make it easier as well if we knew where Transportation's assets were.

But back to Mr. Kemmere's comments, similar to, I think, all government there's a challenge of the historic records of where your data is. I don't think it's any different with Alberta Transportation in that they may not know where their assets are as well. We've often offered: let's do that phased-in approach for all government, not just municipalities but for provincial governments as well. If there's a challenge of where the data is, let's work together and find a solution. We will not register is not the appropriate answer in our mind.

Does that answer your question?

Mr. Schneider: I think so. Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you. Is there any follow-up, Mr. Schneider?

Mr. Schneider: I just have another question, but I'll wait.

The Deputy Chair: Okay.

Then we'll go to Ms Payne.

Ms Payne: Thank you, and thank you to all of the presenters for their informative presentations. I'm not sure – Mr. Chair, I'll beg your indulgence on this – if this is a question more appropriate for you folks or the folks before, but I couldn't help but notice that there's a bit of a difference between the slide presentations we've had, the last two presentations, and I'm just kind of hoping to better understand the issue and where the information is coming from. The folks from Alberta One-Call noted that 51 per cent of damage is due to no locate requests made, and the remainder is due to either, like, 18 per cent they said locating issue, 27 per cent excavation issue,

and 4 per cent for other, yet the slide that you've presented to us noted that 99 per cent of the time damage is avoided when a locate request is made. So I'm just kind of curious why that difference might exist as 51 to 99 is quite the jump.

Thank you.

Ms Tetreault: What I believe Mike's slide was saying is that 51 per cent of the time we knew that there were damages. It was because there was no locate request made. What that slide, the 99 per cent, is saying is that if we know a locate request is made, 99 per cent of the time there are no damages. So it's talking about two different things.

Ms Payne: Sorry. I'm just going to have to get you to explain that to me in slightly more layman's terms. I'm not quite understanding the difference.

Ms Tetreault: If the locate request is made, 99 per cent of the time we know that there are no damages. The reporting of the damages that we do know about, those that did call, 51 per cent of them indicated that they did not make a locate request.

Ms Payne: Okay. Thank you.

Ms Tetreault: Okay. Hopefully that clarifies that.

Ms Payne: Yes. Thank you. That makes more sense now.

Ms Tetreault: Okay. When that happens, of those 51 per cent that did say that happened, 80 per cent of the time there is interruption to the services, right? That could be that telecoms are down, folks are without water, they're without power, or they're without communication.

Ms Payne: Right. Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: Before I move back to Mr. Schneider, I'll just give people on the phones one more chance. If anybody on the phones has questions, please say so.

If not, we'll go back to Mr. Schneider, then.

Mr. Schneider: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Through you to Michelle again. Now, the provincial government doesn't have any jurisdiction over telecommunication service providers, and from what I can gather, they appear to be one of the key concerns for Alberta One-Call and the Alberta Common Ground Alliance. You know, this committee is charged with sending a recommendation to the Legislature determining whether Bill 211 becomes legislation at some point, and I wonder how might this government – this committee is a better example. How do you think we should approach that?

Ms Tetreault: You're correct in that the telecoms are protected by and governed through federal jurisdiction. I think Mike answered the question earlier from Alberta One-Call's perspective, and I think we share the same perspective that telecommunications typically run under public rights-of-way, and that is an area that government does have some control over. So some of the wording in the legislation could state that if you are doing any work in a public right-of-way, you must register with Alberta One-Call. That's one way of potentially handling that. I mean, I think there's a telecommunication presentation after us, so you may be able to ask the same question of those folks.

10:30

Our understanding with Bill 8 in Ontario, which is the only other jurisdiction in Canada that has legislation: once the legislation came

through, the telecommunication companies all applied and abided by that legislation as well. So I think there would be support for the telecommunication industry to join if this legislation came through. I can't speak on their behalf, but that is, you know, what our understanding is. I think that looking at that public right-of-way and what we can do under that language is an area that we could pursue.

Mr. Schneider: Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Schneider, I think, is the only guy on the list. If you have some more questions?

Mr. Schneider: I think we covered it all. I think you've answered the question I was going to ask, the follow-up, too, so I appreciate that.

The Deputy Chair: Okay. I will go to Mr. Piquette next.

Mr. Piquette: All right. Well, thank you. This has been an excellent discussion so far. I think you're seeing committee work at its finest, actually. Thanks for being a part of that.

Just with Bill 211, a question. Now, MLA Schneider has talked about, you know, this bill having a one-year time frame. Considering the complexity of the issues – and we're getting a taste of that even in this morning's presentation – do you think that a year would be enough time to address all the issues at hand and to be able to meet with all the relevant stakeholders, of whom the list seems to keep growing the more we put our minds to this?

Ms Tetreault: Yeah. As a simple answer to your question, yes, a one-year timeline within how Bill 211 is worded now I think is a sufficient timeline. I mean, the consultation process has started now, obviously, formally with you folks, but informally we've been having this consultation for 20-plus years. So the membership, the stakeholders are all engaged.

As Mr. Kemmere mentioned earlier, we've been through this process a bit with the federal Bill 229. We certainly worked tremendous hours on that as stakeholders to work on that wording and how it would be applicable federally. We believe that 80 per cent of the wording that's in Bill 229 could be adapted from a provincial legislation perspective, so we think we're well on the way. As we all agree here at the table, you know, the devil is in the detail. We want to make it fair for all of those. We believe there are improvements to be made from Bill 8. Even our Ontario colleagues have discussed that with us.

Every state in the United States has similar legislation. We have those comparables in terms of where we in Alberta can adapt to and adopt that. Our challenge truly is: what department is going to manage this and be that lead? We have spent tremendous time in the last two years meeting with the various departments, and as you've heard, you know, there is that frustration as to: who would manage this process? I think government needs to help us with that process. But within a year I truly believe we can have comprehensive legislation ready to be introduced.

Mr. Piquette: Okay, Ms Tetreault.

How are we doing for time there, Mr. Chair?

The Deputy Chair: We're over our allotted time, but I'm giving us some leniency.

Mr. Piquette: Okay. Well, just very quickly – and it actually just sort of follows because, I mean, you did bring up Ontario's legislation. Now, you said that there are some, you know, changes maybe to the one-call system that might be appropriate. I wonder if

you could provide maybe a bit of insight into that issue, like, what might be suitable from their model and what might not be suitable.

Ms Tetreault: To be honest, Mr. Piquette, I don't have all the details here on that because, to us, it's more about the process of going through the consultation process. I mean, a couple of insights we had were, again, on the phase-in period that they did with municipalities. For example, all municipalities had to be registered with Ontario One Call all on one day. That's an example, saying that all of the municipalities all of a sudden had to register on one day. That's a simple example of where improvements could be made. The phase-in period in terms of what Mr. Kemmere talks about: what could we be looking at in terms of bills? We could potentially say that as of 2015 everything from that date on must be registered and that we phase in the others. Those are examples of what Ontario didn't implement in terms of what they were dealing with.

The enforcement piece. Ontario One Call, actually, is the regulation body for the enforcement of this as well. There have been some challenges with the excavating and the locating industries in terms of having to file a complaint with the utility owners, because they say: we know where the appeal is likely going to go and into whose favour.

We truly believe that there is an opportunity to make changes here. We do not believe that Alberta One-Call should be the regulator with this piece of legislation. It needs to change. Those are a couple of examples of where we think we can make improvements.

Does that answer your question?

Mr. Piquette: Yeah, it does. Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you.

I think we'll wrap it up. I can maybe take the liberty to ask one quick question as chair – sorry – seeing as I'm going to be discussing this later, maybe just for your comments on which department in government you think would be most impacted or maybe which department you think should be responsible for this bill. If you could give your comments on that.

Ms Tetreault: A good question, Mr. Drysdale. I mean, we've been having this conversation for a few years. You know, it changes – right? – the way the ministry and certain allocations happen. There's a thought – and I'll allow our folks to pipe in as well – that at the end of the day everything revolves around permits and rights-of-way, and municipalities manage that process. So is it Municipal Affairs? That is an area to come from. Another thought is that because data is in collectively – this is about data, a lot of it – it could reside within Service Alberta.

I don't think we're trying to say that it should be one ministry or not. We're open to that conversation. My colleagues here may have some insight as well.

Ron, do you have any comments?

Mr. Glen: I'd just like to add, and perhaps getting back to Mr. Clark's question, that part of the reason that something hasn't been done in the past is that it all comes down to liability. It's a you broke it, you pay for it system. As other people start to take on certain aspects of it, whether it's legislated or not, they always look back to it and say: "Well, wait a minute. Are we taking on liability here?" If you're going to look at a system that mandates by legislation that people are required to seek a permit for something, then what are you going to do to make sure that the delivery of that service is in a timely manner? Are you going to hold a contractor harmless if a locate doesn't come out and provide service on a legislated requirement?

On the other hand, you've got the department putting on pressure, saying: "Wait a minute. You've got a contract. You have to have this project done." That's why I said at the beginning that you've got to look at the entire economic system and the liability system to come to some conclusion that provides some balance to this scenario.

But, at the end of the day, it's the contractor who must pay for the repairs if they strike a line. You broke it; you bought it: that's the system, so that has to be taken into account.

We're happy to, again, take you out on site tours to have a look and see what kind of an environment our people are working in in a three-dimensional workplace. If we can't get timely service, then the risk, in order to meet the other pressures that are coming from other arms of government to deliver projects on time, is to use a private locate service, and there's no guarantee with that either.

It's a very risky business that we're involved in, and anything you can do to derisk that business will ultimately lead to better competition and better pricing for the public.

The Deputy Chair: Mr. Kemmere, you had a question?

Mr. Kemmere: Yeah. I just want to add to it again. It was mentioned earlier by Mike, too, that we all know what it's like in Alberta, that every day that it's 25 below, it's one less day of construction time, one less day of farm improvements, one less day of all the different things that take place. That's why it's imperative that timely locates are going to take place. Somehow we need to have a system that ensures that. It becomes a liability hand-off if you do not do it right as an excavator, yet that liability could have been mitigated with a more timely response.

10:40

So I think co-ordinating those things together: a more robust system and, I still believe, more information available to the landowners so that they can identify where the assets primarily are through a mapping mechanism. You know, we've got so many levels. When we do municipal development plans or we do subdivisions, we can see where the natural gas lines are, but we cannot see where the power lines are, and we cannot see where the telephone lines are or where the fibre-optic lines are. So all of a sudden there's a level of risk there. Get that information to the regular, everyday users so that at least they have another tool, preventative, rather than just relying on the call.

The Deputy Chair: Well, thank you very much for your presentation this morning. It was very good.

I think the committee will take a 10-minute recess while we change out presentations. Our next presentation will be from the telecommunications organizations.

Thank you very much.

[The committee adjourned from 10:41 a.m. to 10:53 a.m.]

The Deputy Chair: Okay. Thank you. We'll call the meeting back to order.

Our next presentation will be by Ian Phillips from Shaw Communications, Mr. Darcy Hurlock from Telus, and joining us via conference call will be Mr. Kevin Green from Bell. Each presenter will have five minutes to make their presentations, after which committee members will have an opportunity to ask questions. We will begin with Mr. Hurlock today and then move to Mr. Phillips and then to Mr. Green. Thank you very much.

Go ahead, Mr. Hurlock.

Mr. Hurlock: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and members of the standing committee. Good morning. My name is Darcy Hurlock. I'm a Telus

manager of operations. Thank you for your time and consideration today.

As a major owner and operator of digital technology infrastructure in Alberta, Telus supports Bill 211, which is provincial legislation that supports the protection of underground infrastructure, which is critical to Albertans' safety, health, and economic well-being.

As background, since 2000 Telus has invested over \$46 billion in digital technology infrastructure in Alberta to position Albertans for success in a modern, global, and digitally-connected era, bringing connectivity to communities across the province, from Blackfalds, Peace River, and Edmonton to Okotoks, Turner Valley, and Didsbury. These investments include a vast network of underground fibre networks. Today this critical infrastructure connects Albertans to their loved ones, to their school work, jobs, and the global market and provides reliable access to emergency services.

As we look to the very near future, with the emergence of 5G technologies, fibre cable will be central to unleashing the power this next wave of technology represents, from the enablement of remote surgeries to smart emergency vehicles and traffic and pedestrian signals.

However, over the years Telus and other service providers have experienced significant challenges caused by our underground fibre being cut by external parties. Over the past three years alone we've incurred damage to our underground infrastructure 862 times in Alberta; so almost once per day we're being hit.

As MLA Schneider brought forward, as one example, in January 2018 our fibre cable was cut in the community of Grande Cache, and this was done by a local road construction crew. This was not associated with Telus. As a result of that damage, 3,340 customers lost service for over 17 hours. This meant that over that period of time those 3,340 Albertans were not able to access service to do their jobs, communicate with friends and family, or watch their favourite show on Netflix. I mean, even if you wanted to go buy gas at the gas station, you couldn't use your debit or credit card. It basically turned Grande Cache into a cash-only society again. But even more importantly, this meant that service providers, the local hospital, emergency response personnel, and others were not able to access services they need to do their job.

Telus mobilized as quickly as possible to repair the damage that was done by this third party. We dispatched a repair crew to isolate the location of the damage as the ground disturber did not notify us that they had damaged our cable. We had cable crews working through the night to splice in a temporary fibre cable to restore service to the community as quickly as possible.

However, I cannot underscore enough that these incidents represent major damages to our infrastructure and require significant resources, budget, and time to address. These are avoidable events that cause significant harm to communities who are unable to access the Internet, call emergency services, and more. As such, Telus supports Bill 211, that would require all buried assets to be registered with Alberta One-Call and excavators and diggers to contact Alberta One-Call for cable locate requests. Telus believes this legislation is an important mechanism that would help assure the integrity of underground infrastructure, ensure reliable connectivity for our communities, including when they call for help in the event of an emergency, and increase accountability between infrastructure owners and excavators.

In closing, I would like to reiterate that the security of underground infrastructure is critical and impacts all Albertans. We strongly support the bill and our ability to keep Albertans connected.

Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you, Mr. Hurlock.

Now we'll move to Mr. Phillips for your five-minute presentation. Thank you.

Mr. Phillips: Thank you, Chairman. I appreciate the board for giving us the opportunity to speak today. We're here about Bill 211, Alberta Underground Infrastructure Notification System Consultation Act, obviously. Shaw is here to specifically speak towards some factors that we believe the standing committee should be aware of when considering this legislation. Additionally, should this legislation be passed, we'd like to put our current situation before the committee and pose some questions that the committee tasked with creating a report for the Legislative Assembly should be aware of.

First and foremost, the question we'd like to pose is: who should be responsible for locating underground infrastructure? Should this cost fall on the infrastructure owners or those who are disturbing the ground? We've seen a number of large-scale construction operations complete their own comprehensive locates prior to breaking ground, and we believe that if that is the norm, it will lead to operational savings for all underground infrastructure owners as well as construction operators. Locate costs are currently being borne by our customers, but it is the builders and excavators who are reaping the benefit of this process. In other jurisdictions the burden falls on the builder or the individual disturbing this ground. The equipment to locate all of this infrastructure is readily available.

I mean, as mentioned by our Alberta One-Call folks earlier, Shaw currently operates a Dig Shaw program, that we feel has met our needs in the past and does currently, not to say that we would be closing out options of future considerations. When mandated, as in Ontario, as was alluded to in previous conversations, Shaw has complied with provincial legislation that mandated joining a one-call system when necessary. It is worth noting that Ontario is the only jurisdiction where Shaw participates in the one-call system currently as our Dig Shaw program, we feel, adequately covers our needs throughout the rest of the country.

When Ontario introduced their mandatory one-call system, in 2013, we saw an increase in our calls, and despite our quite small footprint in Ontario, we saw costs associated with the One Call increase compared to our previous Dig Shaw program. So our costs went up. Also important to note is that we did not see any significant reduction in damage to our underground infrastructure after joining the Ontario One Call system.

11:00

We have a few concerns with the one-call system the way it exists currently. Chief amongst them is price. The current rate of about \$2.50 for notification is actually more than double what the Ontario One Call system has been charging – their rate is currently \$1.10 per notification – and has actually increased from \$1.50 in previous years. We estimated that Shaw's participation in the one-call system would have increased our costs by over \$160,000, with little benefit from reduction in costs because we haven't seen that to be the reality in Ontario.

As mentioned, we've seen a decrease in the per-notification costs in Ontario and would question if Alberta might see this economy of scale once the Alberta one-call notification process, should it become mandatory – would there be a reduction in these costs?

Another one of our major concerns is the volume of calls we receive. Currently we receive fewer than 55,000 calls annually in Alberta. Alberta One-Call receives over 350,000. We expect that the number of calls we receive to increase exponentially; therefore, our costs of servicing these will increase accordingly.

Mandating a one-call system would also create additional work for our mapping teams to create and maintain maps to be shared with the one-call system. So there are internal costs associated with joining this organization as well.

We are interested in opportunities to reduce the cost per locate as well. We think that this legislation might be an opportunity to look into something along those lines. Should one-call be mandated, we believe there might be an opportunity to create or join a consortium to collaboratively site underground infrastructure by all owners participating in one-call as opposed to each infrastructure owner sending out their own crew to mark their own infrastructure. We feel there may be an opportunity to have one consortium locate all underground infrastructure in any given area.

We appreciate the opportunity to present to this committee. We appreciate your time and look forward to some discussion, not only at this juncture but going forward. We're happy to provide any answers and have a discussion going forward. We appreciate the opportunity to be here.

Apologies for not introducing my colleague Ryan White, to my right. He is our manager of network access as well.

Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you very much.

Now, as they did before, we will be joined via teleconference by Mr. Green from Bell. Hopefully, you're there, Mr. Green. You've got five minutes.

Mr. Gauvin: It's Mr. Gauvin, not Mr. Green. Thank you Mr. Chairman, Deputy Chair, and committee members. Good morning. My name is Phil Gauvin, and I am associate general counsel, regulatory affairs, for BCE. With me today is Kevin Green, director of field operations at Bell. He's responsible for our damage prevention program and, among other things, manages our voluntary participation in the various one-call associations across the country.

Before we begin, I'd like to thank you for inviting us here today, and a special shout-out to the committee clerk, Aaron Roth, who very helpfully allowed us to squeeze into the agenda on very short notice and co-ordinated the availability of these teleconferencing facilities for this committee to make it happen.

On that note, make no mistake, whether you're watching YouTube on your smart phone, sending work e-mails, or enjoying Crave TV from your home Internet connection, your telecommunications run on physical networks. As Canada's largest telecommunications company BCE leads the industry in providing world-class broadband communication services to consumers, businesses, and public organizations across the country. To continue to do so, we're rapidly expanding Canada's broadband, fibre, and wireless network infrastructure, with annual capital investment surpassing \$4 billion. At the end of 2018 Bell's fibre footprint reached over 9 million locations, including direct fibre-to-the-premises capability for more than 4.6 million homes and businesses. Bell LTE advanced service, the fastest wireless technology currently available, now covers 91 per cent of the national population.

We're also deploying full broadband Internet service in smaller towns and rural locations, with leading-edge wireless-to-the-home technology. What this means is that we currently have millions of kilometres of fibre spanning the country to connect our various residential customers, businesses, and public organizations to our central network and, ultimately, each other and the world. This includes thousands of kilometres of fibre that comprise Alberta's SuperNet, which connects over 4,200 schools, hospitals, libraries, government and municipal offices in 429 Albertan communities.

The physical wires in our networks can be buried, typically in conduits beneath streets, or aerial, which refers to wires latched onto utility poles. Even wireless communications require physical towers interconnected by physical fibre or microwave to the rest of our physical network.

Our field technicians continuously maintain our network resulting from damages of all kinds. For example, breach of the network can be the result of a tree falling onto aerial wires, a commercial excavator digging through conduit, or even a squirrel chewing through a cable. Therefore, it will come as no surprise to you that we take damage prevention very seriously. We voluntarily participate in one-call organizations across the country. They encourage excavators to call us through the various one-call organizations before digging. This allows us to confirm for them where our facilities are located underground.

Now, although calling before you dig is currently free for the excavator, it's anything but for the utility answering the call. When we receive a call, we consult internal maps and dispatch a technician, who will mark up the ground to indicate where facilities are located with spray paint or flags planted in the ground. That technician will bring specialized equipment along to help determine exactly where those facilities are located, typically by running a wire with an electric current through the conduit and using a special metering device above ground to see exactly where the path runs. Last year alone, we answered nearly 1 and a half million such calls across the country. This means that our voluntary participation, meant to encourage excavators to call us before they dig, currently costs us tens of millions of dollars every year.

As far as we know, one-call associations, including Alberta One-Call, work well with voluntary participation, so it's not clear to us that legislation is necessary. However, if there is legislation, we believe that part of that legislation should enable some cost recovery for participating underground infrastructure owners, including the provincial and federal public organizations that own underground infrastructure and that may incur costs to comply with such legislation.

Eight years ago, when Ontario introduced one-call legislation, we saw an approximate 30 per cent increase in calls to Ontario One Call. What changed? Calling Ontario One Call was free both before and after the introduction of legislation, so that's not what changed. The answer is a concerted communications campaign in collaboration with the Ontario government as well as the introduction of a new financial penalty for excavators that failed to call before digging.

Legislation that includes a fee per request should have an exception for residential callers that are not calling on behalf of a commercial excavator so that it continues to be free for the caller that simply wants to do gardening work at home.

The government can also consider introducing a penalty for excavators that do not call before digging as well as a requirement to take public ownership of a breach if they happen to have done so without calling and damaged networks. Canadians often hear about power network outages but rarely hear about who dug up those facilities and caused the outage in the first place. Shared Services Canada, Parks Canada, the Alberta Ministry of Transportation, Edmonton, Calgary, and many other public authorities, both federal and provincial, own underground infrastructure in Alberta. Depending on the wording of a new bill, all may be affected by it and incur significant costs to comply, especially if there is no fee for cost recovery.

It's also worth pointing out in this respect that a decade ago a provincial authority, the county of Wheatland, sought the mandatory participation by Shaw in Alberta One-Call. That application was denied by the CRTC, and Shaw was permitted to

continue to manage its own call service, Dig Shaw. As such, there are jurisdictional considerations that need to be taken into account in drafting any new legislation.

Now, I know that our time must be nearly up.

The Deputy Chair: Yeah. I'm sorry to interrupt, Mr. Gauvin.

Mr. Gauvin: We would be pleased to answer any questions you have and look forward to working with this committee to ensure that any new bill finds the proper balance between improving safety and damage prevention in Alberta and minimizing compliance costs for underground infrastructure owners in Alberta.

Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Gauvin.

Thank you, all of you, for your presentations this morning.

I will open the floor up to committee members to ask questions of all our presenters. First we have Mr. Hanson.

Mr. Hanson: Thank you very much, Chair. Thank you, guys, for coming, representing. This is kind of on a personal note to Telus. I live in rural Alberta, as do pretty much all of my constituents, and actually still have a land line. We have had some issues with that, and it's because of an exposed line that's been hanging on my fence for about 20 years, since the county rebuilt a road. I'm just wondering how many miles of that you guys have got hanging on fences in the province and if there's any plan to start burying some of that stuff. I've hit it myself twice, and just this last week it was cut by a snowplow, so it is becoming quite an issue there.

11:10

Mr. Hurlock: I don't know exactly off the top of my head how many kilometres we have of that. However, that is the subject of a major program internally to make sure that we get that buried. Every year, unfortunately, we do have to lay new temporary lines due to construction – right? – so it's an ongoing thing where there are always lines being put above ground, and we want to get it buried below ground. It's trying to keep up with that never-ending cycle. That's something that I could take away if you want to let me know where that line is, and I could look into it to make sure that the records correctly reflect that.

Mr. Hanson: Yeah. I could get you those details, for sure. Just if I could follow up with that – and maybe it's a question that we can deal with with Alberta One-Call later – are those kinds of hits taken in as part of your data? I'll catch up with you later on that one, but I just wanted to get that. When we're talking about line strikes, are we talking about just stuff that's hit underground, or do we get every recorded cut to a line of Telus or Bell or any others that is maybe hanging up in a precarious place that it really shouldn't be?

Mr. Hurlock: That 862 number that I reflected is only underground lines, so that doesn't include temporary above-ground lines. That also doesn't include residential service, so the line that goes on your private property to your house is not included in that as well. These 862 are major lines feeding multiple customers.

Mr. Hanson: Okay. Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you.

Next we have Mr. Nielsen.

Mr. Nielsen: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah. I have a whole bunch of questions. I won't try to take up too much oxygen, so don't be afraid to stop me.

The Deputy Chair: There's nobody else on the list.

Mr. Nielsen: Oh. Okay. Well, I'll go until somebody else just interrupts me, then. Perfect.

The Deputy Chair: Maybe with that, though, before you start, Mr. Nielsen, I'll just ask anybody on the phones that if they want to be added to the list, say so, and then we can add you. Otherwise, Mr. Nielsen, it's your show.

Mr. Nielsen: All right. Okay. Well, thank you for joining us as well as Bell on the phone and our other presenters earlier. I appreciate all the information that you've been sharing with the committee here today. I guess, to start off just with a perspective from your respective industries: how pervasive is this issue? I don't know who should probably start. Maybe I'll start with Darcy at Telus.

Mr. Hurlock: Well, I mean, it's a major issue. The difficulty is in that, since it isn't legislated, we don't have exact information, right? Like, we only have information on when there is a damage and it's voluntarily reported: what is the root cause? How many people are actually digging unsafe out there right now is really hard to quantify, as the previous presenters had discussed. I think it's probably pretty pervasive. You know, our statistics internally at Telus, whether or not they don't match Alberta One-Call and Alberta Common Ground Alliance exactly, are very similar along the lines of how many damages could have been resolved if they had just called One-Call beforehand. I think it's quite a large issue.

I think a lot of people, when they're looking at this and particularly when ground disturbers are thinking about doing their work, you know, are thinking about: "I'm in that backhoe, and I want to make sure I don't hit a pipeline because that could affect my health. However, if I hit that phone cable, I'm not going to get fibre in my eye. There's no light that's going to shine on me and hurt me. You know, I'll have to pay for that, probably." But they're not really thinking about what's down the road and who's impacted down the road, right?

When we are claiming back expenses for this, as was discussed earlier by the road construction, we can only claim back in civil court what our costs were to repair that. When we look at something like the Grande Cache incident, the amount that we could actually claim for that damage is really minor compared to the time it took internally to investigate, the time it took to have people answering phone calls from customers, not only customers that couldn't reach us and wanted a credit later on, which couldn't be included, but also people that couldn't reach the town of Grande Cache, wondering what was going on, right? There are a lot of costs that are taken on internally that we can't claim back as part of this process.

So I see it as quite a large problem – right? – and we do want to bring more awareness to this issue and get people against more boundaries. It's better to find boundaries for everybody to play in.

Mr. Nielsen: Sure.

Any further comments from Ian or Ryan?

Mr. Phillips: Yes. Thank you. I'll actually agree largely. We've only reported 60 incidents of our lines being cut in the previous year, and to be perfectly blunt, a majority of those were caused by other telcos because we were in common trenches or close proximity of their underground infrastructure.

The unique part about our industry is that once a line is cut, we know right away. You know, we'll know instantly. Our network will show that there has been an error and there has been a cut. So speaking strictly in terms of solely damages, in that same 12-month period where we've only had 60 incidents, it was \$185,000 in

damages, approximately, that was caused. Now, to Darcy's point, that includes just the repair costs. It doesn't include outage times, et cetera. But we are of the belief that this, to be honest, relatively small cost actually outweighs the cost of being a member currently of the one-call system just due to the increase in volume of calls that we would receive.

Mr. Nielsen: Okay. I think it was Phil that was on the line for Bell, if he had any thoughts.

The Deputy Chair: Oh. Phil, yes. Sorry. They switched.

Mr. Gauvin: I guess in terms of how pervasive it is, it depends on what the issue is. This morning we heard from Mr. Kemmere on the farming community saying that, you know, they need to dig their field multiple times and currently the Ontario legislation doesn't have an exception to that. I actually looked quickly, and he's absolutely right, so there's an issue there.

There are absolutely compliance costs for people that have to deal with such legislation, so that's an issue that obviously needs to be dealt with. There are also costs to perform the locates, and there's the question of whether it should be the infrastructure owner that does it when there's a capital project that funds a construction project or if it should be the excavator that pays for it.

Mr. Nielsen: Okay. Thank you for that. You already answered what was going to be my next question.

But maybe I'll look back to Darcy here. What kinds of costs do you see Telus having to incur around this? I know that Ian from Shaw kind of alluded to some stuff there. Do you have maybe some numbers that you might be able to just throw at the committee here?

Mr. Hurlock: I think that Telus is on the majority of the Alberta One-Call requests. It's, again, hard to quantify how many additional requests would come in. But as Mike Sullivan talked about before, you know, an ounce of prevention definitely outweighs the costs of going out there afterwards and trying to triage it. There would be additional costs from the one-call perspective. If we keep the current locating system, as my peers alluded to, where the utilities are required to go out there and mark on every single one of those requests, the field locate costs would be quite significant. But I think there's probably some middle ground.

Again, as mentioned before, the devil is in the details on how this actually works. Would we like a system where there are multiple options for getting those facilities actually located in the field or how you could dig safely around them? I think there are different options that are available that could be put into place to work with that, though I do support the one-call idea, that you place one call and you know that anyone that's there will be notified. Then what happens after that? I think we have some options on how we could deal with that going forward to mitigate the cost.

Mr. Nielsen: How are we doing, Mr. Chair?

The Deputy Chair: Actually, Mr. Kleinsteuber has a question, so I'll let him ask a couple for a minute. That's the only other one on my list.

Mr. Kleinsteuber: Well, thank you, Chair. And, again, thank you, like my colleagues mentioned, for joining us here today. It's good to hear this presentation and about this topic, for sure.

A question directed to Mr. Ian Phillips, then, from Shaw. You had mentioned during your presentation and referenced what had happened in Ontario, basically with expenses for the Dig Shaw program, that costs also went up in Ontario with no decrease

necessarily, or at least according to the statistics there, in damage. I was just wondering if you could elaborate a little bit, possibly, on where some of those costs might have went up.

11:20

Mr. Phillips: Yeah. Through the chair, thank you for the question. It is because the frequency of calls went up significantly. I don't have the numbers in front of me, but the reason our costs to service them went up is for a couple of reasons. There's actually an extra step in the Alberta One-Call process that you take above and beyond our typical Dig Shaw process. In the Dig Shaw process, once we've done our locate and located it, we notify the landowner or the construction company or whoever put the request in. In the Alberta One-Call we notify, you know, that same individual or company, whoever that may be, and there's an extra step to also notify One-Call that the ticket item had been closed. In addition to the extra staff time, the extra step, there is also an additional cost. In addition to the extra step, there's an addition in that there are more frequent calls that we would receive because our infrastructure is in the area. One-Call is getting more calls than Dig Shaw is. So it's mostly frequency and then the added staff that have caused – more staff time is what it had amounted to.

Mr. Kleinsteuber: Okay. Understood. Thanks for that.

The Deputy Chair: Does anybody else have questions?

Mr. Clark: Mr. Chair, it's Greg Clark.

The Deputy Chair: Okay. Go ahead, Greg, then Mr. Schneider, and then Mr. Nielsen.

Mr. Clark: Thank you. I just want to pick up again on the last comment here in terms of the cost and the frequency of calls to Shaw having gone up. Is it a bad thing that the frequency of calls went up 30 per cent?

Mr. Phillips: Well, the cost is absolutely a bad thing. The issue is that we did not see a corresponding decrease in the amount of line cuts. So in that sense, you know, presumably had there been more calls, one would think there would be fewer cuts, but unfortunately that has not been our experience in Ontario.

Mr. Clark: Just a quick follow-up, then, maybe a couple of quick follow-ups. You say that with the added extra step, then, between the Dig Shaw and the One-Call you need to then close the One-Call ticket. How long does it take to do that? What does that process look like?

Mr. Phillips: I mean, it is brief. That's a fair comment. It's really just a notification, but it is still an extra step in the process. But your point is well taken.

Mr. Clark: Just one last question. I know you, obviously, have the Dig Shaw program, and that, I understand, is mandated by the CRTC. Would there be any consideration given to, if this is in fact costing you extra to do this extra step, just coming over to the One-Call and joining the other providers?

Mr. Phillips: That voluntary option has been on the table for many, many years now, and we have not taken that opportunity at this time.

I will clarify one point – and your point is fair – it is the frequency that is causing more cost than it is actually that one additional step, but it is still an additional step. We've had the option to join One-Call for many, many years now and have not taken that opportunity.

Mr. Clark: Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you, Mr. Clark.
We'll go to Mr. Schneider.

Mr. Gauvin: Sorry. It's Phil from Bell here. If I can just intervene very quickly on one of those questions.

The Deputy Chair: Sure. Go ahead.

Mr. Gauvin: On the question of whether or not it's good or bad to have extra calls, of course it's good for people to call before they dig and prevent damages. But if you take Ontario as an example, when the Ontario legislation came into effect, the number of calls went up drastically, and now we're a bit of a victim of our own success in that a lot of people are calling, we have to do the locate currently at our cost, and there's a tremendous cost to us. Right now it's costing us tens of millions of dollars just to do the locate. So it's not repairing anything; it's just to do the locate. We're spending tens of millions of dollars. So in order for us to continue, we think that there should be some defraying of the cost to comply with the legislation. Obviously, in Ontario there are steps that we need to take on that end. But here in Alberta we think, you know, that should be put together correctly in the bill as it comes in.

The Deputy Chair: Okay. Thank you.
Mr. Schneider.

Mr. Schneider: Well, thank you, Mr. Chair. Through you I'll ask Mr. Phillips a question. I think you alluded to what this answer will be, but I wanted to give you a chance while you weren't under the five-minute timeline. I asked the Common Ground Alliance this question, and I'll ask you the same question.

The provincial government does not, at this time, have jurisdiction over telecommunication service providers. We all understand that. What I kind of said to the Common Ground Alliance was that that infrastructure is one of the bigger key concerns in Alberta. In your words and to all of the panel – I don't have any problem with all of you answering if you like – how might the government or, more applicable this morning, how might this committee approach this if this happened to become legislation?

Mr. Phillips: Well, that's a great question. Thank you. Our urging is that it is – the requirement that One-Call be mandated and taken part of by all underground infrastructure owners we find to be onerous. We're relatively happy with how our current system is functioning. As I alluded to earlier, if it is mandated, we have complied in Ontario when similar legislation was passed. We just think that at this juncture this is an opportunity, before anything comes into place, to have an open conversation about what some of the obstacles to the Ontario legislation might be and how our current system works, which we feel is adequate to limit the line cuts for our customers, for your residents. So I think that, you know, this open dialogue is a great starting point. We just want to make sure that some of these concerns that we have make it onto the public record and are under the consideration of this committee.

Mr. Schneider: Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: Anybody else want to answer that? Go ahead.

Mr. Gauvin: In terms of things that we think should be in the bill if there is a bill, obviously a broken record here, we think there should be a fee per request with an exception for residential users that aren't calling on behalf of a commercial excavator. I suspect that others that are reluctant to join, that right now are doing it

voluntarily, would probably be more willing to join if there was a fee per request.

In terms of other things, with respect to the locates themselves it should be based on information that's available. There shouldn't be an obligation to provide X, Y, and Z co-ordinates – and Z, just so you know, refers to the depth on a vertical basis, the co-ordinates – if the operator doesn't have it. What that means is that, speaking for Bell, we have maps that provide X, Y co-ordinates. We actually know or have a good sense of where facilities are if you look at a map. If you ask us how deep every single conduit is, we can guesstimate based on industry standards. But if you actually need to know exactly how deep it is, within millimetres, because you want to excavate with machines up to a certain depth, then it's up to the excavator or the construction company to actually do some survey work to find out how deep it is.

The legislation should take that into account and not force owners to find out for themselves co-ordinates that don't exist in their mapping system. I guess that would be equally applicable to the municipal entities and provincial entities, you know, that might have a whole bunch of infrastructure that currently they don't have mapping information for. It's news to me, but also an important consideration apparently is the farming industry. They need to actually excavate their land very often every year. I don't know what the exception needs to be there, but there needs to be some brainstorming there.

Finally, off the top of my head, which was mentioned in our opening statement, we think that there should be some obligation for excavators that are negligent, that don't call before digging, to have some obligation to take ownership or that there be a registry that actually publicly names them if there is a breach.

The Deputy Chair: Okay. Thank you very much for that.

We'll move on next to Mr. Nielsen, followed by Mr. Hanson.

Mr. Nielsen: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Obviously, my understanding is that if you puncture a gas line or a pipeline, you know, that's potentially very, very dangerous, maybe even explosive. I know that in doing a ride-along with Edmonton fire, we actually attended a call of a breached gas line. Certainly, not something I'm going to do again in the near future. At least, maybe we could go to a different call. Is the same true when it comes to fibre optic or telephone lines? Does it take more pressure and damage to either interrupt service or degrade service? Maybe you can just expand a little bit on that.

11:30

Mr. Hurlock: I mean, I think it depends on what tools you're using, right? Any method of mechanical excavation like a backhoe, anything like that, is going to likely damage anyone's facility. I'd say that most of our facilities that we commonly lay now are in some sort of plastic conduit, whether it's gas, water, telecom, and once you breach that conduit, what's inside is either coming out or is pretty fragile. So any method of mechanical excavation is likely to breach it, and once it breaches that conduit, then it's all games off.

Mr. Phillips: If I may just speak to that as well. I agree with everything he's been saying. The thing to notice, though, is that it doesn't take very much at all to cut a fibre line. We've had contractors cut them and not even realize that they had done it because it is such a sensitive piece of material, especially if it's not in a conduit, which is the case sometimes, especially if it's aerial. We've had contractors cut it and not even realize they had done it.

Now, you're correct. It doesn't cause the same safety concerns that it does cutting a gas line or an oil line or other things of that

nature. I mean, it has downstream communications ramifications, but strictly speaking, from a safety perspective, it is not the same severity as, you know, with some other methods of underground infrastructure.

Mr. Hurlock: I'd just like to note that it's on the record that the gentleman from Shaw said that he agreed with everything the gentleman from Telus said. Just to make it official.

Mr. Nielsen: Our *Hansard* crew is incredibly efficient. That is on the record.

I don't know if Phil from Bell wanted to chime in on this as well.

Mr. Gauvin: No. I think they've covered it. I mean, we have different types of conduit. Some are basically PVC, some are reinforced, but if there is a backhoe, it can destroy even our reinforced conduits. Some fibres, you know, especially if there are drop cables to a residential user – it's basically a cable.

Mr. Nielsen: Okay. Just to segue, then, you know, we've certainly talked about some of the challenges that we've seen in rural. Just to make that very plainly clear, then, if someone severs a major connection in one of the major metropolitan areas like Edmonton or Calgary, does that shut down the entire city, or is it kind of like, you know, if a transformer goes out or a power line drops down, that it just affects a neighbourhood?

Mr. Hurlock: I think it really depends on the network. I think that all of us, the telecommunication companies, have spent a lot of money building redundancy into our network to prevent that from happening. I mean, that redundancy is very difficult to build in. So it depends on where you cut that cable and how close to the customers as far as how many services are going to go down or if our network can automatically transition and prevent that from going down. But even when that is down, that still makes it such that the network, you know, is more at risk, that if that other line, whatever the redundancy is, goes down, then, yes, neighbourhoods could go down, and a city can go down. Unfortunately, Alberta is a very rural community, and building that redundancy in, as we saw in the Grande Cache incident, is very, very difficult.

You know, as a result of those damages to that cable, we've put in a microwave tower to keep some of the communication going in the event that it does get cut again in the future. But the cost of putting in that tower saves over a million dollars just to ensure that in the future, if that line goes down, the entire community isn't without service, right? So building that redundancy in has been very expensive, and we've done it exactly for these reasons, because of the damage to our infrastructure.

Mr. Gauvin: This morning there was a suggestion that maybe there should be creation of shared mapping, you know, with the industry and other utilities and, essentially, other entities. On that topic, we, the telecommunication providers, I think all of us here today, are members of the Canadian Telecommunications Emergency Preparedness Association, which works with Safety Canada, and there's a national safety concern with respect to sharing maps. If there's a shared map that shows exactly where to hit the network, bring down the network, obviously that's not good from a terrorism perspective, so we wouldn't be able to do that, and I don't think any of us on the call could.

The way that it works today in a city: well, it's basically through one call. If you dig, there's going to be the one-call association that contacts us and asks if we have network there, and we'll confirm whether or not we have facilities there. What we wouldn't do is actually provide, you know, another utility the full map of our

network saying that, you know, this area is especially sensitive and that this other area is not.

Mr. Nielsen: Anything you wanted to add, Ian?

Mr. Phillips: Just one last point. You know, when transport lines are cut, the outages are likely much more severe sometimes than if it happens in an urban centre, where it's much more likely you will just lose a block or a neighbourhood perhaps, perhaps less if there's a redundant connection. It's when the large transport lines get cut that it causes the larger outages. So that's the larger concern.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you.

Our time is allotted, but we have two more speakers on the list, so with indulgence I think we'll cut the list off there and move on. Mr. Hanson, followed by Mr. Clark.

Mr. Hanson: Okay. Thank you, Chair. I just want to point out that it's very important that what we're trying to do here is encourage people to call, and putting a price on contractors that are already questioning whether they need to call or not is probably a step in the wrong direction.

You mentioned that you use Dig Shaw in Ontario and are now using Alberta One-Call. You said that you saw no decrease in the number of line strikes, but do you have any data that shows that those line strikes were caused by people who were noncompliant to begin with? Whether they're calling into Dig Shaw or Alberta One-Call, if they're not going to bother to call either one of those, we should be taking those line strikes out of that data.

Mr. Phillips: I, unfortunately, don't have that information, but that point is well taken. That's agreed.

Mr. Hanson: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Gauvin: On the issue of a fee per call being a step in the wrong direction, in Ontario there's a penalty if you don't call. If you think of construction costs, the constructor that's excavating a street will have to request a permit from the city, and there's a fee associated with that. There are a whole bunch of fees associated with construction. The fact that they would help defray the costs of locating equipment that's associated with their project, you know, I don't think is something that's unreasonable.

Mr. Hurlock: I'd just like to add, if I can, on that point. Well, you know, the cost of locating the facilities is going to exist somewhere, right? Having the utilities take all that on I don't think is necessarily the most efficient way of doing it. I think a lot of contractors would actually agree that if they had the ability to choose their own locator and let the free market decide how that would work and to give them the flexibility of having that locate when they actually want to work as opposed to working through a timeline on the utility, like when the locator is on a first-in, first-out kind of service, I think that with that sort of system, again, there is going to be cost there, but it gives them flexibility to do their work and to open it up to a more free-market system.

Mr. Hanson: If I might, Chair. If you're opening it up to the free market, are you going to share all of your data with the world about where all of your lines are located? Right now we're facing the problem that there are utilities that are not sharing their data with Alberta One-Call, so how are we going to manage this if you're going to now turn this out to free-market locators that aren't necessarily going to have all of the data? Who's going to take the responsibility if there's a line strike and the contractor has gone out

and done their due diligence and your line doesn't show up on their data map?

Mr. Hurlock: That's a very complicated question. You know, in different jurisdictions it's handled differently. In B.C. you can just hire anybody you want to locate your facilities. There is no certification. Is that the right method? I don't necessarily think so.

In Australia there is a certified locator program whereby you, as an excavator, go out and you hire someone who is a certified locator, and then that person is able to access these maps for the utility members. It still allows different people and different companies to be certified but to still have those people, that are secure, access those facility maps. So it's not just out in the world on the Internet anywhere. Trained professionals are able to go out, access those facility maps, and still locate the underground infrastructure. There are different ways of doing it that we've seen across the world.

11:40

Mr. Gauvin: This morning Mr. Sullivan mentioned that when Alberta One-Call gets a request, you know, it is basically automated. There's an e-mail that goes to all the members with the location of the request. If you think of us, Bell, we'll get the request, we look at our maps, and we deal with our locator. We know that in Ontario, for example, some other utilities have banded together to use one locate company for their collective uses. For us, we determined that it didn't make sense for us.

Just keep in mind that I mentioned in our opening statement specialized equipment for telecom facilities. It might be different equipment for other types of utilities in terms of figuring out where the facilities are, so the locate company that makes sense for one type of infrastructure owner might be a different type of company for another. Typically they're very similar, but competition is also good for prices, so if each company can negotiate on their own, great, and if they want to band together and it makes sense for them to use the same locate company, that's also great.

Mr. Hanson: Can I just add in there quickly?

The Deputy Chair: Very, very briefly.

Mr. Hanson: So what you're suggesting is that we put line locating out to the lowest bidder. Is that what I'm hearing?

Mr. Gauvin: Not exactly. Obviously, there need to be skilled workers, and I don't think you could say that our locate companies are inefficient or unskilled. But a locate company that's specialized for our needs might be cheaper for us than a locate company that has to do the locate for, you know, hydro companies plus gas companies plus telecom companies plus plumbing equipment and all that stuff.

The Deputy Chair: Okay. Our last question goes to Mr. Clark on the phone.

Mr. Clark: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You know, I don't do a lot of digging – I live in inner-city Calgary – but what I know is that if I'm going to do some landscaping in my backyard, I need to click before I dig, and I know that because I've seen the ads. Back in the day I knew I had to call before I dig. To make sure I'm a hundred per cent clear, before I went through this process here in this committee, I didn't realize that Shaw had a separate process. So if I call before I dig or click before I dig, does that not include Shaw infrastructure? I just want to make sure I'm clear on that point.

Mr. Phillips: You are correct. With Click Before You Dig or Call Before You Dig you would not encounter our infrastructure. You would have to call the Dig Shaw number to get our infrastructure mapped.

Mr. Clark: Given that I'm someone who's directly involved in this process, obviously it's a concern that I'm just literally learning that now through this process. You know, as someone who does pay attention to what's going on in his community and the province, I honestly didn't know about it. I guess my question is: if there is a separate process for Shaw, how do you market that? How do you promote damage prevention? Do you have a specific budget for that, and can you point me to some of that? I mean, if you do market it, where and how much do you spend on that?

Mr. Phillips: I do not have the number in front of me on how much we spend to market it, but it's well regarded by industry players and in the commercial, you know, ground disruption industry, for lack of a better term. It is also worth noting that if you called Dig Shaw and looked strictly for residential, we would just clear that ticket because we feel that the likelihood that you would hit any potential underground infrastructure in a residential area is quite low. So in all likelihood we wouldn't really mark a residence anyway. Should you clip that line, I mean, there would be no physical damage to anyone involved, and we would come and patch it at no charge. It's just that the likelihood that you would cut a residential drop is so low that we, quite frankly, wouldn't mark it.

That being said, to answer your second question, it is important that it's predominantly focused on our advertising of Dig Shaw. All of the major players, whether they be construction, development, et cetera, are aware of our program, and they call us regularly. That's why we had, you know, 55,000 calls last year in comparison to One-Call's 350,000. It's because of the nature of our infrastructure. It's a little bit different than what One-Call's focus is, which is considerably more broad.

Mr. Clark: Thank you. I'll just say that it seems like an opportunity where maybe less is more here, and it feels like there probably is some duplication happening out there. Sure, you know, I may or may not be at risk when I'm doing my backyard landscaping, but it feels like an opportunity perhaps to just make this a little bit more widely known around the province.

I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

[Mr. Shepherd in the chair]

The Acting Chair: All right. Thank you.

Were there any further questions from members of the committee?

If not, then I would thank Mr. Hurlock, Mr. Gauvin, and Mr. Phillips for making your presentations to the committee today. Thank you for joining us. Presenters are welcome to remain in the public gallery for the remainder of the meeting or depart if they wish.

Now, members of the committee, we have one other request. We have a gentleman who has joined us here in the gallery today, Mr. Armand Cardinal, who is the community and indigenous relations liaison for the wild rose region committee and indigenous relations with TransCanada. He's also a member of the Saddle Lake Cree Nation. He had a few things that he wished to comment on in regard to the discussion we're having here today. In order for us to accommodate that, that would require the unanimous consent of the committee. I just wanted to sort of test the room and see if the committee would be interested in hearing a few remarks from Mr. Cardinal. Are there any that would be opposed? On the phones, anyone that would be opposed?

Hearing no opposition, I would invite Mr. Cardinal to come forward and deliver a few brief remarks.

Mr. Cardinal: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My name is Armand Cardinal. I work as a community and indigenous relations liaison for TransCanada, and I just want to say that TransCanada is in support of the pursuit of the legislation of Bill 211.

I also want to share a couple comments unrelated to TransCanada and in my role as a liaison for TransCanada in the northern half of Alberta. Spanning the vast network of facilities that we have, TransCanada has an extensive public awareness campaign program to provide information and notification to landowners as well as municipalities, indigenous communities in general, not just First Nations but as well Métis communities. I see on a daily basis and over the course of a monthly and yearly basis as part of the incident management process that TransCanada has that there's not a week that goes by where there isn't at least two or three incidents related to unauthorized crossings, whether they be in rural and urban centres in central Alberta but as well in northern Alberta, where our rights-of-way are extensive in the forested area of northern Alberta.

When I read about the incidents that are related to unauthorized crossings or where a contractor, whether in northern Alberta or in rural and urban central Alberta, in landowners' fields, perhaps made a dig on our right-of-way close enough that it could have been fatal, I cringe when I read those kinds of incidents, and I suggest to you as legislators to consider the progress of the legislation, Bill 211, on behalf of TransCanada.

11:50

As a First Nation member from the Saddle Lake Cree Nation as well I'd like to say on behalf of the indigenous communities in Alberta that – I know you shouldn't be looking at that community specifically in favour and in focus, but this legislation could consider as a suggestion that there be reference to the indigenous communities throughout Alberta to have them pay attention to this legislation as it goes forward.

I had a good example as referred to by the MLA from my home community, the hon. Dave Hanson. Before Christmas in my home community the public works manager asked me about a couple of our lines that are in our home community. It was encouraging for me to see that he was following the process. When he and I were engaging in a conversation, he said: "You know what? The activity that we're going to do I know is a little ways away from where I think your pipeline is and your right-of-way is." I told him: "You know what? You need to just go through the process, do the one call, have somebody come and locate it, just make sure just to follow the process." For me, it showed that it worked. Now, does that happen in all the indigenous communities across Alberta? Well, going forward, in my role I'm going to make an emphasis on sharing in the right context the importance of Call Before You Dig, Alberta One-Call, and as well the efforts by Alberta Common Ground Alliance.

Thank you for your attention.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Cardinal.

Did any committee members have any questions or anything to follow up there? Mr. Nielsen.

Mr. Nielsen: Thank you for sharing your thoughts. You had just made a quick mention about that there may have been one or two times of near misses for something that could have been catastrophic. I just want to clarify. Would that be like a gas line strike or other pipeline strike?

Mr. Cardinal: Yes. Like our facilities at TransCanada?

Mr. Nielsen: Yeah.

Mr. Cardinal: Wherever our natural gas pipeline facilities and our rights-of-way are, yes.

Mr. Nielsen: I just wanted to confirm that. Thank you.

Mr. Cardinal: That's our wild rose region. As the chair was introducing me – that's northern Alberta, right? The other region, in southern Alberta, probably has their statistics as well.

Mr. Nielsen: Perfect. Thank you.

The Acting Chair: Thank you.

I believe Mr. Hanson has a question.

Mr. Hanson: Mr. Cardinal, could you just clarify. When you talk about unauthorized crossings, you're talking about major equipment crossings or just quads? At what level does it become an unauthorized crossing?

Mr. Cardinal: For any landowners or contractor companies that are looking to do work and have to cross our right-of-way, whether with equipment or heavy trucks, tractors or any kind of equipment that's heavy enough to cross over our right-of-way and they haven't called TransCanada to notify, firstly, but as well to get an access permit to cross, that's an unauthorized crossing.

Mr. Hanson: Okay. Thank you.

The Acting Chair: Any other members have any questions? Anyone on the phones?

Thank you, Mr. Cardinal.

All right, then. With that, the committee has concluded its receipt of written submissions and oral presentations. Are there any questions or comments from members in regard to consultation with stakeholders in relation to Bill 211?

Seeing and hearing none – oh, sorry.

Mr. Hanson: Are we on other business?

The Acting Chair: We're approaching but not there yet.

The next step, then, in the committee's review will be to make a recommendation to the Legislative Assembly in regard to Bill 211, Alberta Underground Infrastructure Notification System Consultation Act. I believe that will be the subject of our work tomorrow. But before we proceed to other business, do members have any questions in regard to that next step?

Seeing and hearing none, that brings us to other business. Now, under other business we do have an item that was raised by Mr. Drysdale. So, Mr. Drysdale, perhaps you could provide us, then, with a quick summary of what you would like to discuss with the committee.

Mr. Drysdale: Well, I'll try and be brief, Mr. Chair. I think that most of the members of the committee recall our last meeting, where I had concerns when we asked for the government to come and do a presentation so we could ask questions, specifically wanting to know which department was responsible for this. The motion was made to do a written presentation. I've got *Hansard* here. I could quote it, but I won't take too long. In four or five places in *Hansard* I made specific requests that all the departments consult and tell us who would be responsible for this legislation. It was shared by the chair at that time that, yes, we would be asking that specifically, and I think that the mover of the motion agreed with that. I won't read *Hansard*. But anyway, just as I suspected, we do

have the written report here from the government and nobody takes responsibility or credit, so the question I asked isn't answered in here. That's the concern I had.

I don't know whether we've got to ask again. I'm sure that direction was given in the letter written to the ministry because it was pretty clear in our minutes. I'm sure that direction was given to ask for that. I'll just see if there's a response to that.

The Acting Chair: All right. Mr. Roth, did you have anything you would like to reflect on the letter that was sent?

Mr. Roth: Thanks, Mr. Chair. As Mr. Drysdale referenced, there was a letter of invitation that went out. In the letter there was mention made of the committee's desire for the information, the clarification that Mr. Drysdale suggested. I just wanted to mention that.

The Acting Chair: All right.

Mr. Drysdale: I don't want to belabour the point, but this is what happens. Nobody takes responsibility. They all think the other guy is doing it, and it doesn't happen. That's what I'm afraid of with this legislation.

The Acting Chair: All right. Mr. Drysdale has raised the matter.

I have Mr. Hanson that wishes to speak. Any other members that wish to speak to the issue that's been raised?

Mr. Hanson.

Mr. Hanson: Thank you, Chair. I think I have a solution. I could possibly propose a motion that we address this issue.

The Acting Chair: Okay. Please go ahead.

Mr. Hanson: Mr. Hanson to move that

the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship authorize the chair to send a letter to the Ministry of Energy requesting confirmation of which government department has overall responsibility for underground infrastructure notification in Alberta and if there is currently no department with overall responsibility, a recommendation from the ministry on which department should be designated.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Hanson.

We have a motion that's been put forward. Do any members have any thoughts or discussion on the motion? Mr. Nielsen.

Mr. Nielsen: Thanks, Mr. Chair. Yeah. I remember in the last committee we were talking about that. After reading the report from the ministry, I think it seems a little difficult for them to potentially go: you are going to be the lead.

I guess with all of that said, I'm just wondering: are we right now as a committee possibly putting the cart before the horse here a little bit? I think that our whole focus around our job, after getting our presentations and whatnot, is the decision: do we send this back to the Legislature with the instructions to either not proceed or to proceed? Do you assign it to another committee, or do you form a committee? That, I think, is the scope of our duties here right now. I think we would be stealing, potentially, the thunder of that potential committee that would be formed to address and do all the consultations around this. I think we're just getting a little bit ahead of ourselves.

12:00

I don't necessarily disagree with: should there be a lead within a ministry or not? I don't know. I don't think we're in a position yet to make that, and I don't necessarily think we should be making that

right now. I think that should be tasked for the House, you know, with whatever recommendations that we come up with tomorrow as a committee on how to proceed. Should we proceed? I don't know. We're not there yet. I've certainly liked what I've seen here today, and I definitely look forward to our discussions tomorrow and how we could best advise the House.

I think at this point in time I wouldn't support the motion going forward. I would urge others probably not to as well. Again, I just don't want to see us putting the cart before the horse but, you know, don't necessarily frown on the idea either. I don't want to encourage people to do that either.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Nielsen.
Mr. Hanson.

Mr. Hanson: Yeah. Just to clarify, we're basically requesting confirmation of which government department has overall responsibility and, if there isn't anyone designated yet, just asking the ministry to designate somebody as, you know, taking this under their umbrella. I don't necessarily see it as putting the cart before the horse. I think that's what we've been given, an assignment from the Legislature to deal with Bill 211. The request was put in during the last meeting, and I think, basically, if we don't address it with this motion, then we're just shuffling off again. I think we need to designate somebody or some department to take responsibility for, especially, the underground infrastructure notifications.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Hanson.
Mr. Nielsen.

Mr. Nielsen: Yeah. Again, I guess we haven't even decided if we're recommending this to proceed or not, so I still think we have to get to that stage first so, I mean, you know, we don't lose track here. The next thing you know we're going to be recommending all kinds of stuff. Right now I think our focus is: do we recommend to the House if this proceeds? Do we recommend that it be assigned to a committee or they form a committee? Of course, the House will probably end up deciding that in its entirety, how best to handle that.

The Acting Chair: Thank you.

I have Mr. Clark and then Mr. Drysdale. Mr. Clark, please go ahead.

Mr. Clark: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You know, I kind of feel like I'm through the looking glass here again. I know I'm not in the room, but I've been in enough of these committees to kind of know how these things go. This, to me, feels like an entirely reasonable motion from the opposition that is only being resisted because it's a motion from the opposition. Frankly, Mr. Nielsen, whether this goes ahead or not, I still think this is work that should be done. I don't think doing this work biases the decision of the committee. It just enables us, if the committee does decide that this is a good idea, to move the process forward expeditiously.

It's a theme, I think, as I get a little deeper into this world of governance and elected office and a little bit of capital "G" government, that we should all work on, and that's co-ordination within and between ministries. I can't remember who it was that said it, but things just fall between the cracks because everyone sort of looks around the room, points at each other, and goes: I thought you were doing it. You know, in a worst-case scenario it's an excuse for inaction. So I think that generally we should be trying to join up different government departments for a whole bunch of different reasons. This seems like a very obvious thing to do.

I quite honestly can't see any reason why this committee and every member of it shouldn't enthusiastically support this motion. Thank you.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Clark.
Mr. Drysdale.

Mr. Drysdale: Yeah. I mean, I don't want to drag this out again. I've heard both sides. I'm not the one dragging it out. You've just got to vote for it, and it's done. You know, it was a simple question, to ask for the government to report to this committee, and they didn't ask it. Whether this committee recommends Bill 211 proceed or not, the question still needs to be answered. I've heard from the organizations throughout the province, whether it's One-Call or dig or ground alliance. They're all asking the same question: who do they talk to? Who's responsible for moving this forward? It's about the safety of Albertans and the safety of this province, and I think somebody should take responsibility. In the briefing, like, the Department of Energy says that the department currently has no direct responsibilities. Well, who the heck does, then? Like, that's the only question I'd like to know. Who does?

I'm sure we'll get voted down. That's how this committee works, and I'm fine with that. We can move on now if you like. I just had to put the comments in.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Drysdale.

Mr. Schneider: I think that when we first started talking about it – I was on the phone when we had the last meeting – we had kind of talked about having at least a representative from all of the ministries that we did end up sending a letter to. If they had happened to be sitting here today, we would have asked them – I'm not going to be very eloquent here – "Have you guys decided who will actually be the final say or take the responsibility if this bill happens to come back to the House with a recommendation to proceed?" Mr. Roth already told us that we have already included in our letter that we had made a motion without those words in it. But we did ask for at least one of the ministries – lookit, maybe it's more than one ministry; that's fine – or somebody that needs to say: "Okay. Well, when this or if this happens to come back, these are the ministries that will probably be taking care of it."

I have to speak in support of the motion, of course, because we've already discussed it in this committee, and it was agreed to in this committee at the last committee meeting. That's all I have.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Schneider.
Mr. Hanson.

Mr. Hanson: Thank you, Chair. Just to close up, I guess, on my motion, you know, we're an oil and gas province, very proudly. We've got thousands and thousands and thousands of miles of underground infrastructure that poses a potential for catastrophic failure if it's hit, telecommunications, vast amounts of telecommunications. We saw the incident up by Bonnyville that shut down the entire northeast portion of the province, from Lloydminster all the way to Cold Lake, including the air weapons range. The fact that we don't have a government department that's overall responsible for underground infrastructure notification – and that's all we're asking for, the notification, not for somebody to take responsibility for the whole issue, just the notification portion of it. If not, this motion just asks the minister to recommend which department should be designated. I don't think it's an

unreasonable request at this point, especially as we've discussed it numerous times and it was agreed upon by all parties.

Thank you.

The Acting Chair: Ms Payne.

Ms Payne: Thanks. I'm actually going to respectfully disagree with that last comment because we don't know what the scope of the committee review for moving from an optional system, a voluntary system, to a mandatory one would be like even if this committee does recommend that Bill 211 goes forward, which remains to be seen. I imagine we will, based on the comments that I've heard from various people who are in this room. However, like, that is still something to be decided. Further, not knowing what the content of the review of that committee would be, I don't know that we can adequately assume what the content of that would be or who would be the responsible ministry or officials. So I would tend to agree with my colleague's comments that that is a very premature thing, to ask the question of who's responsible when we don't know what they will be responsible for in terms of the requirements of government under any new legislation.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Ms Payne.

Are there any further comments regarding the motion?

Mr. Piquette: I appreciate what Mr. Drysdale is attempting here, and I can understand the logic behind it. However, you know, I have to concur with what my colleague Ms Payne has said.

Also, if you're talking: who's responsible for it? Well, in the interim it's actually us as a committee as we go through these deliberations. The job of legislators is to hold the bureaucracy to task. If you say: who's going to be heading this up? Well, presumably, if the committee approves this bill and lets it go forward, then who's going to ensure that this doesn't stall between ministries? Well, I guess that's going to be up to who's here, and I'm not sure how you can, you know, abdicate responsibility as legislators. It's almost like a false sense of confidence because, I mean, if death of a thousand cuts and delays is our concern, simply designating a ministry is not going to actually address that directly.

12:10

If there's a strong consensus around it – and I can see it's growing – I don't really see that as a risk. I mean, we've brought this issue forward, I think, a great deal, and I think the concern that this is simply going to sputter out is misplaced in this context. I think we should give ourselves a bit more credit.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Piquette.

Are there any further comments regarding the motion? Anyone on the phones?

Seeing and hearing none, I will call the question. All those in favour of the motion put forward by Mr. Hanson regarding the issue raised by Mr. Drysdale to make the request as stated, please say aye. Those opposed?

Mr. Drysdale: Could we have a recorded vote? It's hard to tell.

The Acting Chair: Mr. Drysdale has requested a recorded vote, so we will start to my right. Sorry. Okay. That motion was, to best that

I could tell, defeated. But Mr. Drysdale has requested a recorded vote, so we will go forward to verify that.

Mr. Drysdale: Aye.

Mr. Hanson: Aye.

Mr. Schneider: Aye.

Mr. Rosendahl: No.

Mr. Kleinstaub: Against.

Mr. Piquette: No.

Ms Payne: No.

Mr. Nielsen: No.

The Acting Chair: And on the phones, then, we have Mr. Clark.

Mr. Clark: Aye.

The Acting Chair: Ms Babcock.
Ms Kazim.

Ms Kazim: No.

The Acting Chair: Mrs. Schreiner.

Mrs. Schreiner: No.

The Acting Chair: Mr. Loewen.
That gives us seven against and four for the motion.
That motion is defeated.
Are there any other items under other business?
Seeing and hearing none . . .

Mr. Loewen: Mr. Chair, there were only four ayes?

The Chair: Yes, that's correct. We had four voting aye. Was that Mr. Loewen?

Mr. Loewen: Yes, it was.

The Acting Chair: Okay. I called your name, Mr. Loewen, but did not hear. Did you wish to register your vote?

Mr. Loewen: Yes. I voted aye.

The Acting Chair: Okay. Thank you.

That would bring it to five for aye and seven for no. Nonetheless, the motion remains defeated.

That brings us, then, to the date of the next meeting. Of course, as you're aware, we're scheduled to meet tomorrow, February 27, 2019, at 1 p.m.

With that, is there a member that would make a motion to adjourn? Mr. Rosendahl. All those in favour? Somewhat less enthusiasm than I anticipated. Any opposed? This committee stands adjourned. We'll see you tomorrow.

[The committee adjourned at 12:14 p.m.]

