

# EASTERN REGIONAL SERVICES BOARD

## Minutes of Meeting #17

August 28, 2013

7:00 p.m.

Ramada St. John's

Kenmount Road, St. John's, NL

---

### In Attendance:

Ed Grant, Chairperson  
Ches Ash, Trinity Conception North  
Bill Bailey, Clarenville & Isthmus  
Danny Breen, St. John's  
Wally Collins, St. John's  
Joy Dobbie, Trinity Bay South & Isthmus East  
Shannie Duff, St. John's  
Woodrow French, Conception Bay South  
Frank Galgay, St. John's  
Derrick Green, Bay Roberts  
Sandy Hickman, St. John's  
Harold Mallowney, Vice Chairperson/Southern Shore  
Sterling Willis, Paradise

### Regrets:

Dave Aker, Mount Pearl  
Gerry Colbert, St. John's  
Colin Corcoran, Southwest Avalon  
Debbie Hanlon, St. John's  
Tom Hann, St. John's  
Sheilagh O'Leary, St. John's  
Bruce Tilley, St. John's

### Other Attendees:

Ken Kelly, Chief Administrative Officer, Eastern Waste Management  
Lynn Tucker, Manager Corporate Services, Eastern Waste Management  
Kevin Power, Manager Waste Operations, Eastern Waste Management  
Frank Huxter, Director (Acting), Waste Management Division, Municipal Affairs

## 1. Call to Order

Mr. Ed Grant, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Grant, on behalf of all Board members, passed along sincere thanks and appreciation to Mr. Galgay and Ms. Duff (members who will not be seeking re-election in the municipal election of September 2013) for their dedication and support of this Board. Mr. Grant continued that he would like to pass along best wishes to these members in all their future endeavours.

Mr. Grant congratulated Mr. Breen on being acclaimed today as the Ward I Councillor for the City of St. John's and stated he is looking forward to continuing to work with Mr. Breen on this Board.

Mr. Grant passed along congratulations to Mayor French on the implementation of the curbside recycling program in the Town of Conception Bay South that was announced yesterday.

Mayor French thanked Mr. Grant and stated that the recycling program was delayed somewhat due to the delivery date of the recycling collection vehicle; however, the Town of Conception Bay South is happy to be assisting in reaching the diversion targets of the *Provincial Waste Management Strategy*.

Mr. Grant concluded by acknowledging that the general municipal election is scheduled for Tuesday, September 24<sup>th</sup> and he wished all members seeking re-election best of luck.

## **2. Adoption of Agenda**

**It was moved and seconded (W French/S Willis) to adopt the agenda as tabled.**

**MOTION 2013-044: Carried (unanimously)**

## **3. Review of Minutes – June 19, 2013**

**It was moved and seconded (S Hickman/J Dobbie) that the minutes of the June 19, 2013 meeting is adopted as tabled.**

**MOTION 2013-045: Carried (unanimously)**

## **4. Committee Reports**

### **i. Finance & Audit Committee (D Breen, Chairperson)**

- i. Human Resources Policy and Procedure Manual** - Mr. Breen noted that there are three (3) motions dealing with the HR manual for this evening. As members know, the Finance & Audit Committee has been guiding staff and a consultant in the development of a comprehensive set of policies and procedures to govern the human resources matters of the organization. This project started in the fall of 2012 with a review of pay scales and the development of job descriptions. This work has covered many issues from conditions of employment, conditions for a safe and efficient work environment, to benefits, training and a code of conduct. Agenda items 4(a) (1), (2) and (5) all revolve around HR issues and these motions are from two separate meetings of the committee. I would like these motions considered in the following order.

Motion number 2 is the main motion for the Board to consider. It is recommending the Board adopt the HR policies and procedures that have been tabled and included in tonight's meeting package. In your meeting package there is also a one-page summary (Appendix A) outlining the entitlements for vacation, sick leave, statutory holidays, etc.

Motion number 1 is a more detailed motion and is recommending that the Board establish a short-term disability program as part of the HR policies by granting sick leave of 12 days per year to each employee and those sick days do not accumulate. By not allowing these sick days to accumulate, we do not create a large liability for the Board. This program would be a 50/50 cost-shared benefit.

Motion number 5 is part of the implementation of the HR policies and is recommending that the Board purchase a short-term disability policy from our health and benefits provider, Encon Group Inc., as per the quote of June 20. The ultimate price will fluctuate and will be adjusted as employees enter and leave the organization.

Members asked if staff was involved in the development of the HR manual and if they approve of the policies.

Mr. Grant noted that it would not be appropriate for all staff to participate in this process.

Mr. Kelly noted that Mr. Power and Ms. Tucker were involved with the HR manual and worked with the consultant to develop the document. He noted that there is one item that affects management that may have to be re-visited and that is 'time in lieu' for overtime worked. Members of the management team consistently work hundreds of hours of overtime each year and have been taking time off in lieu to settle these hours; however, this new policy proposes an additional five (5) days off for managers and an additional seven (7) days off for the CAO as recognition of the overtime worked. Mr. Kelly stated that he does not foresee any pushback from staff regarding the HR manual. Three (3) of the current staff members will be going from 10 days vacation annually to 15 days annually; therefore, he noted that he feels staff will be pleased overall.

Mr. Ash stated he feels this is a very good first step and the HR manual will be open for future refinement as needed.

**It was moved and seconded (D Breen/B Bailey) that ERSB adopt the human resources policy and procedure manual prepared by AEM Human Resources Consulting as tabled at the ERSB meeting of August 28, 2013.**

**MOTION 2016-046: Carried (unanimously)**

**It was moved and seconded (D Breen/W Collins) that ERSB provide employees with 12 days annually for sick leave (non-accumulating) at January 1 each year and any new employee would be provided prorated sick level based on their start date. In addition, ERSB will provide a short-term disability plan at 50/50 cost-share between ERSB and its employees.**

**MOTION 2013-047: Carried (unanimously)**

**It was moved and seconded (D Breen/J Dobbie) that ERSB provide a short-term disability program for its employees on a 50/50 cost-shared basis as provided by Encon Group Inc. in its quote of June 20, 2013.**

**MOTION 2013-048: Carried (unanimously)**

- ii. **Rescind Motion to Purchase GPS Equipment** – Mr. Breen reminded Board members that they had previously adopted a motion to purchase a piece of GPS equipment. Once our Field Operations/GIS Clerk was in place, he recommended that we not proceed with this purchase. The accuracy of this equipment is not in line with the current GPS system that we are building; therefore, we should re-evaluate our needs at a later date.

**It was moved and seconded (D Breen/W French) that ERSB rescind Motion No. 2013-018 [It was moved and seconded (D Breen/S Hickman) that ERSB purchase a GPS unit from Cansel Wade with sub-meter accuracy at the cost of \$11,576.50 plus HST.] adopted at its meeting of March 27, 2013 pending further information.**

**MOTION 2013-049: Carried (unanimously)**

- iii. **In Relation to a Discussion about Future Diversion Projects** – Mr. Breen noted that the Finance & Audit Committee reviewed the financial analysis of the impacts of a proposed organics pilot project. This project will be brought forward by the Strategy & Policy Committee Chair tonight. While not a motion, this was something that the committee in its discussion felt strongly about – the financial implications of the achievement of strategic diversion goals must not be at any cost. Committee members felt that reaching the 50% diversion target has to be economically feasible.

**It was the consensus of the Finance & Audit Committee that any statement regarding the ERSB reaching 50% diversion should be qualified by adding ‘not at any costs’.**

General discussed ensued with members generally agreeing that costs associated with any initiative or board program must be reasonable and feasible.

Mr. French felt that this is very ‘forward-thinking’ and realistic as Board members need to keep in mind that many of our customers are experiencing financial hardship.

- iv. **Award Tender for Construction of Cavendish Waste Recovery Facility** – Mr. Breen noted that the committee was presented with a recommendation to award work for the construction of the Cavendish Waste Recovery Facility (WRF). The list of bidders is included in tonight’s meeting package as well as the approval to award from the province (Appendix B). You will note that the recommendation of the committee, the consultant, and the Department of Municipal Affairs is to award to the second lowest-cost bidder. The first lowest-cost bidder did not meet the specifications of the tender. The Department of Justice has reviewed the bidder’s response and recommended that we proceed to the next qualified bidder. This motion was sent out by email on August 21, 2013 and a list of those who responded to that email is included in tonight’s meeting package (Appendix C). This motion will also include a reference that the lowest bidder did not meet the specifications.

**It was moved and seconded (D Breen/W French) that ERSB ratify the results of the email vote to award the tender for the construction of the Cavendish Waste Recovery Facility to**

**MJ Hickey Construction Ltd. of Placentia in the amount of \$262,647.03 as per the recommendation of AMEC Environment & Infrastructure and the Department of Municipal Affairs. The lowest-cost bidder did not meet tender specifications.  
MOTION 2013-050: Carried (unanimously)**

- v. **Award Tender for Construction of Harbour Grace Waste Recovery Facility** – Mr. Breen noted that similar to the previous motion, this is to award the tender to construct the Harbour Grace Waste Recovery Facility (WRF). Again there were issues with the lowest-cost bidder's response – they did not provide a bid bond but instead provided a certified cheque which is not acceptable for projects of this dollar value. Again the motion should reference that the award is not the lowest bidder and that supporting documentation is in tonight's meeting package (Appendix D).

Mr. Grant noted that the contractor should be contacted regarding timelines to ensure that the work is completed as scheduled.

**It was moved and seconded (D Breen/S Hickman) that ERSB award the tender for the construction of the Harbour Grace Waste Recovery Facility to MJ Hickey Construction Ltd. of Placentia in the amount of \$383,098.25 as per the recommendation of AMEC Environment & Infrastructure and the Department of Municipal Affairs. The lowest cost bidder did not meet tender specifications.  
MOTION 2013-051: Carried (unanimously)**

**b. Strategy & Policy Committee - (C Ash, Chairperson)**

- i. **Adoption of Strategic Plan 2014-2017** – Mr. Ash stated that the Strategy & Policy Committee has met several times over the summer to complete work on the strategic plan and has finished the process – the completed document was included in tonight's meeting package (Appendix E).

He continued that he would like to highlight several key points starting with the Vision Statement on page 9 of the strategic plan. It reads, *"To improve the quality of life and protect the environment in the eastern region by ensuring cost effective, value added, sustainable community services are provided to all properties as required by the province while providing leadership to modernize community services."* Mr. Ash noted that much consideration was given to this statement and that even though mostly general it is specific in that it states the importance of environmental protection and that services should be value added, cost effective and sustainable.

Ms. Duff stated that she does not agree with using *"community services"* following *"...value added, sustainable..."* as our mandate at this time is waste management only. As a regional service board, we may have other services added in future; however, at this time, our focus is strictly waste management and she feels the vision statement should clearly state that. It should read, *"...value added, sustainable waste management services are provided..."*.

Mr. Ash noted that as a regional service board, the committee felt the possibility is there for future services to be added and that they developed the vision statement with that in mind.

Mr. Grant stated that he agrees – it was felt that the vision statement should be broad as it is very likely that other services will be added in the future.

Mr. Duff stated she feels that waste management is what we do and that should be included. The proposed statement is just too broad at this time.

Mr. Green stated he feels it is too restrictive to narrow the vision statement as suggested – maintaining community services shows openness and a willingness to assist communities in service delivery as we go forward.

Ms. Dobbie stated that it is her understanding that all directives from the province include the terminology “community services”. This regional service board will be the provider of community services in the eastern region.

Mr. Hickman stated that he agrees with Ms. Duff – we provide waste management services only at this time and our vision statement should indicate the same.

Ms. Duff noted that the statement says “*as required by the province*” - that is basically saying that we have to provide community services because the province states we must.

Mr. Grant replied that the discussion was to include “*as required by the province*” to indicate that the Board receives its direction from the province and cannot provide any service unless directed by the province.

Mr. French noted that he wanted that statement included so that the public would understand that Board members are appointed by the province and that the province sets the mandate, parameters and directives of the Board. He would like for the words “*as directed by the province*” remain in the vision statement.

Mr. Huxter stated that from the province’s point of view and using NorPen as an example, regional service boards should expect other municipal services to be added to their mandates in future. The Board does not set its mandate – the province does.

Mr. Breen noted that there is a difference between mandate and vision. Our mandate is set by the province and cannot change. Our vision statement is where we see the Board going. He concluded that he feels it should state ‘waste management’ at this time and when other services are added in future, the vision statement could be adjusted at that time.

**It was moved and seconded (S Duff/S Hickman) to change the wording of the ERSB vision statement included in the Strategic Plan 2014-2017 to read, “*To improve the quality of life and protect the environment in the eastern region by ensuring cost effective, value added,*”**

***sustainable waste management services are provided to all properties as required by the province while providing leadership to modernize community services.”***

**MOTION 2013-052: Carried**

**[Contrary-minded – Four (4) members]**

Mr. Breen continued that he would like to look at the statement “*all properties*”. Is providing service to all properties the mandate of this Board? This statement could impact the direction of the Board if left in the vision statement.

Mr. Huxter noted that the ERSB is responsible for ALL properties in the eastern region.

Mr. Grant confirmed that the mandate states that the Board is responsible for all properties; however, does that mean that the same level of service must be provided to all properties.

Mr. Kelly noted that the *Municipalities Act* and *Local Service District Regulations* state that waste management services “shall” be provided. The Board may determine the level of service at future meetings.

**It was moved and seconded (C Ash/D Green) that ERSB adopt the Strategic Plan, January 2014 to December 2017, as tabled with one revision as per Motion 2013-052.**

**MOTION 2013-053: Carried (unanimously)**

- ii. **Development of an Organics Composting Facility** – Mr. Ash informed members that staff has been working on a feasibility study with MMSB for the development of a program to start diverting organic material from the Regional Integrated Waste Management Facility located at Robin Hood Bay (RHB). Work on this project began last summer as a means of increasing diversion; providing an alternative to landfilling commercial organics (staff was actually approached by a larger grocery chain in the region that wanted to participate in any organics collection we provide) and, it is an opportunity for the board to gain experience in organics collection and composting. As members will recall, Ms. Sarah Morgan was seconded by MMSB for three months to study options, engage the private sector and develop a simple and cost effective project. She visited several sites in Atlantic Canada to gain further in-depth knowledge and lessons learned from those that are actually composting.

The organics feasibility study provided in tonight’s meeting package (Appendix F) is a draft of the report and some further refinements are being completed. However, if this project is to proceed to the next stage it will require the Board to budget in 2014 for this initiative.

The committee feels that this is an extremely important project for the Board. Our preferred approach has always been to test the options, i.e. transfer station location, concept for waste recovery facilities, etc. The project will start with the diversion of approximately 1,000 metric tonnes in year one and build up to 2,000 metric tonnes for years two and three. We are working to co-locate the project with a waste recovery facility in Whitbourne. In this way, we can leverage staff, equipment and site work.

The project will require approximately \$1.6 million in capital and approximately \$300,000 in operating subsidy. It will generate some of its own revenue but we do not project that they will cover the operating costs. If we subsidize the operations using the RHB tipping fee, it could be about \$1.00 to \$1.30 per metric tonne on the tipping fee.

We will be seeking funding from several sources as outlined in the report – none of this funding has been secured. However, given the importance of this project we are suggesting that the 2014 budget include allocation for the full capital and that the operating costs for year one be included.

In addition, the draft plan outlines roles and responsibilities for development and management of the project. It is the committee's opinion that this project needs to be operated and managed by the Board if the Board is going to be responsible for the funding, regulatory compliance and the outcomes.

Mr. Green asked if there would be a shortfall in tipping fee revenue at RHB if this project is implemented.

Mr. Kelly noted that a subsidy will be needed at RHB to offset the costs of this program.

Mr. Breen stated that the tipping fee revenue from RHB is the major funding source and the majority of the tipping fee revenue is received from two (2) major customers – commercial haulers and the City of St. John's. Therefore, he sees a project where the two major customers of RHB will be paying extra money on each metric tonne of waste disposed at RHB and will receive no benefit from this program.

Mr. Grant noted that he is most concerned about timing. He continued that he has no issue with using part of the surplus for projects such as this one. The only other issue regarding this project would be that ERSB should be managing the project and that was discussed at length at committee. He continued that if the Board seeks the full funding upfront, that may dissuade other possible funding partners from coming onboard. He stated that he is suggesting that the Board wait for the results of the provincial organics study that is currently underway. Dillon Consulting is the consultant working on that report and they will be submitting a preliminary report to the province in late September. In addition, the cost of this program for our residents has not been included in this study. Organics typically makes up 30-35% of the overall waste stream and is quite expensive and dirty to collect and handle. Maybe organics collection will be a commercial piece and not something offered to residential customers. The Board has to be very careful and sure of all costs of any initiative.

Mr. Huxter stated that the provincial organics study report being done by Dillon Consulting is due in December of this year. A preliminary report is expected in late September. He noted that there is a misstep between residential and industrial, commercial & institutional (ICI) waste. Government is responsible for and, therefore, studying residential organic waste and is not looking at ICI organic waste. The Dillon study is primarily focused on

residential organics. This study will not resolve issues with the disposal of ICI organics waste which equates to a much larger tonnage than the residential portion of organic waste. Mr. Huxter concluded that he is looking forward to the results of the Dillon study and feels it will most likely recommend projects similar to the project being proposed here this evening.

Mr. Grant asked if the Board's timing may be off.

Mr. Huxter replied that he feels government will not make decisions on providing funding for organics projects until the Dillon study is completed.

Mr. Kelly noted that members should keep in mind that a \$12 million materials recovery facility (MRF) has been built at RHB for the processing of recyclables. Communities did not have to participate – this proposed project will be the same. The MRF does not pay for itself – it costs \$150 per metric tonne to process recyclables on top of any revenue generated. A complete analysis has been done and this project will provide a better return for our money. Mr. Huxter just confirmed that the Dillon report won't address the disposal of ICI organic waste. This project will address ICI waste. The Board is responsible to advance the *Provincial Waste Management Strategy* and this is the next step in that strategy. He continued that this project does not include all communities in the eastern region as it is a "pilot project" but it is a small-scale project that should provide some very valuable information for future decisions. He stated that the full funding is being requested because once the budget is completed it will be a year before we can request money from the surplus again.

Mr. Ash noted that the committee felt there was acceptance with the Board to move ahead on the diversion of organics. In addition, they saw a need to ensure the funding of this project was available in case all funding partners did not provide the suggested funding. He continued that he understands that once the budget is complete, the Board will have to wait until the fall of 2014 to look at this again. He concluded that members need to keep in mind that the request for the full funding does not mean that the Board will be spending all this money, it would mean that the money would be available if needed.

Ms. Duff stated she understands that the provincial government would be providing funding for these capital projects. She stated that she has a problem with the Board deciding to do this on our own. Organics processing is important; however, it can be tricky and has to be done correctly. Usually when a pilot project is put in place, it indicates the direction that the Board will be moving.

Mr. Hickman asked where the organics will be coming from – what area will be involved in this project.

Mr. Kelly stated that as outlined on page 8 of the organics feasibility study, this project envisions the processing of 5,000 metric tonnes of organics over three (3) years. The materials would come from:

- Domestic organic waste – from communities in Trinity Bay South and Center whose current waste collection contract provides for curbside collection of organics (source-separated) from 2,000 homes. There would be no additional costs to these customers. Total = 200 metric tonnes annually
- Non-Domestic organic waste – from large grocers such as Sobeys and Dominion. Sobeys stores alone generate in excess of 1,000 metric tonnes annually in the eastern region. Total = 500 metric tonnes annually
- Industrial – poultry processing waste from Country Ribbon and aquaculture processing waste, etc. Total = 1,000 metric tonnes annually

Mr. Hickman noted that he feels the funding for this type of project should be coming from the province. In addition, he is in agreement that our timing is off – the Board should await the Dillon report. To proceed may mean additional costs for residents.

Mr. Kelly noted that \$1.3 million of the \$1.6 million required for capital under the financing options listed actually comes from the provincial government. The list of possible funding groups includes government departments that have had monies allocated for organics projects for several years now.

Mr. Galgay stated that the organics project is a good concept; however, he feels the Board should await the Dillon report.

Mr. Willis stated that he agrees that the Board should await the Dillon report before making a final decision on this project.

Mr. Grant stated that historically the provincial government has provided capital funding and the Board provides operational monies. This proposed project lists possible funding partners; however, if the Board decides to fund the complete project that could impact our ability to get future capital funding from the province. Mr. Grant concluded by stating that he understands the surplus belongs to the Board and may be accessed at any time. The Board does not have to request money in the budget process.

Mr. Breen noted that the Board's surplus is approximately \$5 million. If we decide not to proceed at this time, we can always decide after the Dillon report is completed. The surplus is there and can be accessed as required. He stated that he does not see the need for urgency on this decision.

Mr. Ash noted that members have made it clear that they would like to wait for the Dillon report; therefore, he is proposing a motion to defer this decision as long as the Board may access its surplus at any time throughout the year.

Mr. Grant confirmed that he understands that the Board may access its surplus at any time.

Mr. Kelly reminded members that he has an email from the City of St. John's stating that the Board has access to the surplus only through the budget process.

Ms. Duff noted that there will be no need to adjust the tipping fee for next year due to the large surplus.

Mr. Breen agreed and noted that because of the increased amount of waste disposed at RHB there was no need to adjust the tipping fee last year and, he does not foresee a need for a change to the tipping fee for 2014 because of the surplus.

Mr. Dobbie stated that she wants it on record that she feels the Board is going backward. Our mandate was to close landfills and to provide programs for waste diversion. We have closed landfills, put collection contracts in place, put recycling programs in place; however, the Board is stalling on the implementation of an organics program. She continued that she feels the Dillon report will be in line with what is being proposed and feels that the Board should be moving forward with this project as it is a 'no-brainer'.

Mr. Hickman asked for a description of the processing facility being proposed.

Mr. Kelly replied that the organic materials would start the process in a covered building with a concrete floor to limit exposure to excessive moisture and to allow for the frequent movement of the material during the primary phase of composting. It is important to ensure that the 'recipe' is correct in that organics must be mixed with carbon as a bulky agent such as wood chips, etc. to ensure success and the reduction of odours.

Mr. French noted that hearing about changes to the tipping fee makes him nervous. He agrees that this is a good project; however the timing is not right. He doesn't see an issue with waiting until 2014-2015 before addressing organics as the implications may be significant.

Mr. Green noted that the Board's decision may impact the location of the Whitbourne WRF.

Mr. Kelly confirmed that the decision regarding the pilot project does impact the location of the Whitbourne WRF. One proposed site for the Whitbourne WRF is the piece of land next to the Transportation & Works Depot on the highway through Whitbourne; however, it is not a suitable location for an organics processing facility due to its close proximity to the highway and existing properties. The second site being considered is at Spread Eagle Quarry Road which is approximately six (6) kms from the nearest property and would be more suitable for a composting facility. This is the last WRF to be constructed and the communities in the area are awaiting its completion. A depot is planned for the Whitbourne WRF for the storage of the Board's equipment.

**It was moved and seconded (C Ash/J Dobbie) to defer the decision to recommend the proposed pilot project on organics to the October 2013 ERSB meeting depending on the outcome of the preliminary report of Dillon Consulting.**

**MOTION 2013-054: Carried (unanimously)**

- iii. **Update on Pilot School Recycling Project** – Mr. Kelly stated that he has been informed that MMSB has decided that they are not ready to do this project this year and has pushed it out to 2014. That decision was made with no consultation with ERSB. He will be meeting with MMSB tomorrow and should have more information on why the project has been delayed.

c. **Governance Committee - (H. Mallowney, Chairperson)**

- i. **Rescind Motion on Remuneration for Board Members** – Mr. Mallowney noted that the Board has an adopted motion that is in contravention of the *Regional Service Boards Act* and its regulations. While we have not implemented this motion, the Board needs to consider if it will continue to have this motion in place. The regulations set the pay scale for Board members in accordance with the province's policy for boards and agencies. As you know, this is the 1996 rate for Level I or \$145 per day. The Board adopted a motion to pay at Level II rates. To date Board members have actually been paid in accordance with the regulation; therefore, a change in this motion will not affect anything that has actually been paid to Board members. There have been at least two (2) meetings with the Minister regarding this issue and the opinion that the current regulation is not appropriate is shared by the other regional boards in the province.

The Governance Committee is recommending that the Board rescind its motion of February 29, 2012 and instead adopt a motion setting the pay scale in accordance with the regulation. In addition, the province has adopted a policy for reimbursement of expenses that the Board is obliged to follow for Board members. A copy of the policy has been requested; however, it has not been received.

**It was moved and seconded (H Mallowney/S Willis) that ERSB rescind Motion #2012-007 and Motion #2012-008 adopted at its meeting of February 29, 2012 regarding board remuneration; and that, ERSB set its remuneration to Level I of the provincial government's *Guidelines for Remuneration and Rates for Pay for Boards, Commissions, and Agencies* retroactive to November 9, 2011.**

**MOTION: 2013-055: Carried  
[Contrary-minded: S Hickman]**

Mr. Grant stated he would continue to make representation to the Minister on the Board's behalf for remuneration at Level II or adjust the legislation to provide remuneration based on 2% of the Board's budget similar to municipalities.

- ii. **Reimbursement of Expenses Policy** – Mr. Mallowney again noted that the *Regional Service Boards Act* regulation states that Board members are to be reimbursed for expenses as per the province's *Executive Travel Rules*. We have requested a copy of those rules but have not yet received it.

Mr. Huxter stated he has forwarded along two (2) requests for the *Executive Travel Rules* and is still awaiting the document. He will forward it along as soon as he has it.

Mr. Grant noted that the Board is mandated to follow those rules and has never been provided a copy.

- iii. **Communication Messages** – Mr. Mullaney directed members to the handout provided tonight entitled “*Eastern Waste Management Regional Services Board: Communications Toolkit*” (Appendix G). Our public relations agency has developed these simple messages for Board members. These messages can be refined more and we have included a list of questions that Board members are likely to be asked – they are provided on page 6. Mr. Mullaney concluded that members should become very familiar with these messages and to use them.

## 5. Other Business

- i. **Board Moving to Paperless Meetings** – Mr. Kelly noted that a suggestion was made recently that the Board should consider moving to paperless meetings and to provide suitable devices for Board members.

General discussion ensued with the following points:

- Board members are sent meeting packages and they can be quite large. Therefore, members incur expense in printing those documents and then members attend meetings where another hard copy is available. This seems to be a waste of paper.
- Moving to paperless meetings seems to be in-line with our mandate.
- Members could be provided iPads/tablets to review meeting materials, etc.

**Action Item: Mr. Grant asked that Ms. Tucker contact all Board members before the next meeting to determine the number of members who would like an electronic device to be provided.**

- ii. **Bell Island Waste Management Study** – Mr. Grant stated that the recommendation of the consultants who completed the *Bell Island Waste Management Study* is direct-haul to RHB. The only difference for Bell Island is the ferry and the consultants did not feel that the ferry was an issue for waste removal. Mr. Grant continued that he suggests that the Board provide a copy of this report to the Minister with the recommendation of direct haul for Bell Island’s waste. Eastern Waste Management would be available to provide the service if needed. In addition, a decision will be required as to whether a WRF is needed on Bell Island.
- iii. **MMSB Sponsoring Organics Conference – Earth Bound September 25-27 2013**– Mr. Kelly noted that MMSB is sponsoring an organics conference that’s taking place from September 25-27 in St. John’s. He noted that he would be attending along with Mr. Grant; however, if any other Board member is interested in attending, they should let Ms. Tucker know.

**Action Item: Mr. Grant asked Ms. Tucker to circulate information to all Board members**

regarding this conference and directed Board members to let Ms. Tucker know if they would like to be registered for this conference.

- iv. **Farewell from Ms. Duff** – Ms. Duff noted that this may be her last Board meeting and that she would like to thank all Board members for their consideration and support over the years. Ms. Duff continued that she has enjoyed the work of this Board and of the previous committee and feels the work is very important. She concluded by passing along best wishes to all Board members.

## 6. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the Eastern Regional Service Board was scheduled for Wednesday, September 25<sup>th</sup>; however, as that is the day immediately following the municipal election, it was agreed to move the meeting to **Wednesday, October 2, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.**

## 7. Adjournment

**It was moved (E Grant) to adjourn the meeting at 8:50 p.m.**  
**MOTION 2013-055: Carried**

*Prepared by: Lynn Tucker  
September 4, 2013*