

**Southwest New Brunswick Service Commission  
Board Meeting  
Minutes  
March 31, 2016, 6:00 pm  
SNBSC Solid Waste Div. Admin Building  
Lawrence Station, N.B.**

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

**BOARD MEMBERS**

Frank Carroll, Mayor of McAdam, Chairperson  
Garry Christie, LSD St. Patrick, Vice - Chair  
Carla Brown, LSD St. David  
Winston Gamblin, Mayor of Harvey  
Terry James, Mayor of Blacks Harbour  
Dennis Blair, LSD McAdam  
Annette Townes, LSD St. James  
Stan Choptiany, Mayor of St. Andrews  
Joyce Wright, LSD Dennis Weston  
Sharon Tucker – Mayor, Town of St. George  
Wade Greenlaw – LSD Dufferin  
Heather Hatt, LSD Fundy Bay  
David Szemerda, LSD Pennfield (via conference calling system)

**STAFF**

Frank Tenhave, Executive Director SNBSC  
Claudette MacLean, Secretary to the Board, SNBSC  
Mark Porter, Financial Officer, SNBSC

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Five people attended

**Call to Order**

The meeting of the Southwest New Brunswick Service Commission was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by the Chair F. Carroll.

The Chairman introduced and welcomed Doug Rowlands, the new LSD Advisory Chair for the LSD of Lepreau, to the Board of the meeting.

He indicated that Abby Pond, who was scheduled to deliver a public presentation regarding the Tourism Industry in the SNBSC Region, sent last minute regrets that she was unable to attend.

### **Conflict of Interest Declarations**

The Chair asked whether there were any conflicts of interest and none were brought forward.

### **Approval of Agenda**

The Chair then moved on to the agenda for the meeting.

**16-20** It was moved by S. Tucker, seconded by W. Gamblin that the agenda be accepted as presented. **CARRIED.**

### **Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting.**

The Chair then asked for a motion for the approval of the minutes of the last meeting which had been previously circulated.

**16-21** It was moved by J. Wright, seconded by G. Christie that the minutes of the February 25, 2016 Board meeting be accepted as circulated. **CARRIED.**

## **BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

### **Ad Hoc Procedural Bylaw Review Committee Report**

The chair indicated that the goal of this committee's work and report is to receive feedback from the Board, and thus confirm that the Board was happy with their work and that the committee's work is acceptable and that the committee is on the right track. He then recognized the chair of the committee, J. Wright, and asked her to proceed with the report to the Board.

J. Wright proceeded to refer everyone to the lengthy draft procedural bylaw document that had been previously circulated and a hard copy was found in everyone's folders. She picked up from where she left off at the previous Board meeting and again provided a detailed review, page by page, often line by line, of the changes to the current bylaws which this committee was recommending. She highlighted all of the significant changes being recommended while pointing out that a lot of the other changes were just to improve the language and clarity of the document, and that members could read the document themselves to see those minor improvements in clarity, grammar, etc.

During her report, the committee chair did identify two motions that had been passed by the Board back in 2013 and which the committee felt were impeding the ability of any Board

member to bring any issue forward for possible inclusion on the agenda of a Board meeting. She referred to copies of these motions which were also found in members' folders. Given the potential problem posed by the two motions (which create a restriction), the committee recommended that the two motions be rescinded. There was a brief discussion followed by the motion;

**16-22** It was moved by T. James, seconded by A. Townes that motions 13-207 and 13-208 be rescinded from the Procedural Bylaws. **CARRIED ( UNANIMOUSLY )**.

There was then a detailed discussion about the goal of having the final version of the new bylaws approved at the next regular Board meeting scheduled for April 28<sup>th</sup>. It was pointed out that there were only 28 days between this meeting and the April Board meeting. As such this did not meet the 30 day requirement stated in the current bylaws. There were a variety of opinions and potential ways forward suggested, including a possible motion to adjust the required 30 days to a lesser amount. In the end the Board reached a consensus that the most appropriate method that adhered to the letter and spirit of our current bylaws was to schedule a special Board meeting, to deal with the bylaws, be scheduled for a time that was after the required 30 day window.

The Board then decided, by consensus, as follows;

**A Special Board Meeting be scheduled for Thursday, May 5, 2016 @ 6:00 pm at the SNBSC Solid Waste Division Administration Building with the key agenda item being the final review, discussion, and a vote taken on the recommended bylaw changes.**

The Chair and Board members expressed their thanks to J. Wright for the extensive work she has undertaken on this time-consuming initiative thus far.

It was then noted that a portion of the bylaws had already been reviewed and circulated to the Board for a period of over 30 days, as the current bylaws require; specifically all the portions up to Section 2.6. Given that, it was suggested that it would be possible and in order to approve that first revised portion of the bylaws at this Board meeting.

**16-23** It was moved by D. Szemerda, seconded by S. Choptiany that the Board approve sections of the revised bylaw revisions up to Section 2.6., recognizing that the Board has had the changes to that portion of the bylaws for more than the required 30 day timeframe.  
**CARRIED (UNANIMOUSLY)**

### **Discussion of the Cost of Policing Services**

The Chair then moved on to the next item on the agenda which was a discussion of the cost of policing services and in particular the presentation given by the Department of Public Safety at a recent meeting.. He referred to the copy of the DPS PowerPoint presentation that a copy of is found in members' packages. With that he turned the floor over to G. Christie

The CPC co-chair gave a brief commentary on the policing cost issue and what has been happening since the RSC system came into place (costs rising, regional policing model, etc.). He indicated that it was a complicated formula to understand but we know a bit more now than we did before. There were several comments about the lack of specifics of how policing services are allocated and how specific costs were determined and designated.

Concerns about the lack of transparency by the Department of Public Safety on these issues was raised by several directors. There was dissatisfaction expressed about the lack of consistent and on-going communications with the RSC and its CPC by both the RCMP and especially the Department of Public Safety. There was particular frustration to this matter expressed by several given that the cost of policing is being fully borne by the citizens of this region.

The loss of the consistent weekly statistical reports that the CPC and Board received from the RCMP in the past was raised as a concern. These reports were considered valuable and provide those paying the cost some insight into what the police are doing.

The consensus of the Board was that this issue should not be allowed to fade away and the Board should continue to pursue it.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Community Policing Committee Report - G. Christie**

G. Christie referred the Board to the CPC report that was found in their folders. He highlighted the point that there had been three meetings of note since this committee last reported to the Board. Of those he indicated that the joint SNBSC Board - CPC meeting with the Department of Public Safety and the RCMP was the one of most interest. He went on to explain the presentations given at that meeting and the ongoing concerns the public have about the rapidly rising cost of policing services. The active work of the CPC in our region was highlighted and he indicated that our CPC was a leader in the province on several fronts, including the issues under discussion in the previous agenda item. In closing it was indicated that there will be a CPC meeting held on Thursday, April 7, 2016 @ 6:00 pm at the Oak Bay Community Hall. The chair stressed that all directors, and especially the public, are welcome to attend.

### **EMO Planning Partnership Committee Report - C. Brown**

The chair then moved to the next agenda item and asked EMO PPC chair C. Brown to take the floor. She referred all to the report that had been circulated and was found in the members' folders. She indicated that this report provided a summary of the EMO workshop that had been held a few months previously. She went on to highlight the items identified as being the top three issues that the committee would now include an action plan to address future emergency events.

The Chair commented on the excellent workshop and the work this committee is doing which is working on relevant items well beyond simply ensuring that a regional emergency plan is in

place in our region. He further commented that to the best of our knowledge no other EMO committee in the province is taking this kind of proactive role and initiative.

### **Transportation Committee Update – S. Choptiany**

The Chair then moved to the next agenda item and indicated that it also should be noted that no other RSC has made as much progress in pursuing a rural transportation system as this commission. With that he turned the floor over to S. Choptiany, chair of the transportation committee and chair of the Board of the Southwest New Brunswick Transportation Authority. The committee chair referred all to the report in the members' folders and provided a brief overview of the project. Included in this report was the use of funds provided by this commission during the past fiscal year.

He spoke of the delays with this project primarily due to difficulties in getting the planned meeting with the Ministers and MLAs from southern NB. Added to that is the anticipated and soon to be released provincial report and recommendations from ESIC which will clearly call for transportation systems to be included as part of transportation infrastructure development; i.e. "services" and not just "surfaces". He noted again that this province is the only one in Canada that does not directly contribute to the cost of public transit in rural areas. He covered a number of other items but stressed that this is an integrated system that connects with all other existing transportation options that offers a "solution" to many subsections of the public. He also stressed the substantial net savings this offers government. The historic "silo" mindset within government is a major challenge in getting government support and thus achieving those net savings.

He concluded by stating that the committee remains optimistic as it has a solid business case and it is ready to move forward. The SWNB Transit Authority can be a model for the rest of the province if the government supports the project.

### **Financial Report - M. Porter**

The Chair then addressed the next agenda items which was the Financial Report and turned the floor over to M. Porter. He drew everyone's attention to the paper report that was in everyone's folder. He reviewed the 4 page summary document for the 4 "divisions" (solid waste, planning, other and corporate) as well as the accompanying documents. In summary the commission's finances are tracking along as expected for this time of the year.

Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee, W. Gamblin, indicated that as part of the audit process, our auditor had requested a list of assets be provided by an outside party and used to verify the presence of the equipment. Finance and Audit Committee member D. Blair volunteered, took a day to come to the landfill, and did this verification work as requested by the

auditor. The Chair and Board expressed its appreciation and thanked D. Blair for doing this work on behalf of the commission.

As a result of questions about the list of assets report, the Chair asked if the Board wished to have this report provided to all, and especially the LSDs. The consensus was that this should be done as an effort to help educate all about the costs of operating a landfill and commission. The Executive Director indicated that he would circulate the report to all at his earliest convenience.

### **Executive Director's Report - F. Tenhave**

The chair then moved on to the next agenda item and asked the Executive Director to give his report. The ED referred all to the hard copy in their folders and proceeded to summarize its content.

He highlighted the hiring of a contracted (part-time) Planner to do some internal work for the commission related to a possible regional plan (as per the Planning Management Committee) as well as some pending contract work for a municipality or two. He also highlighted this commission's participation, along with 4 other RSCs with landfills, in the joint hiring of an engineer to work for all 5 RSCs with landfills on a number of projects, especially construction projects. This pooling of resources, i.e. proportional contribution to the overall cost, is expected to yield substantial savings in such projects here as the identification and specifications of an appropriate new leachate treatment system/structure, and so on.

He indicated that tonnage was up slightly from Maine, a goal of management, which helps offset reductions here (and thus the associated revenue reductions from here). While this is early in the year, thus too soon to be a clear indication, he saw this as encouraging from a revenue perspective and hoped it continued.

He ended his remarks by summarizing some provincial initiatives that the EDs and ELG have been working on. In brief- some projects and initiatives were showing real progress but an equal number if not more were going nowhere and have been that way for a long time. He made mention of the regional planning issue and indicated while it was much needed, and long considered to be critical to the effectiveness of the entire RSC system, the lack of this component was really hampering all the RSCs from carrying out their full mandates as they were/are expected to do.

The Chair then referred all to the copies of two letters in the members's packages just to ensure they all saw them. These letters were just for information purposes as they had been discussed in the past.

He went on to indicate that there were no items for an in-camera session so one will not be held.

At this point the Chair indicated that, while the meeting was nearing completion, for unavoidable reasons, he had to leave early for another commitment. He then turned the meeting over to the Vice-chair, G. Christie.

### **Discussion of the Amalgamation Issue – G. Christie**

The Vice-chair opened the discussion by indicating that this was such a difficult item that he really didn't know where to start. He went on to provide a bit of commentary from the LSD perspective, specifically making mention of the very beginning of the RSC concept back when Minister Bruce Fitch came to the region and basically promised that no one would be forced to do anything under this new RSC system. Many indicated that no matter who was in power, the likelihood of things being forced on the region, like amalgamations, were becoming more and more possible. Concerns about roads and the cost of roads was another point of contention discussed. Concerns about what the new governance structure of an amalgamated area would look like was discussed at length. In short, no one knew and there was concern about the equality of representation within a new governance structure.

There was a feeling that the province is now asking the RSCs to be involved in the amalgamation efforts at this late stage only because the province itself was such a failure in its own efforts on that front.

The differences in the desires of rural people as compared to municipal residents was discussed at length. The strongly held view was that the majority of rural residents were where they lived because of lifestyle and not lower taxes. Many indicated that they wanted to be left alone and not be "subjugated" to a municipality with their many rules, etc. This led to a discussion of a lack of clarity about how an amalgamated area would actually work. What would the tax rates be in rural areas, what would the government/representation look like, and so forth. The government was criticized for not providing any guidance on any of these issues.

The lack of communication and a true partnership/support with the province on this amalgamation issue was an issue for the majority of directors which led to several directors expressing their suspicion that the province has a plan but won't tell the public what it is.

The Finn Report was extensively discussed and it was mentioned that the full report was in everyone's folders. All were encouraged to read it as it remains the direction that the government seems to be headed. The majority view was that the better all understood the Finn Report, the better the Board would be able to try to make coming changes work to the region's benefit, including pushing back with a united voice against changes that the Board does not see as working in this region.

There was discussion of the Nova Scotia example where the government there forced amalgamation on the Halifax area (and Sydney area). This is what is likely to happen here as voluntary approaches aren't working and the government here knows it. There was a real concern that the RSCs will only be used as a scapegoat when the failure of voluntary amalgamations continues.

The Vice-chair concluded the discussion by suggesting that a united Board needed to be sure that it was ready to react to whatever the province is planning regarding amalgamations or anything else.

### **NEXT MEETING**

The Vice- chair indicated that as agreed earlier in the meeting, the special meeting of the Southwest New Brunswick Service Commission will be held; Thursday, May 5, 2016 at 6:00 pm at the Admin. Building of the Solid Waste Div. at Hemlock Knoll /Lawrence Station.

He went on to reconfirm that the AGM, followed immediately by a regular Board meeting, is as follows;

**The Annual General Meeting of the Southwest New Brunswick Service Commission will be held Thursday, April 28, 2016 at 5:00 PM at the Community Center in Magaguadavic Place, 11 J. O. Spinney Drive, St. George, NB. A regular Board Meeting will immediately follow the AGM starting at 6:00 PM. at this same location.**

### **QUESTION & ANSWER WITH THE PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE**

There were a number of questions, primarily from the press present, asked and answered.

### **ADJOURNMENT OF THE REGULAR MEETING**

At approx. 8:45 PM the Vice -Chair asked for a motion to adjourn and it was moved by T. James that the meeting be adjourned.