

WITHOUT PREJUDICE (E&OE)

NOTE: The meeting started at 1:09 p.m. because Councillors Fuhl, Williams, and Wilson all needed help signing on to Zoom and in the case of Councillor Fuhl, his device could not be activated and another laptop had to be brought in to allow him to participate. Further everyone on Council when they speak forget to "unmute" themselves and have to repeat everything twice. At the July 14, 2020 Committee of the Whole Meeting, there was a hand held recorder in front of CAO Draper, however the Audio File on the RM web site for this meeting ends after the Hank Venema presentation at the beginning of the meeting and the explanation given was that the recorder was almost full when they began recording and there was not enough room on it to record the remainder of the meeting. When asked about Zoom, Ms. Erica Wood said they were unable to recover the missing portion from Zoom. That means the entire discussion about the Springfield Recreation Centre that occurred at that meeting is not recorded. This would imply that Zoom is not keeping a recording of the meetings. There is not much of note on this meeting EXCEPT FOR THE QUESTION PERIOD DIALOGUE WHICH I THINK IS INFORMATIVE AND THEREFORE I AM PREFACING THESE NOTES WITH MY IMPRESSIONS OF THE BERGER PEAT PRESENTATION HELD AT THE DUGALD C.C. ON JULY 21, 2020.

BERGER PEAT PROCESSING PLANT (OAKWOOD ROAD) PRESENTATION

Just 2 days before the close for submissions to the Environmental Approvals Branch of the Provincial Government, Berger Peat suddenly holds an information session on the Project in the Dugald Community Club on very short notice. I brought the spectre of the this project to the attention of my readers back in March/April of 2019 when the RM of Springfield returned from In Camera sessions and passed two resolutions, one agreeing with the Province that peat was now considered an agricultural product and the second adding it to Permitted Uses in our Zoning By-Law 08-01. I proved the first was completely FALSE and therefore it followed that it should not be a use on land zoned agricultural, particularly not a permitted rather than conditional one. Conditional uses require a public hearing and likely to our Council that was not desirable. Other than those resolutions, our Council has been completely mute on the subject of peat at the Council table although for a Council, they do have an inordinate amount of In Camera sessions and secret meetings before and after regular public council meetings but very rarely do these result in any business coming out of those sometimes very lengthy sessions.

But I digress. Back to the Information??? Session. As I predicted, there was a table laid out with various donuts on pre-prepared plates and bottled water available for attendees. The seating was sort of spaced and those attending were mindful of social distancing. The presentation host (in person at least) was a local gentleman, I presume, but the owner, a woman, and the major executives, 2 men, were being videoed in from Quebec and all three had pronounced accents, making it difficult to understand sometimes what exactly they were saying. However it is not really important because the owner continually tried to convince the audience that it was a family business, that they were very honest and cooperative, and that their intent was to communicate openly with the community, all of which in mid July 2020 is difficult to swallow when obviously they had purchased the property back in spring of 2019. The CEO, I believe he was, and the other gentleman who was more into operational matters, could either not provide answers to the questions from the audience or the answers were not on point and not particularly informative. In short, to me it seemed apparent they were ill prepared and this whole enterprise was probably a spur of the moment decision to try and convince the public what they and the Council have been negotiating is of benefit to the community. I find that completely irresponsible, devious, and quite frankly insulting to residents, particularly at the end of the period for public commentary on the proposal. As an acquaintance of mine once said, when confronted with the fact that there was a notice at the back pages of the Clipper publicizing a very important action of Council, "who reads the back of the Clipper, I only read the articles and opinion page". In short, no one paid any heed to the Environment Approvals Branch advertisement, including yours truly. I completely missed it and I tend to look for those things. Someone had to point it out to me. While trying to ask a question at the session, I was rudely cut off by the CEO on the video and ended up for the duration of their lengthy and repetitive presentation hanging on to the portable microphone which someone did try to retrieve at one point. The majority of the 2 hour session was taken up by the company and their representatives, however residents did come out "punching" and the questions were, I thought, to the point, insightful, and the responses were either unavailable or non specific. One particular gentleman who is most affected by this proposal, being I believe the closest residence to it, was particularly vocal and completely dissatisfied with the explanations given. THIS MATTER IS BY NO MEANS SETTLED AS THEIR ENVIRONMENTAL APPLICATION HAS NOT YET BEEN APPROVED. However this has not stopped the company from engaging in work on the property which begs the question, are they doing it illegally or have they been given preliminary permission to proceed without the necessary approvals.

And now while the positives to this operation are the obvious, employment opportunities for locals, property tax revenue, and that is all I can think of, the negatives are many. They include: Much increased truck traffic on PTH 207, not in good repair, and Oakwood Road west of 207, not constructed to optimum municipal standards for gravel roads, the wear and tear on the roads requiring more tax dollars to perform maintenance and repair, dust from those vehicles, traffic noise, consumption of water from the underlying aquifer (potentially leading to major draw down on local wells and potential shortages to the municipal water supply), waste water disposal which could contaminate the aquifer with unknown pathogens or acids, air pollution from the ventilation systems, trash carelessly disposed of by the many shifts of employees, machinery noise, unsightly piles of finished product stored in outdoor bunkers, loss of good growing land to an industrial purpose, and there are probably more. In short, this is a commercial business, an industry, and should not have been located in an un-serviced area zoned Agricultural/Rural Residential. However at the very last moment, perhaps in one of those In Camera deliberations, it was decided to amend their application to the Environment Approvals Branch and refer to their operation as an **Agriculture Support Industry**. Support industries for crop production include such things as: **preparation of fields, sowing and bedding, treatment of crops, crop spraying, including by air, pest control, pruning of fruit trees and vines, transplanting of rice, thinning of beets, harvest, maintenance of agricultural land, operation of agricultural irrigation equipment, provision of agricultural machinery with crew**. I don't believe the Provincial Government Department involved in Planning Matters has a definition for this industry but that was taken from the web to give an idea of what it could include. Vegetables grown in greenhouses is not an agricultural industry, it is considered a horticultural industry. Horticulture is the cultivation, processing, and sale of fruits, nuts, vegetables, and ornamental plants and does not include large-scale crop production or animal husbandry. I

believe all of Council and the CAO attended this meeting and were spread about at the very farthest point from the presenter although this subject has never openly been mentioned at a Springfield Council meeting. None spoke a word. Berger and Council are "grasping at straws" to get their way, regardless of the impact to resident taxpayers and one recreation business located a mile away across what is currently an open field but may be transformed into some other purpose by Berger in the future. **WHATEVER HAPPENED TO THE "ACCOUNTABILITY", "TRANSPARENCY", "FAIRNESS AND INTEGRITY", "LEAD BY EXAMPLE", "SAFETY", "PUBLIC SERVICE", AND "TEAMWORK", the seven Guiding Principles of the RM of Springfield Strategic Plan which everyone can read by googling RM of Springfield and to which myself, Councillor Fuhl, Councillor Wilson, Mayor Fell when she was a Councillor, and former Councillor Shandy Walls all agreed and which cost taxpayers a considerable amount of money.** Just as a side note, when I participated in an Association of Manitoba Municipalities Convention resolution against Harassment and Bullying at Council tables, on my particular Council, it was the women who were harassing and intimidating the men on Council which is why I joined a few other councillors from adjacent municipalities in bringing forward the resolution (and their problems were mainly with male bullies) which passed with an over 90% approval at the Convention. Interestingly enough, many of the speakers that felt they were being harassed and bullied in their councils were MALE, not female. Other thoughts that occurred to me as I type these notes is "who would benefit most from an indoor turf surface where football could be played during the winter months which is a major feature of the proposed Rec Centre" and "who was the co-founder of the current Springfield Chamber of Commerce and holds a business membership as Garbage Girls"?

5. 5. QUESTION PERIOD

Heather Erickson, Anola, Manitoba - 9.10 Springfield Recreation Centre - Land Dedication - Why does Council feel it necessary to pass a resolution as requested by Mayor Fell in the Committee of the Whole meeting to dedicate a piece of land to this project? Before Mr. San Clemente would sign off on the transfer of land on which the Administration Building is located, he insisted on a clause in the agreement that stated that that piece of land to the east of and south of the building could be used only for a recreation centre and nothing else. Therefore the resolution is not required, it is part of an existing agreement. **ZOOM** - Why are Council and Committee of the Whole meetings being conducted on Zoom? The public has never before had an opportunity to phone into these meetings or even observe them without actually attending the meeting. Further can Council tell the public how much the Zoom capability is costing us taxpayers? **Mayor Fell** - So I'll address the Rec Centre first. So this Council has created a plan for a Rec Centre, there's land for the Rec Centre. We want to put it forward in a resolution as it will help with the fund raising efforts. It isn't...and the agreement, that's not public information **NOTE: Mayor Fell is quite correct. That is not public information but it was told to me by a member of her current Council before he was on Council and had somehow acquired details of the negotiations between the Developer and Council of the day.)** this is uh just a thought put forward by Council. We want to make sure the efforts toward fund raising continue regardless of whether grants come in this year or not. And we just think it is a good thing for the public...Councillor Ralke, maybe you have something to add to that as you have more knowledge on the Rec Centres, like just rec in general. **Councillor Ralke** - Right. **Mayor Fell** - I know I put you on the spot. **Councillor Ralke** - I know that it is imperative that when you are applying for grants and when you are fund raising, you have to have a location whether it be a facility already existing or whether it be land dedication or something if you don't have uh uh a location to at least state to individuals that this is where it's going to be and this is how it's going to be funded, um you can't really move forward without it so I know that when we were discussing it just kind of just at that meeting like it was stated, that's where I came forward and proved yes it makes sense. If you don't have something that you can tell the average individual that this is the location it's going to ...not everybody knows exactly everything that's going on in every minute of every step we're taking. Those who are involved and come to meetings know but the average Joe doesn't know where that location is so when you start that fund raising committee cause that's what had originated at that meeting was to promote or say "yes" we support the ability for citizens to now begin funding the program. Um now that you have that program beginning, we can go knock on the door when you start a raffle or whatever it is, you want to be able to tell the average person that hey, this is the location and this is where it is not maybe it might be there or we think it should be but I never knew about uh this dedication of land uh that Heather is speaking of so thank you for that, Heather. **Mayor Fell** - Thank you. **Heather Erickson - Shouldn't the fund raising start with the "grassroots"?** **Mayor Fell** - The fund raising is starting. **We're** creating a Committee and that is "grassroots" because there's going to be people in the community on the Committee and I see nothing more "grassroots" than that than having residents on a funding committee? **NOTE: In every other community, Cooks Creek, Dugald, Anola, the fund raising started with members of the community making the decision regarding adding on to their facilities and beginning to devise means of achieving their goal. The Council of the day did not decide they should augment their facility and then assemble a Committee to start the process. That is the difference here.** No one in Oakbank has come forward to initiate a move to build a Rec Centre by independently starting a fund raising process and that includes members of the existing Oakbank Community Centre. Back in 2008 some members of the Oakbank CC had a plan to improve and add on to their existing facility but Council did not support that initiative and it died almost before it started. At least one member of that Council was also member of the OCC. Now it is the Mayor and Council that feel it appropriate to "get the ball rolling" and Councillor Ralke seems to imply this will give her something to present to the people behind the doors she plans to knock on, a location where it will be situated, likely miles and miles from where they live. I note a number of people driving their children to the skate part that is located adjacent to the proposed "site" even though it is within walking distance of Oakbank. If the Rec Centre is built there, Springfield Place will be a traffic nightmare, even given the lowering of the speed limit to 50 kph. Parking will be at a premium!!! And on the subject of skate parks, there was a portable one purchased in I believe 2015 at approximately \$30,000. that was placed in the Oakbank arena. It was to be shared with the other Community Centres. I have inquired more than once as to where this portable skate park now is, and **NO ONE PROVIDES ME WITH AN ANSWER.** Local skate boarders even given this opportunity used the Administration Building as a skate park. **One even had to be removed from the roof of the building by the then Chief of Police, I understand. SUGGESTION: I feel a Porta Pottie should be placed at the skate park adjacent to the Administration Building in Oakbank because the day of the Council meeting, a lady and her two children went to the Administration Building to use the washroom. It was 1:00 p.m., the hour of the meeting, but the door was locked. Surely that amenity would cost less than the missing portable skate park. I would think our Recreation Director and his staff should have thought of this and arranged for a portable facility to accommodate the skate park which is located far from businesses that are always open in off hours such as evening and weekends.** **Mayor Fell (continued)** - I will address your next question about Zoom. I believe the cost to the taxpayers is \$1,999. a year plus taxes to use Zoom. Um I'll ask Erika to confirm, I believe that was the cost of it? It might be \$2,999. but I think it's \$1,999. **Jody Thiessen** - I can address it. So the cost is monthly, plus with the phone in feature it is \$29.99. **Heather Erickson** - That's

\$29.99 monthly? **Mayor Fell (interrupting)** - That's right, \$29.99 monthly for Zoom. **Jody Thiessen** - It allows uh we opted for a larger feature to accommodate for the public hearings and uh we weren't sure of who we're going to be zooming in so we opted for a larger block of activity. **Mayor Fell** - And the reason for people phone calling in was we want to make sure people have the option if they don't have the kind of internet speeds to actually log in on their computer. They have the option to call in, there's also the option to come in person, so we're giving Springfield residents even more of an opportunity to be involved depending on what their life styles and where they live and their work schedules so that way they have an opportunity to utilize whichever feature or method works best for them. Thank you. **Erika Woods** - Yes, so the increased price we're paying also allows us to go over 40 minutes, the um other option we can't go over 40 minutes so it's not good enough to post our meetings. **NOTE: Even on Planning Meetings, there has only been perhaps one person that used Zoom and on one other meeting when I inquired and the answer was one, the person that participated on Zoom was the Clipper reporter.**

Janet Nysten, Oakbank - Um I guess in the period of time where things are so abnormal I'm back here to try and make some of my normal questions again. My first question is about the agenda item 9.12 there's a **January, February, March Financial Statements**. I'm just wondering, like I've been here year after year hoping that our statements would be coming in a more timely fashion. They seemed to be doing that and there seemed to be Council support for that to happen but here we are in July 21st and just seeing the first of 2020 statements. Can you explain why the delay and what your intent is for moving forward. **Mayor Fell** - Jody, can I ask you to answer that question? **Jody Thiessen** - Ahem ya specifically the delay uh is due to the vacancies in the municipality. Uh right now I'm also overseeing IT. So year-end was backed up for addressing our audited Financial Statements. Shortly it's uh to get the ball rolling we had a whole big season of vacancies that were just filled in the spring so we're trying to get the ball rolling and the financial department back up on its feet to maintain but with the several vacancies in this organization um departments are sharing duties and other priorities are uh taking precedent so. **Mayor Fell** - Thank you, Jody. Do you have any other questions, Janet? **Janet Nysten** - Oh yes. On that I guess the status of the audit is it's underway, it's not completed with all the adjustments, there's no audit adjusting entries yet. **Jody Thiessen** - Not yet, the auditors haven't had a chance to meet to address it. There will be another such meeting. **Janet Nysten** - So my I guess, this will probably be again to Jody through you, um when I looked at the January statement and it continues through uh your February, March statements, on the first page there's a number for the nominal surplus and it says Nominal surplus balance at the beginning of the year and I'm just wondering why that is different than the balance at the December 31, 2019 statement. **Mayor Fell** - Jody, are you able to answer that now? **Jody Thiessen** - I was aware there were from well so they're PSAB entries, those would be moving uh capital entries into what was capital into the um PSAB entry on the TCA so those numbers would be emergency adjustments. **Janet Nysten** - So here I am just a person looking at the statement and there is a difference of just under \$2 million and there's no accounting, there's no disclosure to the public or to Council there is this significant difference of Nominal Surplus. **Jody Thiessen** - Usually the entry means uh moving from a cash basis to a, from a cash basis to a PSAB statement so ... **Janet Nysten** - So why then if it's a PSAB statement we're looking at the same format statement that you gave us at December 31st.? I can see the audited statement being different, I get that there are benchmarks, I do and the utility is out by \$791,000. I think there are significant numbers that I would like to have an explanation for it. I think Council should follow up on that. **Mayor Fell** - So if you would like to send in an e-mail, you can carbon copy all of Council to our Finance Manager, she'll get back to you with those answers. She doesn't have all the necessary detailed paperwork that she needs here to answer those questions. **Janet Nysten** - Well, I'm not going to stand here, I'm here asking you a question I hope it's recorded and I can get an answer. Does that not..like is that not ..like I am just a citizen and I don't know why I have to send in a further e-mail when **Mayor Fell (interrupting)** - And that's fine, she'll answer your questions but in advance, so we don't go through this when you come in. If you send your questions in ahead of time, then our Finance Manager can be prepared when you come in cause clearly you do have your questions prepared already so. **Janet Nysten** - And I prepared them at noon, so I mean I didn't have time to...this is a ring around the rosey statement ... **Mayor Fell (interrupting while Mr. Nysten is speaking)** - Do you have any other questions, Janet? **NOTE: These questions are relating to the first 3 Financial statements of 2020. Ms. Thiessen is our Chief Financial Officer and responsible for millions of taxpayer dollars. She should be familiar enough with these statements after doing them for in excess of 3 years and should also have come to the meeting prepared to field questions related to the statements relative to year end statements. On the subject of e-mailing questions, I e-mailed a question to the CAO on July 6th. with some very simple questions about Garbage Girls. Her reply did not respond to all my questions so I sent another e-mail the same day:** *Colleen, you have not addressed my questions/comments in items 3, 4, 6, and 7. Truck size is not at issue. Up to 1 ton truck and trailers up to a maximum of 14 feet are currently permitted to bring garbage in but that refers to residential waste, not commercial waste. Once a company is formed and charges for a service, they are by definition "commercial" and our transfer stations do not accept commercial waste. Of course Emterra trucks are large but that is not why they don't bring the waste they collect to our transfer station. It is because they are a business that was contracted by the RM and is paid by tax dollars. Garbage Girls is a commercial enterprise and those serviced by it pay a fee for pick up. As such, their refuse no longer qualifies as residential garbage because they are paying for a professional service to dispose of it. You have not provided me with a copy of your policy and procedures with respect to waste disposal at the transfer stations nor have you provided me with a copy of Garbage Girls permit/license. You have not addressed the Conflict of Interest issue. The RM having a membership in the Chamber of Commerce opens that issue. Her response on July 10th. was: Heather, I have responded to your questions and will have to disagree with your opinion of commercial waste and conflict of interest. Permits/licenses are not public documents to be shared. On July 15th. I followed up with: In your reply to me you state: A spreadsheet is kept for Administration to update the records accordingly ensuring we are tracking the garbage to each residence. Larger items are permitted at the transfer station and it would be accompanied with a spreadsheet of where it originated. There is a description column that needs to be filled out. My questions are in light of this: 1) Who is the originator of this spreadsheet? Is the transfer station operator required to fill out the spreadsheet or does Garbage Girls arrive with a spreadsheet documenting their load and its origins? 2) How much extra staff is required to handle this additional work and who is bearing this cost? Are taxpayers at large having to subsidize the additional staff required to accommodate Garbage Girls or is Garbage Girls paying a special levy for the additional work required to document the loads? 3) Would any entrepreneur deciding to start up a similar business in their area of Springfield be afforded this same consideration? 4) This business is being run by a former Councillor who is a personal friend of the Mayor. It is a business by definition because fees are being charged for a service. If this business is being allowed to deposit residential waste for which they are charging a fee, other enterprises offering the same service should be allowed to deposit the waste of Springfield residences at our transfer stations and that would include Emterra. What is fair for one enterprise should be fair for another. 5) Would not all this documentation (spreadsheet completion and checking) cause delays at the transfer stations? Why should residents taking their own waste to the transfer station be required to wait while these loads are verified? 6) The purpose of distributing the bar code cards was to ensure that only Springfield waste is being deposited at our transfer stations. I was of the*

understanding that people using them were required to have a card unless under an exceptional circumstance where they have misplaced it and applied for a duplicate. However it has been observed that some merely call out a bar code number without having the card scanned? How can you then ensure that garbage is from a Springfield resident and not just someone from outside Springfield who is using a friend's bar code #? As I am typing this, it is July 23rd. and I have yet to receive a reply. Further as this was all done via e-mail the public does not have an opportunity to hear what is being asked or the answers being given. **THIS IS NOT OPEN AND TRANSPARENT GOVERNMENT.** These are perfectly fair and valid questions from a concerned taxpayer and the business was featured in an article in the Clipper so nothing personal is being asked either about the business owner or the users of the service. It is a valuable service but it should be on a level playing field with others that provide a similar service such as Emterra. If they must take their waste to the City of Winnipeg, I feel that any business providing the same service should have to abide by the same rules. **Janet Nylen** - I have two more. January, February and March statements show on your statement the budgeted amount. You didn't pass your budget until May so that's kind of negating your statements and typically what's been done previously is there was no amount in those budgeted columns and now there is so I just, I don't know why there's a change in that but I think it's misleading on your statements for those months. Um and I guess the other is the cash on deposit is about \$26 million dollars and there's another \$15 million dollars or more in your reserves and I thought, that's an awful lot of money and I wondered how it's being managed for um potential revenue interest rates and revenue. In the 3 months of this year, the first few months of the year that amount of money which is \$41 million dollars being \$54,000 and I guess I am wondering what Council is going to do to make better uh arrangements for um getting interest like if it's sitting in a chequing account, that's bad, right, like that much money if you're putting it in term deposits, I know interest rates are low but they're not that low. That worked out to um at 2% over a year you should be getting \$820,000. Now I know some of that money is going to be spent and going down but that gives you a picture that 3 months is \$54,000. That's only going to be \$200,000. over the year instead of \$800,000. at 2%. **Mayor Fell** - Jody, did you want to address that? **Jody Thiessen** - Ya, uh, annually or monthly we do have a higher interest savings account that the money is reviewed as to what cash flows we do need for the operations of the municipality so every um I want to say every month to 4 to 6 weeks we review the cash flows needed and we transfer this money into a high..the funds aren't required, we transfer it to a high interest savings account. Uh we review short term deposits, long term deposits and often our interest rate is uh uh is higher uh than some of the uh I guess short term trust funds or short term financing options that we can make arrangements with. Uh the nice thing with the current Sunovo account we do have we can access that cash at any time. Mostly higher interest dealings where they are higher than 1.55% we have to lock it in for a minimum of 90 days or 91 days, then access the cash so the concern is uh in that 90 day window an event may occur where we might need a higher cash flow um and the concern is if we lock it in without the access to it, are we putting ourselves in risk at uh a short term cash flow shortage so. But we do look and uh often with Sunovo we use their higher interest savings accounts and we're at a special rate and it is quite often it is higher than what the financial institutions are offering us right now. **Mayor Fell** - Thank you, Jody. Do you have any other questions? **Janet Nylen** - And you're satisfied with \$54,000. on \$41 million dollars over 3 months? **Mayor Fell** - Um I don't think we're in a position of as a Council to say we're satisfied but we will talk about it at another time with our Finance Manager to look at other options. **Janet Nylen** - Thank you and I also would add to the comments made is that \$25 million dollars if you have an emergency for that amount of money, then that is very significant. I can see you putting in a portion of that money, keeping some of it available but your reserves and some, I think there's a better way of trying to make that money work for the municipality. Um my last one is actually more following up to the dedication and I just don't know anything about that but I did wonder, I don't know who you're dedicating it to or what that is but another potential consideration might be to subdivide it from the larger parcel and have it on a separate thing and then have a cash value to match grants that might come in cause you can use that as equity to what your matching grant costs. Just an idea. **Mayor Fell** - Is there any other questions from the gallery?

Darryl Speer - I want to just follow up on Janet Nylen's comment. The question is, **how many staff do you actually have currently involved in preparing the financial statements?** **Mayor Fell** - So unless you have a question specifically about the 3 Financial Statements, um any other questions you can e-mail to our CAO or to our HR manager and she will answer you, Darryl. **Darryl Speer** - You can't answer that question? **Mayor Fell** - I can but again, question period is regarding specific agenda items related to the topics on the agenda so if you do have any questions about the Financial Statements, ... **Darryl Speer** - The question was related to the Financial Statements, I think that's pertinent, and what was advised was the lack of staff that she mentioned. **Mayor Fell** - Yep, I think Jody answered that question already. **Darryl Speer** - No she didn't. She didn't say how many staff you have actually involved in preparing budget. **Mayor Fell** - That's fine. If you have that question, e-mail it in, thank you. **Darryl Speer** - Ok. I want to go to 9.14 List of Accounts. It shows Chabot Sand and Gravel receiving \$40,288. for traffic gravel. Why is that? **Mayor Fell** - Blaine, would you mind answering that? **Blaine Moffat** - It was for purchase of traffic gravel for our road program. **Darryl Speer** - I understand we were told a year ago that Chabot's contract for supplying traffic gravel was at an end. Is that not the case. That was from yourself. **Blaine Moffat** - Uh so their last year under the contract was this year, 2020. **Darryl Speer** - The reason I suppose for asking that was because in the July statement in 2019, Glacial was given \$69,833. for traffic gravel. The explanation was that Chabot's contract was finished. Is that not the case, yes or no? **Mayor Fell** - So, I think he answered your question, Darryl. The contract is up for this year and that was, is that the last payment for this year? **Darryl Speer** - Ok, according to your statements, you are involved in legal action with this company for gravel misappropriated so why are we still doing business with this company? **Mayor Fell** - So again the legal action with Chabot, our statement has been made and the statement is the statement. We're not going into any further detail, we're not allowed to do that. Do you have any other questions regarding the List of Accounts? **Darryl Speer** - I think it's inappropriate that we do business with this company. **Mayor Fell** - I understand that, Darryl. Thank you. Do you have any other....(Darryl Speer attempts to continue)...**mute the mike, Erika.** Thank you. Is there any other questions from the gallery? I will then close the Question Period.

DELEGATION - A Conley Kehler of Valley Fiber Internet Services gave a presentation on their product that can be seen in agenda package of this meeting on the RM web site.

9.12 The Financial Statements were approved **without any discussion of the points or suggestions made by Jan Nylen** in Question Period.

9.13 June Payroll in the amount of \$397,451.94 was approved.

MEETING ADJOURNED