



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission
Public Hearings

Edmonton

Monday, April 19, 2010
1:30 p.m.

Transcript No. 27-3-11

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission

Judge Ernest J.M. Walter, Chairman

Dr. Keith Archer
Peter Dobbie, QC
Brian Evans, QC
Allyson Jeffs

Office of the Chief Electoral Officer

Chief Electoral Officer	Brian Fjeldheim
Deputy Chief Electoral Officer	Lori McKee-Jeske

Participants

Naresh Bhardwaj, MLA, Edmonton-Ellerslie
Casey DesChamp, Edmonton-Ellerslie Progressive Conservative Constituency Association
Peter Kirylchuk, Mayor, and Cecilia Quist, Deputy Mayor, Lac La Biche County
Stephen Mandel, Mayor, City of Edmonton
Brian Mason, MLA, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood
Dr. Bruce Miller
Peter Pilarski, Calgary-Foothills Progressive Conservative Constituency Association
Orville Sinnott
Len Webber, MLA, Calgary-Foothills

Support Staff

Clerk	W.J. David McNeil
Clerk Assistant and Director of House Services	Louise J. Kamuchik
Senior Parliamentary Counsel	Robert H. Reynolds, QC
Administrator	Shannon Dean
Communications Consultant	Karen Sawchuk
Consultant	Melanie Friesacher
Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>	Tom Forgrave
	Liz Sim

1:30 p.m.

Monday, April 19, 2010

[Judge Walter in the chair]

The Chair: Thank you. We're on for our afternoon session. Melanie, would you give us our first presenter, please.

Ms Friesacher: Our first presenter is Dr. Bruce Miller.

The Chair: We don't have you listed, as such, but welcome. We'd be happy to hear from you. We will be allowing 10 minutes for presentation and 10 minutes for questions.

Dr. Miller: I don't think I have a 10-minute presentation.

The Chair: All right. Would you for the record, since we're on *Hansard*, just give your name.

Dr. Bruce Miller

Dr. Miller: Right. Bruce Miller. I'm presently a minister at Garneau United Church, and I do some work as the academic adviser for the U of A extension program. I'm the former MLA for Edmonton-Glenora. I was in for one term. I was elected in 2004, and I lost the last election in 2008.

My concern is the change in boundaries to Edmonton-Glenora, which is on your page 80. I saw the proposal some weeks ago and have had some discussion with people in the riding. I guess the reason why the boundaries are being changed is to increase the population, but there are some curious decisions in the proposal.

A positive move would be to move the northern boundary from 118th Avenue up to the Yellowhead. That makes sense because, you know, Westmount Shopping Centre is on 111th Avenue, and I'm sure that people who live north of 118th Avenue shop at the Safeway there and use the services in the Westmount Shopping Centre area. The Yellowhead represents a real, you know, natural barrier between people who live south of the Yellowhead and people who live north. That section between 142nd Street and 121st Street north between 118th Avenue and the Yellowhead belonged to Edmonton-Calder before, and it does make sense that it belongs to Edmonton-Glenora. I can see a lot of cohesiveness in that area. In fact, the Edmonton school board closed a school that was south of 118th Avenue, and most of the students are going to a school just north of 118th Avenue, so that makes sense.

On the eastern side, though, I'm puzzled by that. The border was 121st Street right to 118th Avenue, and now it's going to be way over to 97th Street. The airport is there and NAIT. I'm puzzled by that. I don't see any cohesiveness between residents east of NAIT and Edmonton-Glenora because there's a natural boundary along 121st Street. That's where the old railway track went, so there's quite a barrier there. You know, there are residential homes all along on the west side of 121st Street, but on the east side there is a park area all the way along, and then there's the industrial area. You don't get a lot of residents until you're east of 119th Street. So I'm puzzled by that. I don't see the rationale for that.

The other thing is that on the west side, I'm really puzzled by the boundary there because the old boundaries that existed went right across to 170th Street. If you're driving down 111th Avenue, you come to the Mayfield Inn right here. You go down Mayfield Road. That's really the western extent of Edmonton-Glenora's residential homes. There is a natural barrier there. If you look across the road here, Mayfield Road, you see the big partition that's a sound barrier and so on. I guess I'm kind of distressed that this part is removed

from Edmonton-Glenora. It has nothing to do with politics because I didn't win any polls as a Liberal west of 149th Street.

That is a low socioeconomic area. I always found that Edmonton-Glenora was kind of a unique riding because along the river, along Stony Plain just west of 124th Street, you have high-income homes and residents, especially old Glenora and Capitol Hill. As you go north and west, the economic level goes down, especially when you get out to Britannia and the Mayfield area right in the western end of Edmonton-Glenora. I always felt that it was really great to have that diversity in the same riding. I think that people who have low income have a low involvement in politics, and I always felt quite privileged to represent them. When I was MLA, one of the big issues was affordable housing. A lot of people in that western portion struggle with income, struggle with housing, struggle with all kinds of services. I just thought it was a strength to have in Edmonton-Glenora, where you have very wealthy people close to the river, people who, obviously, have a sense of power in politics and are not shy in getting what they need, having those people go to bat for the people who are poorer and in lower socioeconomic areas of the riding. I think it would be a loss, really, to not have that section.

I think there is a lot of continuity in terms of cohesiveness between people who live south of Stony Plain and people who live north. It's kind of an artificial barrier to have the border between Edmonton-Riverview and Edmonton-Glenora right along Stony Plain Road, but that's the way it's been for a long, long time, so I guess that's probably the way it will remain.

I don't think I have any other points to make.

The Chair: Well, thank you. Keith.

Dr. Archer: Yeah. Thanks, Dr. Miller. On the east side, just looking at the map of Edmonton overall, it looks like we used 97th Street as a boundary for a fair bit of the north part of the city, all the way from 167th Avenue, kind of the northwest corner of Edmonton-Decore, all the way down to about 111th Avenue. I guess there's a certain consistency in doing that, but what you're suggesting is that as we go into the individual ridings, that may not be the natural place to have that division. I take it your recommendation is that instead of using 97th Street on the east side, we should be looking at 121st Street, where it is currently.

Dr. Miller: Yeah. That's the way it is now, straight up from 104th Avenue to 118th Avenue. But now, if you extended the northern boundary of Edmonton-Glenora right up to the Yellowhead, that to me makes a lot of sense.

Dr. Archer: You were also recommending pushing it out farther west, so instead of using 149th Street as the western boundary, making it 170th Street. Do you have a sense as to what the relative population trade-off is in making that kind of a change? At the moment Edmonton-Glenora is pretty close to the provincial average. One of the features, I think, of the report this time around is that the Edmonton ridings tend to be within plus or minus 10 per cent of the average. With the changes that you're suggesting, do you have a sense that they will keep us within those ranges?

1:40

Dr. Miller: Well, I think that if Edmonton-Glenora didn't include the part east of the airport but did include the parts west of 156th Street, you'd probably have the same numbers. It would come out the same, maybe even a little more because along Stony Plain on the west side there are a lot of walk-up apartments, a lot of seniors'

dwellings. I mean, the original boundary was 170th Street, right? Beyond Mayfield Road it's mostly stores and it's an industrial area, but if you included all those communities like Mayfield, Britannia, Canora, and so on that are between Stony Plain Road and 111th Avenue right over to Mayfield Road, that's a much greater population, I'm sure, than this little section over east of the airport.

When people say Glenora, people think, you know, that it's basically from 124th Street to Mayfield Road. I mean, they think of that whole area. There seems to be a cohesiveness in terms of the way people travel and so on.

Having the boundary go up 156th Street and then over to 149th Street, well, I mean, with 149th Street, that's the industrial area there. There's no residential population, so the boundary could actually go over to 142nd Street and go north because there's nobody living in there anyways. But splitting Edmonton-Glenora the way it is now, along 156th Street, I don't understand that.

Dr. Archer: Okay. If we were to push Edmonton-Glenora over further to the west, at least towards 170th Street, that would be taking population away from Edmonton-La Perle, which is a bit bigger than Edmonton-Glenora. We have Edmonton-La Perle at about 5 per cent above the average whereas Edmonton-Glenora is 1 per cent above the average, and maybe those numbers will flip around if we do that. You're saying that there's more of a community of interest in going that way, and if the net result is that Edmonton-Glenora becomes a bit larger, then you're prepared to support that.

Dr. Miller: Oh, yes. Yeah, I think so. I mean, I have no problems with that. It's a huge number of people to try to represent as the MLA, but I didn't find it overly taxing. I think that if it was around 40,000 or whatever – I'm not sure what numbers you're using.

Dr. Archer: The average is 40,880.

Dr. Miller: Yeah. I don't see that that's a problem.

Dr. Archer: Okay. Thanks for those comments.

The Chair: Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and thanks, Dr. Miller, for your specific comments. If you ask us to move the eastern boundary of Edmonton-Glenora further west to 121st Street, had you thought about where the NAIT and airport lands would best be situated? Which constituency would you recommend have it? That was one of our questions. There appears to be a plan in place in Edmonton to develop on the airport lands. One of our thoughts was that those living in Edmonton-Glenora would likely be significantly affected by that development, and an MLA covering that area from NAIT to the west might have a common set of interests. If we were to remove it – it's got to go somewhere; it can't be on its own – where would you recommend it?

Dr. Miller: Well, Edmonton-Centre is probably too big as it is because of the high-rise developments and condos and so on. I don't know. I don't have those numbers. But that would be the natural connection, I think, with downtown, because you're going to have an LRT expansion from downtown out to NAIT. At the same time, I mean, I don't know; Kingsway Mall, which is right by the airport, brings people in from all over the northern part of the city. I don't think that many people from Edmonton-Glenora shop at Kingsway Mall because there's Westmount Shopping Centre, and West

Edmonton Mall is not that far from Edmonton-Glenora. Actually, in terms of interest, people further east would be more focused, I think, on that area. It just struck me as being really strange to throw that in. I don't know why you think that Edmonton-Glenora people would be particularly interested in having that. I mean, the airport: obviously, the development that is going to happen there is probably a long time in the future. I don't know. Another boundary commission might have to deal with that in the future by the time they figure that one out, but right now I don't see that that's really an advantage for people in Edmonton-Glenora or even of much interest.

Mr. Dobbie: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you very much, Dr. Miller. Just in terms of more of a comment than a question, really, I think in terms of the configuration of Edmonton-Glenora we got a little boxed in. It's hard to make that jump north across Yellowhead Trail, so that was a fairly easy boundary. I think we needed to gather some population because I think even now Edmonton-Glenora is just 1 per cent above the provincial average. We were dealing with a fairly significant reconfiguration along the south and west boundary of Edmonton, that Edmonton-Glenora might have got caught up in, because it's not really feasible, I think, for it to go further north than Yellowhead Trail. That becomes a fairly significant barrier.

I don't know if that helps solve the puzzle. It probably doesn't help resolve the issues with respect to the communities of interest around Edmonton-Glenora. In terms of that, looking from where the west boundary is now between – I mean, I think it may not be feasible to go all the way to 170th Street. Are there particular communities there? If we were going to start to add but maybe not go to the current boundary at 170th Street, are there communities that would be more sensible to add than others or just as a boundary?

Dr. Miller: No. I think those communities have a lot in common. They all struggle, those communities west of 156th street. Some of them have lost their school, and they really struggle in terms of community services and in terms of organizations. I don't know what advantage it would be for them, actually, to be taken away from Edmonton-Glenora and added to a riding that goes way, way out west, which really probably involves a lot of real suburbanites with new homes and so on. I mean, these are really quite older homes. In fact, in Mayfield – this used to be kind of a marshy area – a lot of the homes actually were not built with basements. I know that as an MLA because you always had to climb up so many steps to get to the front door.

I just don't know. I'm really concerned about social justice, and I'm always concerned about political decisions that affect the lower socioeconomic people.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. Well, I appreciate that, and I appreciate your comments about where we might try and put the airport and the NAIT lands.

I notice that there was an error in the data we used for Edmonton, so we're going to have to change the configuration around Edmonton-Highlands-Beverly as well. I appreciate your comments. We have to do some rearranging in that area, so we will take that into consideration.

Thank you.

The Chair: Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Dr. Miller. I'll start with that airport area, first of all. As my colleagues have said, you know, if you look at the historic Edmonton-Glenora, that area to the west of 121st of course is very interested in what is happening at the airport. We felt it was consistent – and this is not absolute, of course – to have the areas that we've identified east and south of the airport as part of that whole airport redevelopment area, particularly when you consider population issues.

1:50

When I look at the area west, it would be helpful to us if we had some comments from some of those folks west of 149th and west of 156th to 170th if they feel that their representation would be better in Edmonton-Glenora as opposed to Edmonton-La Perle because I don't think we have heard that at this point in time. Edmonton-La Perle looks to me like it's got a pretty good socioeconomic mix with the boundaries that we have considered for our interim report. I would be curious whether yourself or anybody in the Edmonton-La Perle constituency, as we've created it, would have any comments about the merits of that configuration as opposed to being back in Edmonton-Glenora and using 170th. I certainly see the reality of the difference between the west and the east side of 170th Street. That does apply somewhat to 149th or 142nd, as you said, for the north. And 156th is a fairly decent-sized roadway although not nearly as much of a demarcation point as 170th.

I certainly appreciate your input. Those are my only comments. Thank you.

Dr. Miller: If I could just respond to that one comment about the people west of 156th and the fact that you don't hear from them. I'm not surprised. I mean, that goes along with it being a low socioeconomic area. The voter turnout is very, very low for the polls in that area. You don't have a lot of people that are, you know, politically aggressive and so on. That's why I'm here, because I really feel that they need to have a voice. I thought that as an MLA for Edmonton-Glenora I could be an effective voice for them. A lot of their concerns have to do with poverty, social services, and affordable housing, and I represent those kinds of issues really well. I feel that it would be kind of a loss for Edmonton-Glenora to not have that section go right out to 170th, you know, Mayfield Road.

Mr. Evans: It is somewhat offset by the socioeconomics of that area east of the airport. I presume there's not a huge distinction between the two.

Dr. Miller: Well, there are a lot of NAIT students in there. I mean, that's a different kind of population. I know a little bit about it because the builder who built my house in Glenora used to live over in that area. It's a different kind of population. I'm not sure about the continuity or the cohesiveness between Glenora and that population.

The airport development is such a new thing. I don't know how to respond to that, really. It's down the road. I'm not sure what it will mean.

The Chair: Thank you very much. We'll take into account what you've given us.

Dr. Miller: Thank you. All the best.

The Chair: We're running behind, so we're going to have to start looking at time frames and adhering to them.

Ms Friesacher: The next presenter is Ms Casey DesChamp, Edmonton-Ellerslie PC Constituency Association, and Mr. Naresh Bhardwaj, MLA, Edmonton-Ellerslie.

The Chair: For the record, since we're on *Hansard*, would you please identify yourselves?

Ms DesChamp: Sure. My name is Casey DesChamp, and I am here to make a presentation on behalf of the Edmonton-Ellerslie Progressive Conservative Constituency Association.

Mr. Bhardwaj: Naresh Bhardwaj, MLA, Edmonton-Ellerslie.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms DesChamp: We have two main areas. I have the report, but it's identical to the one that's already been submitted. I wasn't sure if you wanted me to read it or just discuss the bare bones of it. Which would you prefer in the interest of saving time?

The Chair: You proceed as you choose.

**Naresh Bhardwaj, MLA
Edmonton-Ellerslie**

**Casey DesChamp, Edmonton-Ellerslie
Progressive Conservative Constituency Association**

Ms DesChamp: Okay. Thank you. Predominantly we're looking at two major areas. One is Knottwood.

Actually, Naresh, if you can operate that for me, that would be great.

In the proposed boundaries there are two changes we would like to propose, or suggest. One is that we keep the Knottwood Community League together. As you know, most of the communities work in neighbourhoods of their community leagues, and this part, that Mr. Bhardwaj is showing, is part of the Knottwood Community League. We are recommending that 91st Street makes a far better boundary than Mill Woods Road. Mill Woods Road is in the middle of residential areas. Children cross the street quite often to get to their schools, to go back and forth, this kind of thing. Ninety-first Street is a divided roadway – I was going to say highway, but that's not quite right – and makes a far more natural boundary in that respect.

The Meyonohk neighbourhood, which is just a bit north of there, belongs more in the Lakewood Community League. We're suggesting as per your recommendations that Lakewood be separated. It could go into the Edmonton-Mill Woods boundaries as you like, but we would ask that you reconsider Knottwood Community League.

The other area that we're particularly interested in is the corner of 50th Street and 28th Avenue. If you have the presentation I brought, on the very last page you'll see that it's area B, and then this is even more detailed. Actually, if you count the Allen Gray continuing care centre, there are only seven residential buildings in that little pocket there. The rest of all of poll 6 is commercial.

Again, if you look at the bottom, since the provincial election these two buildings on the bottom there, showing Hewes Way and 25th Avenue, have since been completed, so the population increased from 1,047 to 1,156 in that little corner. That's all there is, and they are not associated with any community league or anything else. Some of these buildings are seniors only. As a matter of fact, four of the six are. I'm excluding the continuing care centre from defining these because those are seniors who need the care. The others are closer to normal residences.

Across the top there are sort of three divisions. The one on the corner is the continuing care. The two beside it are seniors, some who require some assisted care but not all. These two in the middle are adult only, and then the two at the bottom allow for families. We're asking that that please remain in Edmonton-Ellerslie. It's an important area to us. We spend a lot of time with them, especially with the seniors, and working with them. They're familiar with us, us with them, and it is the only residential area in all of poll 6.

That's about it. Those are the two main areas that are of concern, recognizing that we could give up the Meyonohk, the Lakewood to balance out. We're under on the population, so leaving that in Edmonton-Ellerslie would not increase us at all.

The Chair: Is there anything else before we start asking questions?

Mr. Bhardwaj: Just to further supplement some of the comments made by Casey, the area specifically that she's talking about in the Knottwood area is called Satoo, which is splitting the Knottwood Community League in half. In talking to the president of Knottwood Community League and some of the residents of the community league, they feel and we feel that it's best represented by one member as opposed to splitting the community right in the middle and having two separate members representing a community league for various reasons, attending community league meetings, having to work with the community leagues on various issues. I think it's best if one member is representing that.

The total population we're looking at in that specific area, which is being drawn by the Anthony Henday line and Mill Woods Road, would be about 3,490 total, roughly 3,500 people, the total number of voters. Carrying along the same argument of keeping the community leagues together, although in our written submissions they were very, very happy to serve the Meyonohk area, it's a better fit for a number of different reasons. For the same reason I alluded to earlier for Mill Woods, you know, include them as part of the Edmonton-Mill Woods constituency. So all of that area will be part of the Lakewood Community League, including both of the schools.

2:00

If we move further up east of 66th Street, where there are about five residential areas, adult condominiums for the most part and one of them being the Allen Gray continuing care centre, that area is really a stand-alone. We've done a lot of research in that area about which community league that really belongs to. They don't. They are a stand-alone. They don't belong to any of the Edmonton community leagues. They've been a part of Edmonton-Ellerslie constituency. I think the majority of them are seniors or adults. They're quite used to being part of Edmonton-Ellerslie. In fact, a lot of them would love to make a presentation as well if need be. Their thinking is that they feel much more comfortable there. They know where to go, where to vote. All of that is natural for them, and I think it serves their purposes to keep them as part of the Edmonton-Ellerslie constituency.

With that, if we are taking a look at total numbers, it would bring up the numbers for the Edmonton-Ellerslie constituency. If Edmonton-Ellerslie constituency was to include the two areas, the Satoo and the Allen Gray areas, which we pointed out, it will bring the population total number up to 41,448, which is pretty well in line with our provincial average. But if we're looking at lower numbers for Edmonton-Mill Woods – and I don't know what part is being considered – in talking to the city of Edmonton and really observing the overall growth pattern, boundary reviews happen every eight years, and that means that for the Edmonton-Ellerslie constituency to go over your prescribed limit, which is 25 per cent, it needs to

grow by over 10,000 people, which is not likely. The thinking is that if eight years from now Edmonton-Ellerslie has outgrown your predetermined number, then the whole community league could be moved as one as opposed to splitting the communities apart.

You know, by reshuffling the numbers as we're describing, that will bring Edmonton-Mill Woods to 35,617. That's well within the 25 per cent threshold you're describing and is still probably a larger number than some of the other provincial constituencies.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is our submission, and we're open for questions.

Dr. Archer: Well, thanks very much for that presentation. Because Edmonton-Ellerslie is about 10 per cent below the average right now . . .

Mr. Bhardwaj: Yeah, we're sitting at 36,849, which is 9.88 per cent below the provincial average and about 11 per cent below the Edmonton average.

Dr. Archer: Right. So there's certainly room to consider the recommendation that you're bringing forward.

In our interim report we recommended that Edmonton-Mill Woods would be closer to the provincial average and Edmonton-Ellerslie would be a bit below to accommodate some potential growth. What you're suggesting is that putting Edmonton-Ellerslie closer to the provincial average will likely still not result in Edmonton-Ellerslie having a population that's well above the provincial average even six or seven years out because the growth is going to be probably less than 10,000 people.

Mr. Bhardwaj: Yeah. Absolutely.

Dr. Archer: That's a useful bit of advice for us.

Now, we had a presentation earlier today from someone from Edmonton-Mill Woods, I think, who was making a similar recommendation, but the one variation in her proposal was that instead of using 91st Street as the western boundary, she suggested coming all the way over to Calgary Trail and, consequently, having 23rd Avenue all the way to Calgary Trail as the southern boundary of Edmonton-Mill Woods. That would incorporate that part up to 91st Street that you're talking about but also the area from 91st Street to Calgary Trail south of 23rd Ave. Is that consistent with what you're recommending? Would you see that as problematic?

Mr. Bhardwaj: It's not really problematic. Well, there are a couple of things I'm keeping in mind by looking at your recommendations and strictly working with your recommendations in trying to come up with natural boundaries. Ellerslie Road used to be the south boundary, Calgary Trail used to be the west boundary, and 34th Avenue used to be the north boundary. But if you did it that way, Edmonton-Mill Woods is going to end up losing probably – and I had the numbers written down, actually, but I don't have them right in front of me – about 1,500 to 2,000 people. So it will push the numbers down considerably for Edmonton-Mill Woods. Hence, by calculating the way, you know, our PC association did – that's the premise we worked with – we kept mostly what you're recommending in mind when trying to make some minor modifications to accommodate the objective you're trying to accomplish yet, at the same time, be fair in everything we're doing. Like I said, we're more than happy to represent the Meyonohk area, no hesitation there at all.

Dr. Archer: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you. Just following up, one alternative – and this was suggested this morning – is that the Ridgewood neighbourhood be moved from Edmonton-Ellerslie to Edmonton-Mill Woods. If we accepted your proposition or perhaps moved over to Calgary Trail, it would let us deal with the numbers for each constituency in a manner that we think might be more appropriate. For example, my understanding is that the Edmonton-Mill Woods constituency is largely developed. There's not likely to be much infill housing or much growth in there, relatively speaking, when compared to Edmonton-Ellerslie. Is that a fair assumption?

Mr. Bhardwaj: That's a fair comment to an extent. They've just included in the Hillview area a whole bunch of new condominium units on one of the old school sites which was surplus.

Mr. Dobbie: Just so I know, where is that neighbourhood, sir?

Mr. Bhardwaj: It's part of Mill Woods.

Mr. Dobbie: Can you point it out on the map just so we can see it?

Mr. Bhardwaj: You know, to be honest with you, the map doesn't go that far. It would be on the Edmonton-Mill Woods map. It would be roughly 38th Avenue and, I would say, 57th Street or 58th Street, in that neighbourhood.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you.

Mr. Bhardwaj: There are a whole bunch of condominiums going up there. Without my glasses I'd really need to move up there. But that's the general area where it's happening. Further to that, there are other neighbourhoods. This particular one I brought up is brand new. Exactly how many condominiums are built there I'm not sure. But those kinds of developments are happening. The reason we're sticking to, you know, proposing what we're proposing is that further down the road it will need – and you're correct to an extent that Mill Woods itself is not going to grow a whole lot other than some of these new condominium units and some of the remodifications that are going to come up, but if at some point the population exceeds considerably in the Edmonton-Ellerslie constituency, then, yes, we would have no choice. But that's way out yet.

Mr. Dobbie: All right. Again, if you could only have one option, if we were to add the area you suggested at the cost of Ridgewood moving to Edmonton-Mill Woods – and that's the community that is currently bounded by 34th Street on the east and 34th Avenue and Mill Woods Road . . .

Mr. Bhardwaj: East of 34th Street and . . .

2:10

Mr. Dobbie: Well, Mill Woods Road currently is the western boundary of that community. The suggestion is that we could take the little jog that's into Mill Woods and move that road to the west to 34th Street. That's a neighbourhood of about 3,500 people. The argument from the Edmonton-Mill Woods presentation this morning was that it's a better fit with Edmonton-Mill Woods rather than Edmonton-Ellerslie.

Ms DesChamp: I'm sorry. I don't understand which one. Edmonton-Mill Woods is sort of a big square. So when you just say Mill Woods Road, I'm having difficulty sorting out which one it is.

Mr. Dobbie: Right in here. This currently – you see the map.

Ms DesChamp: That is currently part of Edmonton-Ellerslie.

Mr. Bhardwaj: What are the boundaries, if you don't mind reading that off to me, please?

Mr. Dobbie: Sure. On the west it's Mill Woods Road northwest; on the north, 34th Avenue; on the east 34th Street; and on the south, 23rd Avenue.

Mr. Bhardwaj: Okay. Well, I'll go back to my earlier argument. What it's going to do, then, is that it's going to split the Knottwood Community League in half. Using 91st Street as your natural west boundary and keeping that Knottwood Community League together, in my opinion, is a far better representation. If you split the community league in half, it could mean that you could possibly have two separate representatives – well, not possibly; it will be two separate representatives – representing one community league. That's my submission there.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sorry; I'm just going to follow up on that. I thought Knottwood was on the other side of the constituency. So if we add – what is it? We're looking at adding Ridgewood.

Ms DesChamp: Excuse me. If I can come up here. Is this Ridgewood up here?

Ms Jeffs: Yes.

Ms DesChamp: That's Ridgewood. Okay, but your proposal shows that it goes into . . .

Mr. Bhardwaj: Edmonton-Mill Woods.

Ms Jeffs: Into Edmonton-Mill Creek.

Ms DesChamp: Edmonton-Mill Creek. All right.

This is not part of Edmonton-Ellerslie in your proposal?

Mr. Bhardwaj: It's not part of Edmonton-Ellerslie right now.

Ms Jeffs: No. The suggestion was that it could move as part of that configuration. But I just want to be clear because dealing with Ridgewood doesn't affect Knottwood.

Ms DesChamp: No, because that's Edmonton-Mill Creek, and it could go in there, but it wouldn't affect Edmonton-Ellerslie.

Mr. Bhardwaj: This is the part which is the most concerning.

Ms DesChamp: This is the part over here which splits the community. Mill Woods Road is only a four-lane street, and it runs between residences. I drive it quite often because my grandchildren go to school there. There must be a crosswalk, like, every two or three blocks. It does not create sort of the natural boundary that the double-wide 91st Street does, basically.

Mr. Bhardwaj: Furthermore, the lack of representation.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you. I appreciate the clarity of that presentation. I want to shift a little bit in terms of the issue of growth. We had left Edmonton-Ellerslie about 10 per cent below the average to allow for some growth. You're suggesting that maybe we left a little too much. But I note that if Edmonton-Ellerslie grew by 10,000, that's over 20 per cent. That would be getting very close to that 25 per cent. Even though by statute the divisions can vary by 25 per cent, what we've consistently heard is that's not an optimal thing if we can do it. Having said that, where possible we're trying not to split communities. So I'm hoping there's a way we can move some of the boundaries there and achieve both ends; in other words, leave room for some growth there because it has been our sense that there will be quite a bit.

Mr. Bhardwaj: I think that even if you went with what we're just proposing, it's not written in stone that that particular area will grow by 10,000. It may only grow by, you know, 5,000. That will still be well below your 25 per cent. So we're sort of assuming and forecasting, and we try to get the closest numbers from the city to the best of their ability, to the best of our ability. This is by going to the other extreme that it could happen in the next eight years. But it may be only a few thousand, and you may not have to.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. Thank you. Because I'm cartographically challenged, this area on the back of your presentation: these residences are currently in the area B that you've talked about.

Ms DesChamp: Yeah, and that's all the residences that there can be there.

Ms Jeffs: Okay.

Mr. Bhardwaj: There are only five buildings.

Ms Jeffs: Right. I just wanted to make sure it wasn't a different area.

Mr. Bhardwaj: The rest is Canadian Tire and, actually, Mill Woods Town Centre mall and a few other businesses.

Ms Jeffs: Then, did I get confused? I thought you were talking about another adult building, but is that within here as well?

Mr. Bhardwaj: That's in the area marked "B."

Ms Jeffs: Okay. So that's all within that area.

Mr. Bhardwaj: It's all included; you bet. The total number is about 1,100 people, or 1,056 to be exact.

Ms Jeffs: Okay. Thank you very much. I just wanted to be clear about that.

Ms DesChamp: There's the continuing care centre, but of the other six four are adult only, and two of those right next to the continuing care are assisted living to some extent. You can choose to have it if you live there.

Ms Jeffs: All right. Thank you very much. Those are my questions.

Mr. Bhardwaj: Thank you.

Ms DesChamp: Those are our dear seniors.

The Chair: Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and thanks to both of you for your presentation. I would just like some clarification as to what you know to be the areas that have been approved for residential development within your constituency. Specifically, that area along Anthony Henday and east of 34th Street, is that an area that's already subject to an area structure plan, or is it just a future development area?

Mr. Bhardwaj: No, it's not. No. It's a very, very future construction plan. The area which has been approved right now is Walker Lake. That is south of Ellerslie Road and west of 50th Street. Anything east of that is way out for approval. You know, exactly when I can't honestly answer because I didn't specifically check into that. Right now the area which has been approved is called Walker Lake. In fact, you don't even need to go as far as 50th Street. I would say probably 57th, 58th Street and Ellerslie Road south. In that general area is where there is some development happening. When you're looking at south of Anthony Henday west of 50th Street, in that area, there is nothing happening there right now.

Ms DesChamp: When you go door-knocking in that area, you have to drive from residence to residence. It's not a residential area; it's more like estates and farms. We call it our little rural area.

Mr. Evans: Okay. Well, that's very helpful. Again, we had kept the population low because we assumed that development was imminent in that area.

Mr. Bhardwaj: No. In fact, we have put in a call to the city just to get you the exact numbers. We don't quite have them. We didn't have them at the time of the submission. You know, we wanted to give you that exact number and their projections, which are a long ways out.

Mr. Evans: Okay. Thank you very much. Those are all my questions.

The Chair: Thank you both very much. We'll certainly take what you've given us under consideration.

Mr. Bhardwaj: Thank you so much.

Ms DesChamp: Thank you for your time.

The Chair: Thank you.

All right. We'll take a very short adjournment and be back in 10 minutes.

[The hearing adjourned from 2:19 p.m. to 2:27 p.m.]

Ms Friesacher: Our next presenter is Mayor Stephen Mandel with the city of Edmonton.

The Chair: Since we're being recorded by Alberta *Hansard*, I'd ask that you identify yourself for the record.

Mr. Mandel: Mayor Stephen Mandel with the city of Edmonton.

The Chair: Go ahead.

**Stephen Mandel, Mayor
City of Edmonton**

Mr. Mandel: It's a pleasure to be here today. Judge Walter and members of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, thank you for this opportunity to present Edmonton city council's position. We commend the commission on its work so far. Of particular note, the boundaries as proposed in the interim report have resolved the major concern of the size of the Edmonton-Whitemud riding. The population in this riding has been reasonably reallocated so as to balance the voice of each voter in the city. We believe the work can be done, that we can take it one step further as to better balance the population of urban centres as compared to the rest of the province.

The city of Edmonton is requesting that the Electoral Boundaries Commission adopt option 2 referenced on page 10 of the interim report so as to provide 20 electoral divisions within the boundaries of our city. This would be an increase of two from the 18 electoral division seats we currently have. Since the 2006 federal census the population of the city of Edmonton has increased by over 60,000 to a current population of 782,439 people. The capital region growth plan is projecting the city's population to be over 900,000 people by the end of the next commission report, in 2019. It's important to recognize the city's recent growth and to ensure appropriate representation as the city continues to grow. The amount of rebalancing required in 2019 will be reduced if the number of seats in Edmonton is increased to 20 now.

City council continues to recognize the difficult task before the commission and the balancing that you must do to satisfy the requests and needs of all citizens in Alberta. However, as I stated the last time I appeared before you, in September of last year, Edmonton is not only the capital of the province; it is an engine of economic growth for the region, the province, and the nation. As such it requires equitable representation in the Legislative Assembly of Alberta. Edmonton city council supports option 2 and urges the commission to consider further redrawing the electoral boundaries on the map to allocate 20 seats in the boundaries of the city of Edmonton. I really believe that this issue of not doing anything until 2019 is a major issue and needs to be addressed now.

On that note, thank you very much, and I'd be more than happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

The Chair: Keith.

Dr. Archer: Thanks, Mayor Mandel. The numbers presented on pages 10 and 11 reflect the various options that the commission was looking at and the variances that would exist under the recommended option. We don't fully outline the variances that would exist under each of the three options that were considered, but it would be something like the following. I'm looking in particular at the table that's about halfway down page 11.

Mr. Mandel: Halfway down page 11, where it says the after per cent quotient?

Dr. Archer: The after per cent quotient. With option 2 what we would see is that the average variation in Calgary would be as it's stated there, plus 4.3 per cent, so on average each of the Calgary ridings will be about 4 per cent above the provincial average. The rest of Alberta would be pretty close to zero per cent, and Edmonton would be about minus 4 per cent. Under option 2 the net result is that what we're calling the rest of Alberta would have an average very close to the province as a whole, Calgary would be 4 per cent above, Edmonton 4 per cent below.

One interpretation of that outcome is that Calgary would receive one fewer seat, one could argue, than it deserves by the arithmetic, and Edmonton would have one more seat than it deserves by the arithmetic. It seems to me that it wouldn't be unreasonable for a person to conclude that one of the seats from Calgary was transferred to Edmonton. How would you respond to that interpretation?

Mr. Mandel: I don't have any problems with the interpretation. I'm confused which table you're talking about here. On page 11 you have interim recommended divisions. Which one? I got confused. The first one is that Calgary is 4.3 per cent and then Edmonton plus 0.7 per cent and the rest of the province minus 2.8 per cent. Is that the one you're referring to?

Dr. Archer: I'm referring to two tables. The first table is on page 10, and it's the table that has the three options, options 1, 2, and 3. The majority position by the commission recommended option 1. Then with option 1 we presented midway through on page 11 the percentage variation in the three areas if option 1 were applied.

Mr. Mandel: That's option 1. Okay. I haven't spent the time which you might have spent on this particular document.

Dr. Archer: Fair enough. Now, what we didn't do was to provide similar percentage variances with option 2 and option 3. I can tell you that the variances with option 2 would have Calgary about 4 per cent above, Edmonton 4 per cent below, and the rest of Alberta right about on average. The conclusion that one could draw from the option 2 recommendation is that a seat was taken from Calgary, a seat that Calgary's population merited, and was given to Edmonton, putting Calgary one seat under and Edmonton one seat over.

Mr. Mandel: Sure. As I indicated before, we do not want to do that. Under the preferred option that you have, I'm assuming that Calgary will be 42,618 people per riding. Am I reading the right thing now?

Dr. Archer: That's right.

Mr. Mandel: Edmonton would be 41,000 while the rest of the province would be 39,000. I guess your option shows that both Edmonton and Calgary, especially Calgary, are to a certain extent getting less than a balance within the province in representation by population.

Dr. Archer: Right. So Calgary has one fewer seat in option 1 than its population would warrant if we went based upon population alone. Edmonton is 0.7 per cent at variance from what the population would warrant. In other words, Edmonton is pretty much where the population would warrant.

2:35

Mr. Mandel: Sure. Dr. Archer, I'm not going to argue with you about that. The issue is not so much today, but you don't do these things until 2019, from what I understand. If you look at the growth of both Edmonton and Calgary and the reduction in growth of the rural areas, there is already an imbalance that you're putting into the formula right now by option 1, and you're going to be nine years approximately, plus or minus, before you make this change. If the trend continues, then the growth of both Edmonton and Calgary will probably substantially increase against the other parts of the province, and there will be this continuing inequity. That's the issue we're talking about now.

I think that option 1, as far as the balance goes in today's world,

would be hard for us to argue with. I think that Calgary could argue that they should get one over the rest of Alberta, but I don't know. That's a question you're going to have to deal with with Calgary, not with me. I think it's the going forward which is an issue with the city of Edmonton. In the next nine years if we increase our population, as will Calgary over the next number of years because we are becoming a very urbanized population, then we're going to have a difficult time balancing the number of people versus the rest of the province.

That's the challenge that I think we're trying to point out today, that that's a bigger issue. If you did this every three years or every four years, it might not be as big a deal because then you make the adjustment. By doing it every nine years, that has a challenge for us, so that's the issue we need to bring to the forefront.

Dr. Archer: Right. Okay. The point I'm trying to make back to you is that no other seat allocation brings Edmonton closer to the provincial average than the 19-seat allocation.

Mr. Mandel: I don't disagree with that. We're very clear on that. In today's world, yes, it's fair, but you're doing something for a long period of time. If you do this, as I say, more frequently, then it would probably be fine. Nineteen would be reasonable, and then as time progresses, there would be an adjustment. But since it's not for nine more years, that's a substantial number of adjustments that will have to be made in the years to come.

Dr. Archer: If I could just extrapolate from your comment, would it be fair to say, then, that your recommendation would be to provide more representation for the city of Edmonton and the city of Calgary in this iteration than their numbers would warrant to accommodate future growth?

Mr. Mandel: Well, you could take it a different way. I know it's a difficult thing to do, but representation by population is fairly important. Instead of doing this every nine years, you should do it on a more frequent basis. I know it's a real pain in the neck and it's a lot of aggravation, a lot of time and energy, but it is about representation by population. I would suggest that you would do this every five years or every four years. Then you'd be able to make the adjustments in a reasonable time frame, and then you could perfect the system better. You could have a more perfected system if you did it more often.

On today's basis, what you're saying: as I said before, I can't argue against equity. Representation by population is fair. All I'm saying is that with the growth I think the change will be dramatic, so we're suggesting to maybe do this more often or look at a better balancing as you move forward.

Dr. Archer: Thank you. That's all the questions I have.

The Chair: Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Mandel. I, too, have a challenge accepting the proposition that Edmonton should be increased by two constituencies at this time. I know that when you were here prior to our interim report, among other things you strongly recommended that we do not go outside of the boundaries of the city of Edmonton, that issues for the city of Edmonton are important to be dealt with by city of Edmonton MLAs. You also spent some time talking about the principle of parity of voting. The legislation and the law, though, directs us to consider effective representation, and my understanding from your

presentation today is that notwithstanding what the Supreme Court has directed and notwithstanding what the Alberta Court of Appeal has directed, you are a proponent of ridings that are effectively the same size throughout the province. Is that correct?

Mr. Mandel: Yes.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you.

Mr. Mandel: Populationwise, not areawise.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you very much, and thank you very much, Mayor Mandel. As you know, I agree with you with respect to the option 1, and that's reflected in the minority position in the report. I had been struck by the fact that since Edmonton last had 19 seats, the population has grown by some 166,000.

I think there has been some focus on the Edmonton average versus the Calgary average, but if I'm hearing you correctly today, your concern is with urban versus rural. I'm wondering. The analysis that the commission has looked at has looked at the two major cities and then the rest of Alberta, and this average arises from that. Do you have any sort of comment as to the usefulness of that? What we have heard is that the rest of Alberta includes areas that are very sparsely populated, and it includes other cities like Red Deer, fast-growing cities, and so on. I mean, if we are looking at population equity across the province, perhaps we need to look at some of the ridings that are 12, 14, 15, and in the case of the proposed West Yellowhead 23 per cent below the quotient at this time.

Mr. Mandel: I think you make a very good point. What's happening here is that there seems to be this propensity to look at Edmonton and Calgary, which we think is important, but we're becoming an urbanized province. Whether we like it or not, people are moving to the cities. That's Red Deer, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat – I'm not going to list them all – Fort McMurray, Grande Prairie, et cetera. I think it's important that there's proper representation of those cities in the Legislature.

As Mr. Dobbie mentioned, the issue is making sure our ridings maintain a holistic nature. For us and other municipalities, too, to be part rural and part urban really defeats the purpose. We have different challenges, different problems to face. It's not that we're not supportive of our rural neighbours and the problems they face, but cities have tremendously different kinds of problems. I think that that needs to be recognized within the allocation of seats as well as within the philosophy of this province.

I'm not here to dictate what you should or shouldn't do, obviously, but I think there needs to be a recognition that we're becoming a very urbanized population, and for allocation of seats on that basis, what's important, again, is representation by population. To have a riding, whatever that riding is – I don't care whether it's West Yellowhead or Edmonton – to be out of whack with its percentage when you decide to disassociate a large number of urban ridings from the formula does not seem to be fair.

If you're putting in the formula, is the rest of the province – obviously Red Deer, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, all those cities – fairly represented within the population? I think that's what's important. Urban issues are important in the province of Alberta as we grow, so I would concur with what you're saying and support your view of that.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you. Just so you know – I don't know; you might

not have noted it – when we were in Red Deer last week, we had quite a bit of representation from Red Deer about maintaining the urban centre as a continuous boundary; in other words, not hiving off a portion of that city and combining it with a rural area, which is in the report. But one of the effects of that is that if the commission does that, that recommendation would mean that both Red Deer ridings are about 5, 7 per cent, I think, above quotient. That, I take it, becomes an issue as well in terms of urban representation.

Mr. Mandel: There's no question in my mind that the integrity of an urban area is absolutely imperative. I don't think there's any issue as far as electoral boundaries, in my mind, that's more important than keeping that integrity. I think that for the city of Edmonton, even though we like our neighbours, get along with our neighbours, we don't believe that we should share ridings with them. They have totally different concerns, different views of many things, different economics: all kinds of issues that they face that we don't. Or there are all kinds of issues that we face that they don't, and it's more the latter than the former.

I would echo support for Red Deer if that's what they so desire. I'm not here to speak for Red Deer. I think that the integrity of urban areas is absolutely important, and I think that's been a frustration of many of the urban areas where they've divided the urban areas into urban-rural, or call them 'rurban' or something like that. I think that hurts the voice of those areas, and I think it's wrong.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you. I have nothing further, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much, Mayor Mandel, for your presentation. I wouldn't be so presumptuous as to assume that I could say a few things in the next couple of minutes that might change your view on how many seats Edmonton might get, so I'll just make a comment instead.

As you know, absolute voter parity is not a requirement under Canadian law in the interpretation of the courts, but effective representation is. This commission has done its best to try to deal with that and to recognize the reality of growth in Edmonton and Calgary, growth in the smaller urban centres, and what's happening in rural Alberta as well.

2:45

I certainly hear your concern about what happens by the time we get to 2019. But as an offset to that, two comments: one, in the period 2002-2003 to today incredible, rapid growth in the population of the province of Alberta, most of it in urban Alberta. Notwithstanding that, if you were to go strictly on a rep-by-pop basis, Edmonton would get one more seat and be right at that provincial average. I would suggest to you, Mayor Mandel, that there is a very good chance that we won't have as rapid a population growth in the next eight to nine years as we had in the past eight or nine years, so that's an ameliorating aspect to your concern about how fast Edmonton and/or Calgary would be growing.

I guess the second comment is just kind of a rhetorical question. I'm not sure myself about the in-migration since 2002-2003, whether that's from other areas of Canada and elsewhere into urban Alberta or whether there is a significant population shift from rural Alberta to urban Alberta. My gut tells me that it's probably the former rather than the latter. So, again, if we are not to have such a robust economy in the next four, five, six, eight years, my conclusion would be that we're not going to see such a disparity in population change.

Certainly, the people we talk to and hear from in rural Alberta seem totally enamoured by their lifestyle and totally disenamoured by the opportunities to move into cities. That speaks to your desire to keep municipal boundaries sacrosanct, and I think that's really important. I also believe that our rural areas are going to remain strong areas where people are committed to that lifestyle and committed to living in areas that really do promote the natural resources of Alberta and promote the economy that we all benefit from, whether it's urban or rural.

Forgive me for getting on my soapbox there, but any comments you'd like to make, I'd appreciate them.

Mr. Mandel: First of all, I'm a huge believer in the buoyancy of our economy. I think Alberta is the future of this country. I think the oil industry and the creativity of this province and the energy of the people will make it grow. Somebody gave me a statistic the other day which was quite astonishing. Some years ago, not many – five, six years ago – the oil industry and the automotive industry were about the same at a \$56 billion a year contribution to the economy. Today the car industry is \$32 billion, and the oil industry is about \$108 billion and going to continue to grow.

This province is the place for the future of this country, and there is no question in my mind that it's going to grow dramatically. I personally don't care. If it grows rurally, I'm very happy, too – don't get me wrong – but we seem to have had this tendency over the last number of years to have people move to the cities, and I mean Red Deer, Edmonton, just all of them together. I think we're separating Edmonton and Calgary a bit too much from the rest of the pack, but that's your decision, your way of doing things, and I'm fine with that.

I'm a big believer that there will be a great growth in this province. I look at some of the challenges we face and some of the new Canadians that our coming to our city. You could probably count on a few hands the number of people from Africa who were in the city of Edmonton a number of years ago. Today we have thousands of people. They're migrating from other parts of the country when they see there's not opportunity and coming here because they believe this province is the future of this country, and I believe that, too.

So I would disagree with you, and I would guess that in time we'll both know the answer to the question, but I see that there will be no slowing it down here. I think there is good vision in this province and that we'll be a force to be reckoned with around the world.

I do agree with much of what you said. I'm not here to get extra seats for Edmonton. I'm just saying that this is looking down the road and seeing what's happening, and I think that's our biggest concern. To do this every few years is fine. We're not here to get more than our share. Our fair share is fine with us. I think that we are an urbanized population, and I think we need to group those large urban populations in the sense of not just Edmonton and Calgary but Red Deer and Fort McMurray and Grande Prairie and the southern cities as well.

You've got a tough job. You're never going to make everybody happy. You've got to make a decision. Life will go on.

I want one final comment: it's the quality of your representation, maybe not the number.

Mr. Evans: Thank you.

The Chair: Just before we go, I take it that what you are saying is: I'm not arguing with the distribution as it's set out in the interim report; I'm just saying that down the road there's likely going to have to be a significant readjustment at the time of the next commission.

Mr. Mandel: Yes.

The Chair: Thank you. Thank you both for your input, and we'll certainly be considering it.

Mr. Mandel: Thank you for the work you're doing. It's not easy. Good luck.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms Friesacher: Our next presenter is Mayor Peter Kirylchuk, Lac La Biche county, and Mrs. Cecilia Quist.

The Chair: Could I ask you before you start your presentation, since this is all being recorded, if you'd give your name so it could be recorded.

Mrs. Quist: My name is Cecilia Quist, and I'm a councillor with Lac La Biche county and the deputy mayor.

Mr. Kirylchuk: Peter Kirylchuk. I'm the mayor of Lac La Biche county.

The Chair: Thank you. Please proceed.

**Peter Kirylchuk, Mayor
Cecilia Quist, Deputy Mayor
Lac La Biche County**

Mr. Kirylchuk: Hon. Judge Ernest Walter and members of the commission, I would like to commend you for your ongoing commitment to ensuring fair electoral representation in the province of Alberta. It is my pleasure to speak to you this afternoon about an area that is dear to me. I am the mayor of Lac La Biche county, and I have lived in the Lac La Biche community my entire life.

The Lac La Biche county council has received the interim report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, and we are pleased with the recommendation that the Lac La Biche-St. Paul constituency boundary remain the same. As stated in our fall presentation on September 8, 2009, the Lac La Biche county council carried a unanimous resolution to maintain the current constituency boundaries of Lac La Biche-St. Paul constituency.

For the benefit of the commission it is important to highlight again the significant advantages of fair electoral representation by maintaining the current Lac La Biche-St. Paul constituency boundary. Throughout our present constituency we are blessed with a mixture of geographic features, including large tracts of agricultural land, large natural areas, and an abundance of lakes and environmentally significant areas. Our MLA effectively represents us as he understands and appreciates the entire area.

Two, it is crucial to find solutions to the challenges faced in continued natural resource development in this area of the province and to move ahead while preserving environmental integrity. Thus, not enlarging the boundaries would be in our best interests.

Three, in addition, throughout our present constituency we have a mixture of demographic features, including a wonderful and diverse mix of heritage. Since the communities within the existing constituency boundaries share many common interests and philosophies, we strongly favour the boundaries remaining the same. Let me cite one example. Our local francophone community of Plamondon celebrated their centennial in 2008, and similarly the French community in St. Paul celebrated their centennial in 2009.

Four, the continuity and balance of meeting the needs of a large

geographic area with smaller urban centres in such aspects as infrastructure are best met within the existing boundaries with the present MLA.

Again, Lac La Biche county is very pleased with the current constituency structure, and we thank the review commission for supporting our request in the interim report. We encourage the commission to maintain the current boundaries of the Lac La Biche-St. Paul constituency in their final report.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Brian.

2:55

Mr. Evans: Thank you, Chairman, and thank you very much for the submission. As you recognize and as is in our report, Lac Biche-St. Paul is at 38,499 by our calculation with the most recent population stats that we have, which puts it almost 6 per cent under the provincial quotient.

Literally, all of the presentations we've heard have acknowledged a tolerance, if you will, for a variance up to 5 and beyond, up to 10 per cent. What we have tried to do is identify those areas that will likely grow the quickest and those areas that will likely shrink, at least relative to the quotient, between now and the time of the next Electoral Boundaries Commission. I hope what you are saying with your acknowledgement of our suggested boundaries is that there's a recognition that we hope that this area will continue to grow relative to the quotient because in the future commissions may not be able to be so generous in determining boundaries if the variance expands.

In that regard, can you identify any areas in your constituency boundaries as we've recommended where it's likely that we will either see a relative increase in population or a relative decrease in population?

Mr. Kirylchuk: You know, we had Nichols Applied Management do an assessment of that very thing when we went to the people to get a plebiscite vote for our multiplex, which is now called the Bold centre. They indicated to us that by 2015 there was going to be substantial growth. That is evident by the activity that we see happening north of Lac La Biche. So I would say that possibly in the next 15 years you're going to see the need for another constituency.

Mr. Evans: And that growth is resource industry extraction.

Mr. Kirylchuk: That would be the main driver, yes.

Mr. Evans: I see. Well, thank you. I hope that prognostication comes true. Thank you very much for your presentation.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mayor Kirylchuk and Councillor Quist. I don't have any questions for you. I thank you, actually, for coming and telling us that you liked what we did, not just because we like to hear that when we get something right, but also it's helpful as we go forward, as we look at other boundaries, as we have other submissions talking about tweaking boundaries that may have cascading effects. I really do appreciate you coming here today to express your views on the proposal for your constituency.

I don't have any questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

The Chair: I do have one. It's been suggested that we add the name Two Hills to the constituency name. It would be Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills. Do you agree with that?

Mr. Kirylchuk: It would better describe our constituency.

Mrs. Quist: I agree.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Kirylchuk: Hon. Judge, I have one small concern with the interim report, and it's on page 112 of the report. On that map that you have there I could not find Lac La Biche, and I'm wondering – I know that timelines are short – if it's possible to include that in the final report.

The Chair: The reason for that, as I understand it, is that once you became a county, Lac La Biche as a town went off the map. It's the county of Lac La Biche.

Mr. Kirylchuk: But you have other hamlets on there. The hamlet of Plamondon is on there.

The Chair: Well, we have our consultant here.

Mr. Forgrave: It has already been corrected on the base map.

Mrs. Quist: Thank you.

Mr. Kirylchuk: You're definitely ahead of me. Thank you.

The Chair: Well, I wasn't.
Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mayor. As I reside in a county that has not yet adopted the positive working relationship that you have in your county, it's reassuring to have you here today and to see that things are going well for you. As Ms Jeffs said, it's nice to hear some positive feedback. For me it's very important to hear the reinforcement of trying to maintain the integrity of existing boundaries.

In the centre of Alberta we put forward as an option a change in constituencies to reduce their size by moving them towards highway 2. We've heard very clearly from the reeves and the mayors and the representatives from that area that the cost to existing relationships, existing understanding of boundaries, and working with their MLAs is much higher in making a dramatic change to the boundaries than the benefit that's gained from reducing the physical size. We heard that we got it wrong in central Alberta, but what we did hear there were some suggestions from them as to how to make it right, and they met with each other. As part of your due diligence, have you talked with any of your adjoining constituency mayors or reeves? Have you heard anything else from them that you'd like to pass on to us about their constituencies? If we have it right here, are you hearing suggestions in other areas?

Mr. Kirylchuk: Well, we were at the AAMD and C convention, and in speaking with others in our area, I certainly didn't hear anything. Possibly, Cecilia, did you hear anything?

Mrs. Quist: No. Not in our area.

Mr. Dobbie: Okay. Well, thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you.

Dr. Archer: Mayor and Councillor, thanks so much for coming and affirming your support for the recommendations of the interim report. I don't have anything to add, either.

The Chair: Thank you both very much. I hope you get some rain out there. We could use it in the province right now.

Thank you again for coming. We'll certainly consider the positive remarks.

Mr. Kirylchuk: Thank you for your time.

Mrs. Quist: Thank you very much.

Ms Friesacher: The next presenter is Mr. Orville Sinnott.

The Chair: Since this is going in *Alberta Hansard*, could you be so kind as to give your name and if you're representing a group?

Orville Sinnott

Mr. Sinnott: My name is Orville Sinnott. I live in Edmonton-Glenora constituency, and I was concerned about the expansion of our riding. After looking at this book, I see the reason why. The answers are right there on page 16. The populations still average about the same, but the area is just a little different, a little bit bigger. That was my concern. I thought it would be a lot more, but it's not. That's my question. It's been answered by just looking at this book.

The Chair: Well, thank you very much.

Mr. Sinnott: It's simple enough.

The Chair: Does anyone have any questions?

Mr. Evans: I think that's a great conclusion, and I'm happy to hear it from you, sir.

The Chair: There is one question. Keith.

Dr. Archer: Sure. Thanks, Mr. Sinnott. We had some other discussion about the Edmonton-Glenora riding earlier today. One of the suggestions that came up was about the boundary in our interim report. It's on page 80, by the way, if you have a copy of the report. The boundary at the moment on the east side, the northeast corner of the riding, goes out to 97th Street, and on the west side it is either 149th Street or 156th Street, depending upon whether you're north or south of 111th Avenue. Now, the suggestion we had earlier today was that on the northeast portion it would make more sense to have the riding end at 121st Street and then push it out a bit further west, as it is at present, possibly as far as 170th Street if the population would warrant. Could you just respond to that in terms of your sense of whether the community is different in some way on the west end compared to the northeast? Are we more or less likely to reflect a community of interest by the boundary as we've proposed it or by the suggestion we heard earlier today as I've just outlined it?

3:05

Mr. Sinnott: I live there, but I don't know all those things. Maybe it's a strategy they're looking at. I don't know. I'm just looking by the numbers. I don't know who lives over there and who lives over there. I can't say, to tell you the truth.

Dr. Archer: Okay. Thanks.

The Chair: Thank you very much, and thank you for coming this afternoon.

Mr. Sinnott: You're welcome.

The Chair: Is there anyone at this time, or should we take another short adjournment?

All right. We'll adjourn, and next will be Len Webber.

[The hearing adjourned from 3:06 p.m. to 3:17 p.m.]

Ms Friesacher: Our next presenters are Mr. Len Webber, MLA, Calgary-Foothills, and Mr. Peter Pilarski.

The Chair: Just before we start, since this is being recorded on *Hansard*, would you please for the record identify yourselves?

Mr. Webber: Certainly. I'm Len Webber, MLA for Calgary-Foothills.

Mr. Pilarski: Peter Pilarski. I'm a board member of Calgary-Foothills.

The Chair: Thank you.

**Len Webber, MLA
Calgary-Foothills**

**Peter Pilarski, Calgary-Foothills
Progressive Conservative Constituency Association**

Mr. Webber: First of all, I'd like to thank the commission for hearing our presentation here today. I'd like to talk to you a little bit about your proposed boundary redistribution and perhaps just indicate to you with my pointer here on the map that what I currently have are the communities of Citadel, the Hamptons, Edgemont, Hidden Valley, and the Kincora area up here. You can see that your new proposed boundaries would bring in the Panorama area here, it would take away my Hidden Valley community, it would add in the community of MacEwan Glen, and it would take away my community of Citadel.

Our first proposal to the commission suggested that we would have Country Hills Boulevard, which goes from east to west, be the main boundary border along here, suggesting that I may lose Edgemont, but I would continue to keep my other existing communities, and because this is a high growth area up in the north that perhaps in the future, then, there would be, certainly, more growth up there, which would bring my population numbers up. That was the first submission.

Now we're here today to perhaps give you some other indication of what we think would make some sense, and that is about your proposed area in here, MacEwan Glen, that you suggested be incorporated into Calgary-Foothills. We would oppose that, or we'd strongly suggest that you don't give us MacEwan Glen because it just makes more sense to have it in the community to the east of us. I know that there were some other presentations suggesting the same thing.

I would ask that you continue to keep the community of Hidden Valley in our constituency. You are proposing that it goes into another riding. Also, it would work well with my other colleagues who have constituencies to the east. They strongly agree with me that they would like to see that happen, where Hidden Valley would continue to stay within Calgary-Foothills rather than in Calgary-Mackay as proposed.

The community of Citadel is a community that is also going to be

taken away from Calgary-Foothills, or you're proposing that from the first submission. It is certainly difficult for me to see that community leave. It's been a community that I've worked in for six years now, and it's just been a lot of work. To lose that would hurt, but I understand that things have to be done because of the population growth in the area here.

This particular community up here, Panorama, is not in my riding currently. You are actually suggesting to include that in there but take away a community that I've had for six years now and also add another community that I have not had. I hope I'm making sense here. I guess what I'm saying is that to take away a community and give me two others of the same population distribution, or very close to the same, to me doesn't make a lot of sense because of the fact that I have had the community of Hidden Valley for so long. I guess I'm suggesting to you this time around, members and Your Honour, that you continue to keep Hidden Valley in my constituency of Calgary-Foothills. I certainly don't have a problem continuing to hang on to the Panorama area up here, but I think that MacEwan Glen down here would certainly make more sense if it was put into the Calgary-Mackay community over here. I know that other presenters have presented the same thing as I am here today.

The first submission, again, had Edgemont as perhaps a lower boundary being taken away and Citadel and Hidden Valley and everything else continuing to be in Calgary-Foothills. I can live with Edgemont continuing in my community, but it's that eastern border that is the issue right now with a number of my colleagues and myself. If you can take a further look at your proposed suggestion along here and, perhaps, if there was any way of reconsidering, that would be most appreciated by myself and my constituency association in Calgary-Foothills.

Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you.

Dr. Archer: Well, thanks, Mr. Webber. That's quite helpful. We did have some conversations and presentations last week in Calgary from I think it was a group from Calgary-Mackay, who were talking about the same area, and I think they were looking at some more substantial changes than you're talking about as I understand it.

Just so that I'm clear about this, your recommendation, then, is for Shaganappi Trail to be the eastern boundary of Calgary-Foothills rather than 14th Street, so have MacEwan over to Calgary-Mackay. Then for Hidden Valley that would be accomplished by using Beddington Trail as the boundary and then Country Hills.

Mr. Webber: That's right. So it would be – I'll just draw it here with this pointer – coming up Shaganappi Trail all the way up to Country Hills Boulevard, heading east on Country Hills to Beddington Boulevard, and then heading north on Beddington, and what I would suggest is to continue up the boulevard. I think Beddington then turns into Symons Valley.

Dr. Archer: Right.

Mr. Webber: But you have incorporated this community up in the northeast area here as perhaps a community that would be incorporated, and I don't have a problem with that at all, but my original riding does not incorporate this community right now.

Dr. Archer: Yes.

Mr. Webber: So, again, Shaganappi Trail all the way up to Country Hills, east on Country Hills to Beddington Boulevard, and then north on Beddington, which turns into Symons Valley.

3:25

Dr. Archer: Right. Now, I don't have the populations of the Calgary communities in front of me at the moment; I have them elsewhere. Your suggestion, though, is that this seems to be a fairly even trade? Because I know that Calgary-Foothills is pretty close to the average constituency size at the moment; I think you're just a point or two off the average. Is the move from Hidden Valley essentially equivalent to MacEwan Glen, or does the Panorama have to come into play there to make it an even trade?

Mr. Webber: A very good question. Yes, absolutely. The community of Panorama would have to come into play to make the population equivalent to that of Hidden Valley as far as I understand.

Dr. Archer: Right. Okay. Well, that's helpful. Thanks very much. That's all I have.

Mr. Webber: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, gentlemen, for the presentation. The numbers we have show Hidden Valley at 11,772. I'm not as familiar with the neighborhoods in Calgary, and I'm wondering: if you take Hidden Valley back and you move the constituency or the neighbourhood south – what's the name of that community there?

Mr. Webber: This community here? That is MacEwan Glen.

Mr. Dobbie: We have it as MacEwan. I don't have a MacEwan Glen.

Mr. Webber: MacEwan Glen is the same community, I guess.

Mr. Dobbie: That's 5,233 according to our map. Again, just for clarification, so we get it on the record, it's Panorama Hills, and we have that at 16,444.

Mr. Webber: Then you've got – I'm sorry, Peter – Hidden Valley at?

Mr. Dobbie: At 11,772. The challenge that is created when we look at these larger communities is that with such a large block in Panorama Hills, if we move it, it's roughly equivalent to those other two. I think that was what was driving some of our thinking. Knowing that area, I don't know if there's any possibility that Panorama Hills as defined has a logical division within it anyway. But the question I have for you is: is it possible in the next seven days to give us some direct suggestions? Because, of course, the cascading effect of these changes is important and the relative parity of the numbers that we have is something that we want to maintain. So we would really appreciate you giving us your options in order of preference.

Mr. Webber: Great. Thanks, Peter.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you very much, Mr. Webber and Mr. Pilarski. One of the issues we had looked at was sort of trying to keep communities of a similar character together, and I'm afraid I don't know this end of Calgary very well. How

would you characterize these communities that we're talking about here: Hidden Valley, Panorama Hills, MacEwan Glen? Are they relatively similar? Are they dissimilar? How are they dissimilar?

Mr. Webber: Of course, Hidden Valley has been around for a number of years now, ever since I've been an MLA, in the last six years. It's quite an established area and not any room for growth at all.

Ms Jeffs: It's single family basically.

Mr. Webber: Right. Yes, exactly. With a number of schools in the area as well. I must admit I'm not very familiar with MacEwan Glen as far as what type of a community it would be. I certainly don't represent that area now, so I'm not that familiar with MacEwan. I continue to call it MacEwan Glen, but it's MacEwan, I guess.

Ms Jeffs: Is it a similar kind of density of neighbourhood? Do you know at all?

Mr. Webber: You know, that's a good question. I would think so, but I really couldn't answer that question, Allyson. I really don't know.

Ms Jeffs: That's okay. I lived in Calgary for a long time, and I can't recall.

Mr. Webber: Of course, Panorama is a community where I see a lot of growth potential there. Obviously, you can see where it continues to grow as well as Kincora and the communities up in the northern part of Calgary-Foothills.

Ms Jeffs: All right. You mentioned that. What are the other sort of key growth areas for Calgary-Foothills? What are the other areas that are likely to grow in the next few years?

Mr. Webber: Well, of course, north of the Hamptons, which is the community in the middle here, all this community up here is undergoing quite a bit of growth right now and will continue to do so. The community over here of Citadel and west Citadel is a community that has pretty much grown to its potential. I don't see any further growth there at all. Likewise with the community of Edgemont down here. It's a fairly established community, and it will continue to stay as it is. There won't be any more growth in that area as well. Again, I look at the future. I look at Country Hills Boulevard as being a very solid boundary here to here, and to have everything up north as the constituency just makes sense to me.

One other option that I thought would perhaps make a little bit of sense is in your new riding over here of Calgary-Hawkwood, incorporating Citadel, which is currently a part of mine, into that new riding. Again, with this strong boundary across here, rather than Calgary-Hawkwood incorporating Citadel, perhaps it could incorporate Edgemont instead, although I certainly love the community of Edgemont. People in there are wonderful. I'm not suggesting I would want to lose Edgemont at all because I certainly like the community, but it just makes sense. That way it, again, brings the potential of further growth in Calgary-Foothills for that riding.

The Hamptons is right in the middle. That is also an established community with, I don't think, any further room for growth in there as well.

That's a description of the communities.

Ms Jeffs: Excellent. Thank you very much. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Thanks very much, gentlemen. If you take a look at that Calgary map, you see the difficulty we've had. You know, there's a lot of growth through Calgary-West. There's going to be growth in Calgary-Bow. There's growth in Calgary-North West and, of course, in Calgary-Foothills and Calgary-Mackay, Calgary-Country Hills that we've set out, and Calgary-McCall. The presentation we had last week from Calgary-Mackay was: well, put another constituency in there; you'll solve all of the problems.

When you look at the various sizes of communities – Edgemont, 16,534 by our figures, and as Peter has pointed out, 11,772 in Hidden Valley and 16,444 in Panorama – that's a whack of people, and we don't want to separate communities. That's the real difficulty that we've had, and that doesn't take anything away from what you've said. It's all understandable, quite frankly.

I guess the question I'd have in terms of Hidden Valley is: notwithstanding that Country Hills Boulevard is an intersection point here, would you say that it is more connected with Calgary-Foothills than it is with this Calgary-Hawkwood area that we have identified; in other words, that Citadel-Arbour Lake area down to the south of Hidden Valley?

Mr. Webber: You're asking whether or not Citadel is more connected to . . .

Mr. Evans: Well, where I understand you're talking about Citadel is just south of Country Hills Boulevard. Is that correct?

Mr. Webber: No. Citadel is north of Country Hills Boulevard.

Mr. Evans: Oh, okay. So it's in that same Hidden Valley area there.

Mr. Webber: No. Hidden Valley is to the east, this community over here. To the far east is Hidden Valley, and this is Citadel to the west.

Mr. Evans: Oh, that's Citadel there. Okay.

Mr. Webber: Yeah. You have incorporated Citadel in your first submission as part of Calgary-Hawkwood.

Mr. Evans: Right.

Mr. Webber: I guess what I was saying is that if we had this natural boundary of Country Hills going across here, then Calgary-Hawkwood . . .

Mr. Evans: The community of interest is north rather than south, into that Hawkwood area.

Mr. Webber: That's right, yes. It's the one north, in Citadel. Perhaps that could be an option, replacing Citadel with Edgemont in the new constituency of Calgary-Hawkwood.

3:35

Mr. Evans: Right. Well, we'll certainly take your comments into consideration. Please just understand that we're in no way, shape, or form minimizing your concerns or your comments. It's just that

it's a difficult thing because of the size of the population and the opportunity and the likelihood of growth in the near future.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Webber: Well, thank you very much. I appreciate the hard work you've got ahead of you. Thank you for what you're doing.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Dobbie: I'll just provide you with our list of Calgary communities. You can have my copy.

Mr. Webber: I appreciate it.

The Chair: Our next presenter will be at 3:50. We'll take a short adjournment till that time.

[The hearing adjourned from 3:36 p.m. to 3:54 p.m.]

Ms Friesacher: Our next presenter is Mr. Brian Mason, MLA, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood.

Mr. Mason: Good afternoon.

The Chair: For *Hansard* could you please give your full name, Brian, if you would.

Mr. Mason: Sure. Brian Mason. I'm the MLA for Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood.

The Chair: Thank you.

**Brian Mason, MLA
Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood**

Mr. Mason: Okay. Thank you very much for the opportunity to address you. I wish to just read my letter to you into the record since it was sent after the deadline for written submissions. It's a response to the correction notice that you provided to us, and it says:

To the members of the Electoral Boundaries Commission,

Thank you for sending a copy of your correction notice to my office. I would like to offer the following recommendations in response to that notice.

To alleviate the disparity in population sizes between the proposed [electoral districts] of Edmonton Clareview and Edmonton Highlands-Beverly, we would recommend that the neighbourhood of Beverly Heights,

which has a population of 3,375 or 8.26 per cent of an average electoral district,

be moved to the proposed [electoral district] of Edmonton Clareview.

The proposed electoral district of Edmonton-Clareview has a population of 41,068, which is a .46 per cent variance from the provincial mean. Edmonton-Highlands-Beverly has a population of 46,544, which is a variance of 13.86 per cent.

Our recommendation would place Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview at a population of 44,443, which is an 8.71 per cent variance from the provincial mean. Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood would have a population of 43,169, with a variance of 5.59 per cent from the provincial mean.

As demonstrated by the above chart, this would result in both [electoral districts] having a population within the 10% variance.

The Beverly area is commonly accepted as including the communities of Abbotsfield, Beacon Heights, Bergman, Beverly

Heights, and Rundle Heights. This recommendation has the advantage of keeping this community of interest together in one [electoral district].

With this in mind, we would also advise the Commission to retain the names “Edmonton Highlands-Norwood” and “Edmonton Beverly-Clareview” for the new [electoral districts].

Retaining the previous [electoral district] names has the advantage of reducing confusion among voters. It also saves money by avoiding the costs of new office signs, letterhead, [and so on].

Thank you for your consideration,
Sincerely,
Brian Mason, MLA

The Chair: Well, thank you very much, Brian.
Brian.

Mr. Evans: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Mason, for your comments. It certainly does seem to make sense to alleviate that difference. I guess the obvious question is: have you had some conversations with Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview about your proposal?

Mr. Mason: Who in Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview? The MLA?

Mr. Evans: Or the community associations, et cetera.

Mr. Mason: No.

Mr. Evans: Do you have enough knowledge of that area to give us some background?

Mr. Mason: I represented the area on city council for 11 years, so I'm quite familiar with the area. The original town of Beverly, for example, which was annexed to the city in 1961, included all of the communities that would now be incorporated in this proposal. Bergman, Beacon Heights, Beverly Heights, Rundle Heights, and Abbotsfield are all communities within the boundaries of the old town of Beverly, so there is a common history there. It is quite distinct as a community from Clareview, which is, of course, across the tracks and across the Yellowhead, but the two communities together make, I think, a good constituency.

Mr. Evans: Okay. Great. Thanks for that. In terms of the balance of the proposed constituency boundaries for Edmonton-Highlands-Beverly, they do make sense to you, I take it, from the lack of additional comment that you've made on those.

Mr. Mason: Yes, they do. I was actually quite pleased with your recommendation overall. It restores to my constituency those areas that were adjusted the last time. You know, I always questioned the value of bringing Edmonton-Gold Bar across the river. I think there's much more commonality of interest with Riverdale and Boyle Street and McCauley. I have represented those communities in the past, both municipally and provincially, and I think it's a good fit.

4:00

Mr. Evans: Of course, those are the traditional inner-city areas that probably take most of your time or a great deal of your time as the MLA?

Mr. Mason: Certainly with respect to casework that's true.

Mr. Evans: But I hear you saying that it's a manageable number and demographic for an MLA?

Mr. Mason: Uh-huh.

Mr. Evans: Good. Thanks very much. Those are all my questions.

Mr. Mason: Thank you.

The Chair: Allyson.

Ms Jeffs: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much, Mr. Mason, for such a clear and precise presentation. If I'm understanding this correctly, then, the Beverly area would shift into what we have named Edmonton-Clareview?

Mr. Mason: Yeah.

Ms Jeffs: And they would stay together in that constituency.

I don't have any questions. I was going to ask, as Brian did, if you had any other input with respect to your communities. I had heard some concerns, not from you, not even really concerns. Some of the feedback I'd heard elsewhere was simply that, you know, there were a lot of high-needs communities coming into that area, and I wondered if that was a concern. There are a lot of inner-city communities, although I understand that you know them very, very well from your time as an MLA and as a city councillor. Is there any concern with that?

Mr. Mason: Well, there are some high-needs communities in Abbotsfield as well and bits of Rundle Heights, so that's something you should take into account. The area represented by the old town of Beverly is not entirely homogenous. On the very east end there is high-density, much newer housing that the city put in, and there are, you know, some differences demographically, I would say, but it all is considered part of the greater Beverly area.

Ms Jeffs: Well, there has certainly been a lot of community involvement in recognizing and establishing that historic tie.

I don't have anything else, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

The Chair: What you've suggested seems to make a whole lot of sense, and together with retaining the names, it's all common sense.

Mr. Mason: It will save me printing new business cards, too, I hope.

The Chair: Yes.
Peter.

Mr. Dobbie: Thanks, Mr. Chair. Thanks, Mr. Mason, as well. We had heard from other constituencies that, frankly, a factor we had not considered was the cost to the various organizations in printing and also the cost to people identifying with the constituencies. Part of our naming protocol had been to try to follow a bit of an approach, but we hadn't taken those costs strongly enough into account.

I clearly understand your suggestions here, and I agree that they make a lot of sense.

Have you had a chance to consider the other constituencies within Edmonton, and do you have any advice to offer us with respect to the changes we're proposing outside of your constituency and the one adjacent to it?

Mr. Mason: No. You know, I have to say that I was relatively pleased with the map that you came up with with respect to Edmonton. I think it works. I know it's a difficult job to balance. It's like

getting 18 plates going in a show and none of them falling off. I would be relatively satisfied. I think that it makes a lot of sense to use boundaries like the Yellowhead and so on. It's not necessarily what we proposed in the beginning, but I think it's a reasonable proposal.

Mr. Dobbie: Thank you. Those are my questions.

The Chair: Keith.

Dr. Archer: Yeah. Thanks, Mr. Mason. I wonder if I could have you comment on another suggestion we heard earlier today which would have an implication for your constituency.

Could we put up the riding of Edmonton-Glenora? You can probably anticipate where the question is going. By shifting the boundary of Edmonton-Glenora from 121st Street to 97th Street, we brought into Edmonton-Glenora the community around the airport and east of the airport, and the argument was made that that didn't have a lot in common with Glenora. So we were advised in an earlier presentation to use 121st Street as the eastern boundary for Edmonton-Glenora. If we did that, the logical place for that quadrant, I think, would be your constituency. Can you comment on that? In this map it's the area that's bounded by 111th Avenue.

Mr. Mason: I can't quite make it out. What's the eastern boundary of Edmonton-Glenora right now?

Dr. Archer: This is 97th Street; this is 121st Street. The suggestion is to take this all the way up to the Yellowhead and then put this, presumably, into your riding.

Mr. Mason: Wow.

Dr. Archer: I'm not sure how many people are in those neighbourhoods.

Mr. Mason: I'm not sure either. I have not represented that part of the city before, so I'm not really familiar with the neighbourhoods. I think one thing to take into account is that they are well along the path of closing the airport and planning to redevelop it primarily with residential housing. I don't know the timelines around that. I can't really comment further than that. It's not something that I've

considered. Having just had to come up with a community to shed in order to come down in size, adding that may present you with a brand new set of problems. I don't know. I'm sorry I can't be more helpful in regard to that.

Dr. Archer: No. That's fine. It sounds like it may be a concern to move that into your riding.

Mr. Mason: Yeah, I think it would be.

Dr. Archer: That's all I have. Thank you.

Mr. Mason: Thank you.

The Chair: Well, thank you very much. It's been a pleasure having you here. We can certainly take into account what you've given us and, hopefully, be able to act on it.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much. Can I just raise one question or revisit one issue?

The Chair: You sure can.

Mr. Mason: The question of the Dunvegan-Central Peace riding and the name.

The Chair: Certainly.

Mr. Mason: I would urge the commission to once again consider that. I think that given the history and the support that we found in that part of the province for the idea and given – I guess you could call it an equity principle – that you have Edmonton-Decore, you have Edmonton-Manning, and you have Calgary-Lougheed, that riding with Grant Notley's name would be, I think, fitting and fair.

The Chair: Well, thank you very much again.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much.

The Chair: All right. We'll adjourn and reconvene at 6 p.m.

[The hearing adjourned at 4:08 p.m.]

