



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Fourth Session
Forty-Seventh General Assembly

**Proceedings of the Standing Committee on
Resources**

May 11, 2015 - Issue 2

Department of Environment and Conservation
Office of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Assembly
Honourable Wade Verge, MHA

RESOURCE COMMITTEE

Department of Environment and Conservation

Chair: Eli Cross, MHA

Members:

Ray Hunter, MHA
Nick McGrath, MHA
Lorraine Michael, MHA
Christopher Mitchelmore, MHA
Tracey Perry, MHA
Sam Slade, MHA

Clerk of the Committee: Sandra Barnes

Appearing:

Department of Environment and Conservation

Hon. Dan Crummell, MHA, Minister
Jamie Chippett, Deputy Minister
Jennifer Collingwood, Director, Communications
Ross Firth, ADM, Natural Heritage
Martin Goebel, ADM, Environment
Colleen Johnson, Manager of Finance, Budgeting and General Operations

Office of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency

Jackie Janes, Assistant Deputy Minister

Also Present

Eddie Joyce, MHA
George Murphy, MHA
Kevin Pollard, MHA
Peter Miles, Official Opposition Office
Ian Murphy, Official Opposition Office
Ivan Morgan, Researcher, NDP Office

Pursuant to Standing Order 68, Eddie Joyce, MHA for Bay of Islands, substitutes for Christopher Mitchelmore, MHA for The Straits – White Bay North.

Pursuant to Standing Order 68, Kevin Pollard, MHA for Baie Verte – Springdale, substitutes for Tracey Perry, MHA for Fortune Bay – Cape La Hune.

Pursuant to Standing Order 68, George Murphy, MHA for St. John's East, substitutes for Lorraine Michael, MHA for Signal Hill – Quidi Vidi.

The Committee met at 6:05 p.m. in the Assembly Chamber.

CHAIR (Cross): If everybody is ready, then I guess we will get started.

The first item of business, we need to have a mover and a seconder for the minutes from this morning's session.

MR. JOYCE: So moved.

CHAIR: Moved by Mr. Joyce, seconded by Mr. McGrath that the minutes of this morning's session be adopted.

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: I am not sure if we had to vote, but we cannot go wrong if we do.

On motion, minutes adopted as circulated.

CHAIR: We are together this evening for Estimates – we are going to start first with the Estimates for the Office of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency, which is under Executive Council on page 2.6. This is where we are going to go start and I will do the other couple of little chores before we start now.

We will ask the members to introduce themselves, and then I will turn it over for the minister to make opening comments or introductions.

We will start with Mr. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: Eddie Joyce, Bay of Islands.

MR. MILES: Peter Miles, Opposition Office.

MR. MURPHY: Ian Murphy, Opposition Office.

MR. MURPHY: George Murphy, MHA for St. John's East.

MR. MCGRATH: Nick McGrath, MHA for Lab. West.

MR. HUNTER: Ray Hunter, MHA for Grand Falls-Windsor – Green Bay South.

MR. POLLARD: Kevin Pollard, MHA for Baie Verte – Springdale.

CHAIR: Minister, if you will introduce your staff.

MR. CRUMMELL: Minister Dan Crummell, Responsible for the Office of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency.

MS JANES: Jackie Janes, Assistant Deputy Minister in the Office of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency.

CHAIR: This will not be quite as complicated as a little later on, but what we usually do is remind members who are here with the minister two things I guess. We remind everyone who are asking questions that all questions are directed to the minister and then if he chooses, he can deflect them to members of his entourage, his department; and then subsequent questions, if it is about the same item, can go to that person but, generally, it will come back, at the minister's request, to him at any time.

We are governed by Standing Order 65 to 77, in case you brought your book and want to make sure we all in order. Basically, we offer the minister an opportunity to open with a couple of comments. The way we worked this morning, which worked sort of relatively well, is we alternate ten minutes – fifteen for the first time for the member for the Official Opposition, and then ten minutes each after. If we ran out of a section – we ask everybody to start in the front sections of the Estimates and we move through so after we complete each part, then we will call

the line item and eventually get to the end as opposed to just having open free-for-all, all the way through. That worked rather well this morning and got us through in an orderly fashion, so we will keep it moving that way this evening.

MR. JOYCE: I missed that, so I cannot ask probing questions starting out?

CHAIR: Can you –

MR. JOYCE: Ask probing questions. I do not have to go through line items if there are probing questions.

CHAIR: You can ask probing questions if it is in any of the particular categories.

MR. JOYCE: They are in all of the categories.

CHAIR: Okay.

If the minister does not mind jumping from place to place, then we will just call the line items at the end. We will see how it goes and if it is only a couple –

MR. JOYCE: I can assure you, Mr. Chair, I am not going to be lying down and just going from line for line and say that is it.

CHAIR: No, no, that is not what I meant.

MR. JOYCE: Okay, Sir.

CHAIR: What I meant is we just had the different categories and what happened this morning, I called all of section 2 and we moved through all of that and then went to section 3, so there might have been five or six categories in each one.

MR. JOYCE: I am not doing that.

CHAIR: That is okay; whatever is comfortable, we are willing to be flexible.

Minister, you can start, page 2.6 on Office of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency.

MR. CRUMMELL: Okay, I will just say a couple of words at the beginning. Good

evening, everybody and thank you for coming here.

First of all, I would like to thank Jackie for being here and her staff, a wonderful group of people who are doing some very good work. There are eight people, I believe, within your branch and department. It is a very economical and efficient office, hence the name, but good work done by all. It is important work.

There are a lot of things that are happening in this world today, in terms of a global sense, and climate change is one of the greatest challenges that are facing our Province today. It is truly a cross-country, horizontal issue with implications for all people and all communities, all sectors of our economy, right across this country and certainly right across the world.

Climate change certainly brings both risks and opportunities. It will impact sectors of the economy in all parts of our society. More extreme weather will impact our infrastructure in communities. We all know that too well from hurricane Igor. The changes in rainfall and temperature will affect our resource-based sectors such as forestry, agriculture, fisheries, and tourism livelihoods of people who depend on them. We have actual statistics that are showing increases over the last twenty years of rainfall and temperature as well in this Province that are measurable. It is interesting to know that.

Businesses will need to evolve to compete in a lower carbon global economy. Supply chains are impacted. Consumer preferences change and warm weather will more likely bring more pests and diseases to our Province like Lyme disease and a potential impact to human health.

So to be effective, our role as government is we need to minimize risks and cease the opportunities. We must balance economic environmental considerations to ensure our Province's approach is both environmentally sustainable and economically prudent.

One important aspect of advancing energy efficiency, which can deliver multiple benefits, includes lower household fuel bills and improving business competitiveness. So there is a whole wide range of impacts and opportunities

that we see as people in this Province. It is important that we have an office that helps us, as a government, as a people, to try to deal with that moving forward.

This is what our department does. I am not going to get into a prolonged preamble. I will put it to the floor now, Mr. Chair, to take some questions on the Estimates.

CHAIR: Mr. Joyce, are you ready for the first –

MR. JOYCE: I am just going to ask some probing questions first, Mr. Chair, and it is all throughout because it is all contained in the budget.

Current greenhouse gas emissions in the Province, how does Newfoundland compare to other provinces on the greenhouse gas emissions per capita?

MR. CRUMMELL: We are certainly doing our fair share. What we have seen in the last year, and the federal government statistics have shown, we are actually down in greenhouse gas emissions versus the previous year – I am correct in that one, Jackie – and by a significant amount. Now, we did have the offshore that was down for a little while in terms of production, but we have also seen other changes to how our industries have performed in the last year: the mining industries in particular, the forestry industry.

So greenhouse gas emissions actually have gone down in the last little while. How we compare to other provinces – in terms of per capita we are little higher than the Canadian average, but for a small population and a handful of large industries, I think is where we have to be right now and should be. We have seen progress.

MR. JOYCE: Do you have an energy efficiency or conservation target set for Newfoundland?

MR. CRUMMELL: Excuse me?

MR. JOYCE: Any targets set for energy efficiency or conservation for the next number of years for Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, again, we have targets set for the Province. We have targets set for 2020. We had targets set for 2010, correct?

MS JANES: Yes, the target for energy efficiency is for 2020, but for greenhouse gases it is 2020 and 2050.

MR. CRUMMELL: Right, exactly. Targets have been set and our goal is to meet those targets.

MR. JOYCE: Are the targets public?

MR. CRUMMELL: That information is public, absolutely.

MR. JOYCE: How about the targets that you set prior to and if you met those targets, are they public also?

MR. CRUMMELL: Go ahead.

MS JANES: Yes, there was a target to reduce greenhouse gases, to stabilize greenhouse gases at 1990 levels by 2010. The Province came within 0.4 per cent of meeting that target, which was pretty spectacular given that the 1990 base year figure did not include offshore oil because of course there was no offshore oil industry there. So it came very close but it has a target now for 2020, which is the next one.

MR. JOYCE: Are there any plans to set up an energy conservation Crown corporation?

MR. CRUMMELL: Crown corporation – no plans right now.

MR. JOYCE: Any new environmental initiatives in the budget for this year?

MR. CRUMMELL: We are speaking to Estimates here, and I know there are some questions that you have on policy and we did our little preamble and I expect you to have your preamble there as well. Our plan is to continue on, the plan that we have had for the last little while, and Jackie you might be able to expound on that. Certainly large industry is a priority for us in terms of consulting with them to make sure they understand the implications of our greenhouse gas targets and what needs to be

done, and what their roles and responsibilities will be in helping us meet those targets.

That has been a priority for us as well, the greening of government, making sure government is fully aware of what our targets are, where we need to be, and we are working with different government departments and entities to make sure we get to that good place; also, our communication with the public and trying to create awareness about the impacts of climate change and how energy efficiency can help that.

There are a number of initiatives out there that we will continue to do and there are timelines set around some of them. I encourage you to ask questions on the actual expenditures.

MR. JOYCE: This is an expenditure – are there any expenditures in this year’s budget for any new environmental initiatives?

MR. CRUMMELL: I would not say there is anything new.

Jackie, would you say right now – again, there is a plan set that we are following right now. Go ahead.

MS JANES: It is not new, but it is the second year of a two-year home energy conservation pilot project. The first year was last year, and the second year is this year. There is also the tail end of a pilot project in schools. It runs for the academic year, so there is a little bit of money for that. It does not, though, appear in the office’s budget; it (inaudible) in the Department of Education’s but the office is a partner on that initiative.

MR. JOYCE: Can you tell me much funds are in this year for any new environmental initiatives in this year’s budget?

MR. CRUMMELL: If you look at the line items here and we look at Professional Services, that is where the bulk of our money is and that is where the bulk of our money is being spent. In terms of our initiatives that are out there, our core staff is eight people that we have working for us, certainly working on all of these projects and also other things as well.

In terms of the programs that Jackie referenced, that is where a lot of (inaudible).

MR. JOYCE: Can you tell us how these funds are going to be in 2.2.04.01, Salaries, in Professional Services – can you give us a breakdown of that over \$300,000 being spent?

MR. CRUMMELL: For instance, we do have Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro who we are doing a pilot project with right now. It is the first year of a two-year project to determine how homeowners in the Province would change their electricity consumption behaviour. It is about providing real-time information with home consumers to help guide their use of electricity. That project estimate that we have in this budget this year is \$200,000. The \$200,000 was allocated for the first year of the project. The final invoice came in at just a few dollars over than expected.

That is just one example of what we say Professional Services. In Newfoundland Hydro we did engage with that and used them as a resource. Caneta Research, National Energy Code for Buildings in 2011 Newfoundland and Labrador, there was \$83,000 that was spent last year and \$80,000 to be spent this year. Again, the initiative to compare our current construction practices in the Province of 2011 National Energy Code for Buildings. We have Conestoga-Rovers & Associates updating the industry duration frequency curves. I spoke of that in the House the other day.

We also have some Multi-Material Stewardship Board. That last one was for \$38,000 for 2014-2015. The Multi-Material Stewardship Board, we engaged in a waste audit of West Block of the Confederation, the Petten Building, and a few other government entities that we looked at just to get a sense of where we are in terms of a greening government. So we hired them on contract to provide us that information.

The Government of BC, a small one for \$625, common provincial-territorial reporting guidelines – we accessed them for some information and that is what is cost us.

It is pretty much straightforward, I think, Jackie.

MR. JOYCE: This \$200,000 for hydro. Can you explain – isn't that a Crown corporation? You are paying them to do some work for your department.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, the project that we wanted to do, which we see great value in – there is only one hydro company in the Province, that is who they are. It is Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. So we wanted to do this pilot project to see how homeowners would react to having real-time information in their homes in terms of their energy consumption, to see what changes would happen over the – I think it is a two-year program, Jackie? It is a two-year program. What changes in behavior would happen if they just had information about what they could do to save electricity and also changes in habits if they had both provided to them – that is correct, exactly, yes.

It is a pilot project over two years. We advertised that at length over the last number of months. We have how many people?

MS JANES: We have 750 participating households.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, 750 households are participating in this study.

MR. JOYCE: You mentioned there is an awareness program for schools. How much money is in this year's budget for it?

MS JANES: It is \$60,000.

MR. CRUMMELL: What is that?

MS JANES: It is \$60,000.

MR. CRUMMELL: It is \$60,000.

MR. JOYCE: How much was in last year's budget?

MR. CRUMMELL: Excuse me?

MR. JOYCE: How much was in last year's budget for the same program because it is a two-year project?

MS JANES: It was \$140,000 but it is in education (inaudible).

MR. CRUMMELL: Right. It was \$140,000 last year. It was an educational program.

MR. JOYCE: It is \$60,000 this year.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, correct.

MR. JOYCE: Last year, there was \$350,000 budgeted for energy efficient retrofits in selected government buildings. What government buildings were retrofitted and was the money spent?

MR. CRUMMELL: That is not money that was in our budget. That was in TW's budget and that would be something that would be better suited to ask them exactly how that was done. We do monitor what happens there, but certainly that is a line item in their Estimates.

MR. JOYCE: So it was not in yours?

MR. CRUMMELL: No.

MR. JOYCE: Okay.

What is the cost of the two-year pilot project for real-time efficiency display monitors in homes?

MR. CRUMMELL: That is the project that we were just referring to with Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. The total again over two years is \$350,000.

MR. JOYCE: Okay.

How many years did you say? Three years?

MR. CRUMMELL: Total of \$350,000 over two years.

MR. JOYCE: The climate change advisory board, is that up and running now, or is there any money put in the budget to get it up and running?

MR. CRUMMELL: Are you talking about the ministerial advisory committee?

MR. JOYCE: The advisory committee, board –

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, that is active. There has been correspondence. We have meetings and talk about things in Cabinet, but absolutely.

MR. JOYCE: Is there money in the budget for that?

MR. CRUMMELL: No, there is no allocation.

MR. JOYCE: No allocation whatsoever there.

Government is going to create a culture of conservation, an announcement in 2007 Energy Plan. Is there any follow-up on that through energy efficiency; is there any follow-up if anything was involved – is there any money in the budget this year to do any consultations or see if there was any follow-up, if there was actually work in the Energy Plan?

MR. CRUMMELL: Our initiatives to change the culture have been around Turn Back the Tide, which is an online tool that people can go in, look and see what is happening, what needs to be done and how they can save money. Jackie, the HotShots is ours as well.

MS JANES: Yes, I think the minister identified some of the key activities; one is the Turn Back the Tide public awareness campaign, which was designed to raise awareness about climate change and energy efficiency but also gives people information on what action they could take. At the heart of that, there is a website that is designed to give practical, user-friendly information and advice to people who do want to take action.

In addition to that, there are the initiatives that we have already referred to. There are the initiatives that the office has undertaken in partnership with the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development where we develop new resources for school children and for teachers on energy conservation, and curriculum resources as well. So we picked a couple of courses, one for Grade 6 and one for Grade 9, science courses, and looked at how we can provide materials to teachers that would align with the curriculum, but enable them to teach the students about energy efficiency more effectively.

That initiative also involved sending resource packs to all public schools in the Province and doubling the amount of presentations on energy conservation that the utilities were providing under takeCHARGE! They had capacity constraints so they could only do around 150 a year. We contracted the Conservation Corps so we doubled that number. In fact we have done, in addition to that, there is another 170. We have also done some contests for different grades at school to encourage them to engage in efficiency.

Then the other big initiative is the pilot program that the minister mentioned. It is designed, as he said, to try and identify whether the provision of a real-time energy monitor in a home will lead a household to change their behaviour and conserve more energy. There are three groups of 250. The first group just gets the monitor and that is it. The second group gets the monitor and they get regular communications about efficiency, the importance of it, and how to use their device. The third group just gets the information, but does not get a monitor. The idea is at the end of the pilot project to see what was the best way of trying to generate behavioural change, and to see if that change will endure over the year in order to promote a culture of conservation.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you.

Is there any money in the budget for any energy-efficient vehicles?

MR. CRUMMELL: We consult government. We advise government. It is particularly TW that looks after the fleet and does the purchasing for the fleet.

There is a commitment in the Blue Book to investigate the use of electric vehicles. We have been working with them for a few months now to determine what would the right fit be and how would it work. There are stumbling blocks we ran into if we wanted to get a few vehicles on a pilot basis. The City of St. John's looked into that as well recently.

The stumbling block there basically has been the providers, the maintenance, and the local suppliers, being able to supply new vehicles and maintain those vehicles. There is one company

now that is set up that does sell used vehicles, that does do some maintenance on these vehicles as well. We are looking into it and it is something that we are –

MR. JOYCE: So is there any money in this year's budget for it?

MR. CRUMMELL: Well, it would not be in our budget. We would consult TW. That is a question that you would have to ask TW. That is not something that would be in our budget.

We do not purchase vehicles or lease vehicles. We are a small shop that advises government departments on how to green.

CHAIR: Okay. I will move on to Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I guess, Mr. Minister, just to start off, you have eight people in your Climate Change office; how many people in your department working right now, altogether?

MR. CRUMMELL: There is six; there is two vacancies right now.

MR. MURPHY: What are the two vacancies?

MR. CRUMMELL: There is a director that has been posted as well and –

MS JANES: It is just about to be.

MR. CRUMMELL: – a Policy and Program Specialist. We have had some changeover in the last little while and that is why there are two vacancies.

MR. MURPHY: How many altogether in Environment and Conservation?

MR. CRUMMELL: In Environment and Conservation?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. CRUMMELL: How many total employees?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. CRUMMELL: I mean, this is an outside entity from Environment and Conservation; this has nothing to do really with Environment and Conservation.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

MR. CRUMMELL: That would be a question you can ask me –

MR. MURPHY: So did you want me to wait for Environment and Conservation before I ask that?

MR. CRUMMELL: Two hundred and odd with our crowd – I would have to look at numbers but it is over 200 (inaudible) something like that.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. Just on Climate Change then, in subhead 2.2.04 you mentioned the Caneta project – do I have the spelling right, \$83,000 contract?

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: What was the nature of that contract?

MR. CRUMMELL: Jackie, maybe you can expound on that a little bit.

MS JANES: Government is committed to examining the case for adopting the national energy codes for buildings that the federal government developed in 2011. At the moment, there are no minimum energy standards for larger commercial buildings in the Province. The challenge is we do not know what the cost and benefits of adopting that code would be, clearly as a small jurisdiction and sometimes with different products and services available here.

That piece of work was to develop some archetypes to assess what the costs and benefits might be for different types of buildings, say, a large office building or a warehouse, buildings of different size and scope, so that we could then have an evidence base with which we could consult external stakeholders on the possibility of adopting that minimum standard.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

Was Caneta the only company that was asked to do this, or was this tendered?

MS JANES: It was tendered.

MR. CRUMMELL: It was tendered.

MR. MURPHY: It was tendered, okay.

I want to ask you a little bit about the greenhouse gas emissions and how you monitor the industrial changes. Maybe you can give me some background on that.

MR. CRUMMELL: I have no problem going there. Again, this is Estimates and we are talking budget numbers, but I have no problem –

MR. MURPHY: You did mention it, yes.

MR. CRUMMELL: No, I hear you.

I mean obviously the federal government plays a lead role in determining greenhouse gas emissions and there is a modeling that they follow. I will let Jackie jump in here now to get it to that technical level. Go ahead.

MS JANES: Yes, under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change they have inventory rules and all parties to that convention have to follow them. The federal government does follow those rules. There is sort of a standard methodology for calculating greenhouse gas emissions.

At the federal level often it is based on sales of fuel and fuel type. So if you have a certain fuel type and you know the carbon intensity of that fuel type, from that you can derive how many greenhouse gas emissions there were.

It is a large industry. In particular, there is a federal requirement that if a company emits more than 50,000 tons of greenhouse gas emissions in a year, it is required to report on an annual basis to the federal government. We have those figures provided to us by the federal government.

At a provincial level, of course, we generate our own projections on a bottom-up basis. We also look at companies that emit less than 50,000 tons so we have a full picture of our emissions.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. I was just wondering, when it comes to the scope of that –the regulations around emissions is what I am getting at. I cannot help but think too that it must be a chore on government to actually set the number because some of these numbers can be affected.

The simple shutdown of an oil field, for example, due to maintenance might end up affecting your overall data at the end of the year, or there might be a downturn in the mining industry. For example, we lost the Cliffs mine and everything.

How would they affect your numbers? Are they factored out in any way? How would you do that?

MR. CRUMMELL: No, absolutely. We can pretty well predict what is happening in industry based on past history. We only have a handful, literally, of big industry in the Province, six or seven.

MS JANES: Well a few more than that.

MR. CRUMMELL: A few more than that, less than fingers and hands basically. So we can look back at their history and see what they have emitted in the past that is measureable, and predict what is going to happen in the future.

Obviously, yes, if there is a downturn in commodities and production goes a little lower, if their production goes down, they do not emit as much. You are exactly right about that

There are models that we follow to plan ahead, to see where we are going to be. This is information that we gather actually, and give it back to the federal government to let them know what is happening in our economy with regard to industry, and big industry in particular. It helps build their numbers when they go to the international conventions. They are going to go there and say here is what Canada is emitting; here is where we want to get to and whatnot.

I do not know, Jackie, you might be able to add to that as well?

MS JANES: I think the minister has covered it. You are right, greenhouse gas emissions do

oscillate with economic activity. If there is growth in the mining industry, obviously that can be an energy-intensive process; any energy-intensive industry.

In this Province, 50 per cent of our greenhouse gas emissions come from the large industrial sector. When you do have something like one of the FPSOs going for scheduled maintenance, obviously in that particular year emissions may fall while that platform is not producing, but they will go up again once it starts producing.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

MR. CRUMMELL: For instance, if I just may add quickly, just like Vale, when they go fully on stream – they are producing there now and actually refining there now but at a very small level, a very small scale. If you look at Holyrood, we know that is going to be pretty much decommissioned in 2020, so we know that there are going to be less emissions coming from Holyrood. We can predict what is going to happen in our years with some of these large industries.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. I am just wondering overall now. For example, when you get the data for this year it is probably going to be on the low end because of oil field shutdowns and the downturn in the mining industry. Minister, I guess the question is when the federal government waves the flag on climate change and greenhouse gas emissions they are going to have a lowball number more or less. I guess that is probably the best way I can do it.

Would you go by the high standard in the busier economic times as that line in the sand we cannot cross? What is done there?

MR. CRUMMELL: I guess the best way to answer that is we represent about 5 per cent of all greenhouse gas emissions in Canada. It is less than 5 per cent. It is 4 per cent and a bit. It is probably not likely to change dramatically in the next while.

Hebron is coming on. Vale is coming on. It might go underground at Voisey's Bay. If the mining ramps up in Labrador of course that is going to change things. In terms of setting our targets and whatnot, in terms of the Canadian

scope, we are only so much – they can apply there.

We do have to challenge. We need to set our targets. We need to find targets that make sense and live with them. We have to be part of the solution, just like any other jurisdiction in the world, no matter how big or small they are, need to be part of that solution.

Yes, it is a difficult question. George, I know what you are saying. How do we get to those numbers? Well, we do it with the best information we have as we go forward. That information changes over time and you understand what is happening.

MR. MURPHY: What is the department looking at, Minister, when it comes to, for example, cap and trade carbon credits?

MR. CRUMMELL: We have looked at everything, but we are getting into policy questions now. We would like to stick really to what we are talking about here now which is Estimates.

We have looked at everything, George. We have actually analyzed what other provinces are doing and there are a mixture of things that are going on out there. We are doing our due diligence on that. We will let the people of the Province have input on that when it is time.

MR. MURPHY: All right. Turn Back the Tide, the PR campaign; how is that working out? Do you have an update on that or is that too much of a policy question?

MR. CRUMMELL: No, not at all. I just want to make sure this moves along. We have Environment – but to make sure. General questions like that is no problem at all.

Basically we know that this program actually has won many awards for us and has been recognized as being leaders in Atlantic Canada and Canada in general. I am correct on that, yes.

We had 140,000 page views since it was launched in 2012. The campaign videos have been online and viewed approximately 1,900 times. The Facebook page has about 2,000; 1,700 followers. We have about 600 or 800

Facebook users per day featuring over twenty-five news articles since its inception. We do know that it is recognized out there and people see it. Commercials on TV certainly create awareness around that and drive people to the site.

We won two Pinnacle Awards in 2014. The Pinnacle Awards showcase is the International Association of Business Communicators Newfoundland and Labrador.

Jackie, is there anything else you would like to add to that?

MS JANES: I would just like to say there has been a full evaluation of the campaign and it is available on the office's website. It was only posted in the last couple of weeks so it is fairly new. That goes through what the targets were for the campaign and the success of the campaign.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

CHAIR: I guess we will move back to Mr. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: You have eight employees. Are they all full-time employees and no temporary employees?

MR. CRUMMELL: Right now we are moving people from contractual to permanent. We are in the final end stages of that process right now. Jackie, you might want to add to that as well.

MS JANES: When the office is originally established, the first rule establishes contractual post. The intention was to make them permanent, but because the office was fairly new there was a desire to try and make some rapid progress. It was quicker to put people on contracts than to establish permanent positions because you have to create the job advertisements and it can take a while to get the post classified. Now that the office has existed for a number of years, it is sort of on an even keel in terms of understanding what its operational needs and requirements are in terms of the skills and expertise that you need to man the office.

In last year's Budget, government approved the making of the posts permanent. Those posts have been going through a classification process. They have only just completed that process.

So the intention is to seek approval to fill those posts on a permanent basis. They are all still contractual, with the exception of one that was made permanent last year, but this year they should change their status.

MR. JOYCE: How many employees do you have, eight?

MS JANES: Eight.

MR. JOYCE: How many are contractual? How many are permanent?

MS JANES: There is only one permanent employee, currently. The other seven are contractual.

MR. JOYCE: How long have they been contractual?

MS JANES: Since the office was established. I cannot say definitively because some posts were added and a few came a bit later, but the office was established in 2009.

MR. JOYCE: So all of these seven positions were contractual?

MS JANES: Yes.

MR. JOYCE: Still working but not gone through the Public Service Commission for hiring.

MS JANES: We did actually do competitions in many cases through the Public Service Commission. Not in all, but in many cases for those posts.

MR. JOYCE: Okay. That is strange. It is strange to be so long without having to go through the Public Service Commission to get people hired full time. When you have people in contractual that long it –

MS JANES: Well, the people in those posts do not have a right to the post. When it is advertised, there will be a full competition.

MR. JOYCE: My question is: Why wasn't it done sooner than letting someone stay there for four or five or six years on a contractual basis? Now, all of a sudden, you have all the experience and you can go apply for a job that only you have been doing for five or six years.

MS JANES: It was considered at an earlier stage but because of budgetary issues, it was decided to defer that decision until a later time.

MR. JOYCE: So will all those positions be made permanent?

MS JANES: All of the position but not the position that I hold. That is just a normal ADM position.

MR. JOYCE: Okay. All the other ones will be.

MS JANES: Yes.

MR. JOYCE: I missed how many – how many are contractual now did you say? I missed it.

MR. CRUMMELL: There are seven contractual and one permanent. All are going to be permanent – the jobs will be permanent. Again, just to reiterate what Jackie said, there will be a competition.

MR. JOYCE: Seven years later.

MR. CRUMMELL: It is what it is. There are people on contract within government in different capacities. This is no different.

It is a relatively new department. It has evolved a certain way. In 2012-2013, when we had tough budget times, I guess the decision was made back then to keep these jobs at a contractual level and not bring them to a permanent status. I am making that assumption based on what I think probably happened.

MS JANES: Not all of the posts have been held by the same people.

MR. CRUMMELL: There have been people moving in and out. Not all the people are still there that has been there for the last seven years. There have been changeovers in those positions and rehires and competitions and all of that.

MR. JOYCE: So did they go through a competition? If they are on a contractual basis, obviously they can go through the Public Service Commission.

MS JANES: Some did, some did not. Some of the competitions we have had recently, in the last year, we have had like three or four posts turnover.

A lot of the people who come into the office come on secondment from other departments for a period of time and then they go back to their entity so you can kind of build capacity elsewhere in the public service on climate change and energy efficiency. It has been a bit of a hodgepodge.

MR. JOYCE: Okay, fine Sir.

CHAIR: Okay.

Mr. Murphy, anything further in section 2.2.04?

MR. MURPHY: No, just one more thing. I made a notation here around climate change. I guess Ms Janes already touched on it a little bit, but I would like the minister to comment.

Whenever you find something that is important enough that it is going to impact the Province, for example, like warming temperatures, obviously there would be a risk, I do not know, of mosquitos bearing West Nile virus for example. How do you communicate that message to other departments, for example, so that it does not impact their budgets or that something is going to impact their budgets? Is something set up through the office to warn various departments of impacts to their own budgets?

MR. CRUMMELL: Go ahead, Jackie, (inaudible).

MS JANES: Yes, I mean that is part of the office's role, is to try and understand how climate change is going to impact the Province, and to engage with the other departments to integrate those issues into their day-to-day work, be it policies, procedures, legislations, or programs.

We try and build their capacity in understanding so they can integrate that into their planning and decision making going forward.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. Those are all the questions that I have.

CHAIR: Okay.

CLERK (Ms Barnes): Subhead 2.2.04.

CHAIR: Shall 2.2.04 carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, subhead 2.2.04 carried.

CLERK: The total.

CHAIR: The total.

Shall the total carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, Office of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency, total heads, carried.

CHAIR: We are done with the Office of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency.

Thank you to Jackie. I guess the minister will bring in his second crew – a crew of one? No, there is more.

We will just start off again, fresh. I will do the introductions on this side again so that everybody knows who everybody is. We will start with Mr. Joyce again.

MR. JOYCE: Eddie Joyce, Bay of Islands.

MR. MILES: Peter Miles, Opposition Office.

MR. MURPHY: Ian Murphy, Opposition Office.

MR. MURPHY: George Murphy, MHA, St. John's East – no relation.

MR. MORGAN: Ivan Morgan, Researcher.

MR. MCGRATH: Nick McGrath, MHA, Labrador West.

MR. HUNTER: Ray Hunter, MHA, Grand Falls-Windsor – Green Bay South.

MR. POLLARD: Kevin Pollard, MHA, Baie Verte – Springdale district.

CHAIR: Minister, you can introduce your group.

MR. CRUMMELL: Dan Crummell, Minister of Environment and Conservation.

MR. CHIPPETT: Jamie Chippett, Deputy Minister, Environment and Conservation.

MR. FIRTH: Ross Firth, Assistant Deputy Minister, Environment and Conservation.

MR. GOEBEL: Martin Goebel, Assistant Deputy Minister, Environment.

MS JOHNSON: Colleen Johnson, Manager of Finance, Budgeting and General Operations, Environment and Conservation.

MS COLLINGWOOD: Jennifer Collingwood, Communications Director, Environment and Conservation.

CHAIR: We will go the same route. If the minister has an opening comment, we will entertain that now before we go to –

MR. CRUMMELL: I would just like to say that I have been here for a few months now with Environment and Conservation. Again, it is a wonderful department. They do great work protecting not only the environment here in this Province, but certainly protecting the people of the Province from any health and other risks associated with development and whatnot, when

it comes to developments that are happening on our Province.

There is quite a bit of information here so I think we are just going to get right to it. I thank my staff for preparing for today.

CLERK: Subhead 1.1.01.

CHAIR: Shall 1.1.01 carry?

Mr. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: I am going to start with a few program questions, generals all throughout the budget. I heard the minister say it earlier; how many employees are in the department?

MR. CRUMMELL: The number is a little over 300. I think it is 304.

MR. JOYCE: How many are temporary?

MR. CRUMMELL: Temporary employees are fifty-one.

MR. JOYCE: Fifty-one?

MR. CRUMMELL: Fifty-one.

MR. JOYCE: How long have they been temporary?

MR. CRUMMELL: I would assume at different times and different places.

MR. JOYCE: Can we get a list of all the temporary – I do not know if you give the employees, their names, or the positions they held. Can we get a copy of that?

MR. CHIPPETT: From a position perspective – just to clarify where the majority of those are – you will see throughout our Estimates there are a series of federal-provincial agreements, for example, or co-operative wildlife projects and so on. The staffing depends on having those agreements in place. A large number of those fifty-one would be based on those types of activities.

MR. JOYCE: Can we get a copy of the positions?

CHAIR: One interjection. When someone is identified – from the minister – can you just state your name? It helps the Broadcast Centre. They got you quickly that time, Mr. Chippett, but if there is somebody from the back or further down they might not have gathered as quickly.

MR. CRUMMELL: Permanent, we have 136; temporary, fifty-one; seasonal, 114, of course we have the parks and other ecological reserves; and contract, we have three.

MR. JOYCE: You said there are fifty or forty-something temporary in place. Can I get a list of the temporary employees?

MR. CRUMMELL: I do not see any problem with that.

MR. JOYCE: Okay.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes.

MR. JOYCE: Do we have the same number this year as last year?

MR. CRUMMELL: Our head count is approximately the same. I think it might be down a little bit because of some of the things that the deputy minister had mentioned. Some programs are no longer in effect right now or agreements in effect. So we are pretty much in the same space I believe.

MR. CHIPPETT: In terms of the numbers in the Salary Details, there is a big difference that shows up there for permanent employees because the Lands Branch moved from our department over to Municipal and Intergovernmental Affairs. That is the biggest difference. There has been some movement around of positions, but largely we are pretty close to the same headcount.

MR. JOYCE: Okay, but we will get a copy. Perfect.

In 1.2.03, Policy Development and Planning, is there any money in this year's budget to clean up contaminated sites?

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, absolutely. Actually, if you look further into 2.1.01, Pollution Prevention, that is basically where the monies

are captured there. So like Buchans, Hopedale, New Harbour, 2014-2015, and the monies that we are going to be spending next year would all be captured in those budgets.

MR. JOYCE: Can you give us the name of the site?

MR. CRUMMELL: Actually, we just completed Buchans last year. We only had \$54,000 spent last year in 2014-2015. For instance, in Hopedale we have budgeted \$2.6 million. There will be another \$3 million in 2016-2017. In New Harbour there was just \$11,900 spent last year and they are coming to the end again.

MR. JOYCE: Is that the two or three sites going to be done this year?

MR. CRUMMELL: Excuse me?

MR. JOYCE: Is that the three sites that are going to be done this year?

MR. CRUMMELL: There is more work being done across the Province, but those are the biggest ones that are out there right now.

MR. JOYCE: Can you show us where in the budget and what projects it is going to be used for under this heading 2.1.01, as you just mentioned?

MR. CRUMMELL: Again the question? Sorry.

MR. JOYCE: You mentioned there are other projects.

MR. CRUMMELL: Basically, we have 182 potentially impacted sites in the Province. There is not dedicated work going on in every one of these sites, but certainly we are doing an audit to incorporate that into impacted sites like the building assessment program. That will be made public in the coming weeks. So there is work being done around that, but these –

MR. JOYCE: My question again: Is there any money going to be spent on those 180 sites? If there is, can you show me where in the budget. You just named three sites with this amount of

money. Are all the monies going to be used for these three sites?

MR. CRUMMELL: The money that you see in 2.1.01 incorporates everything that we do within that department, including the money that was spent on remediating sites, as well as our costs.

MR. JOYCE: Okay. Once again – and I know it is a budgetary issue – can you give me a list of what sites are going to be done because it is easy to just say we will put the money in the line item. I am asking for a breakdown of that line item.

MR. CRUMMELL: Sure.

MR. CHIPPETT: In terms of specifics, just to make the clarification, there is remediation and actual clean up, and then there are assessments to see what would need to be cleaned up.

MR. JOYCE: I understand that, yes.

MR. CHIPPETT: In Professional Services and Purchased Services in 2.1.01, the majority of funding there for this year is for Hopedale. I think that is about \$1.5 million in Purchased Services and about \$200,000 in Professional Services. That is cleanup at Hopedale. That is the biggest priority for this year. Then on top of that there is \$50,000 in Professional Services to do site assessments to be determined.

Basically if there is a change at a site that we already know is impacted or if there is a new site, that \$50,000 would allow us to do environmental site assessments to determine what degree of liability –

MR. JOYCE: Is there any site assessment done for the Abitibi mill? Are any of these funds going to be used for the former Abitibi mill in Grand Falls?

MR. CRUMMELL: The lead on that is Transportation and Works. We certainly consult and work with Transportation and Works to help them with their RFP proposals, and provide scientific knowledge and expertise around that, but that would be TW that would be carrying that line item.

MR. JOYCE: Okay. Was there any money in the budget last year, or was there any carry-over from this year to do an environmental assessment? The Department of Environment does the environmental assessment. Transportation and Works may be the lead in bringing up proposals – but for the environmental assessment. It was said in this House that the environmental assessment will be carried out by the Department of Environment and Crown Lands.

MR. CRUMMELL: We do assessments of impacted sites. We do the work around that to determine what we think costs would be. With regard to Abitibi, again, it is TW that owns that building. That is something they would do the work on, either contract that out – we just provide advice.

MR. JOYCE: In Come By Chance there was supposed to be an assessment done. Is there any money in this budget or this line item for that?

MR. CRUMMELL: They are independently owned companies and they own the property there. We would work with the companies to help them and guide them through our Pollution Prevention Division, but no, that is something that the companies would be responsible for.

MR. JOYCE: I just want to show where it is at. Part of the transfer was the government committed to do an environmental assessment so –

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, and that is the commitment – in the terms of Come By Chance, part of the purchase agreement, the proponent, the developer, is the one that had to take on that responsibility to do that work, not us.

MR. JOYCE: Do have any – and I am sure the department does. I am sure there is money in it somewhere, in the line item. What is the cost of the liability? Again, this is stuff that is said in the House of Assembly and in the media. So there are no funds last year or this year for the Come By Chance environmental assessment, or do you have a liability, did you do any work –

MR. CRUMMELL: Again, the work that we are doing right now on an Impacted Sites Liability Assessment Program will capture all

the impacted sites in the Province. With regard to Come By Chance, that work is ongoing and it is being done by the owner of the Come By Chance refinery, but there is nothing captured here in this. That is not where that would be. The monies here, besides the impacted sites that we talked about that are being remediated, it is salary items and cost items for our employees to be out in the field to do the work and working with companies to provide advice on how they go about their business.

MR. JOYCE: I hate to disagree with you, but Purchased Services is not employees. Purchased Services is going out –

MR. CRUMMELL: What number is that?

MR. JOYCE: Purchased Services, line item 2.1.01, Purchased Services, when you purchase services that is not your employees, that is you go out and complete stuff, so obviously (inaudible) –

MR. CRUMMELL: It is good for you to note, but again that is where the Hopedale contaminated site work is captured; the monies there are captured in that line item. So of that \$1.6 million, \$1.3 million is with Hopedale.

MR. JOYCE: So I can say with certainty that there is no money in this year's budget, in either line that I asked the minister to show me, for Abitibi or to Come by Chance.

MR. CRUMMELL: Again when you look at Abitibi, TW is the department that you should be asking that question. That is not something that is for our department. It will be captured under the Impacted Sites Liability Assessment, and that project is still ongoing. It is coming to a conclusion. We will have that ready for the Controller General and the Auditor General in short order in the next few weeks, and that will become public after they receive that information.

With regard to Come By Chance, again the owners of that facility are required by the purchase terms to do that work, and again we are providing advice to them.

MR. JOYCE: Okay.

I only have another few minutes left before I move on. Do you have an inventory of environmental liabilities in the Province? Is it expressed anywhere in the budget where there was work done on it for a list of liabilities?

MR. CRUMMELL: Again, what you will see here in these line items are actual costs that we are incurring to do some remediation on some of the impacted sites in the Province. The assessment program, which we have just basically concluded and are now putting the final touch on, is what is going to capture exactly what you are talking about there.

MR. JOYCE: Can we get a full list of all environmental liabilities in the Province?

MR. CRUMMELL: That work is being done right now and we will be providing a list to the Comptroller General and the Auditor General in the near future.

MR. JOYCE: You do not have a list now that you can –

MR. CRUMMELL: That work is still not finalized. That is something that we will take to them first before we make that public.

MR. JOYCE: Is there any line item there that you would need for emergencies like oil spill capacity in Newfoundland? Is there any line item in here for that, for oil spill capacity?

MR. CRUMMELL: When you talk about oil spills, whether it is on land or even on sea, it is the requirement of the polluter to have that captured and do that work.

On land, we certainly come in and do the assessment, provide advice to whomever did the polluting, as to what needs to be done to remediate that site or to transfer it to a landfill, any of the contaminated materials. We would work with the contractor usually who would get the contract to clean up any spill that would occur.

Offshore, it is a federal government responsibility. It is not our responsibility, but we do that within the scope of work that we have captured in our line items in our Pollution Prevention budget.

MR. JOYCE: Okay.

Subhead 2.3.01, Environmental Assessment: Environmental assessment timelines, are there any consequences if the department misses an environmental assessment timeline or is there some way to put some predictability into environmental assessments to be done?

MR. CRUMMELL: Again, the only thing I will say to that is the vast majority of environmental assessments are down within the forty-five day period. When there are extensions made, it is the proponent that would normally, nine chances out of ten, ask for that extension. It would not be us looking for that extension. Usually, if it is reasonable, we would grant extensions to that.

There are times we need to gather more information internally. It may go on for a little while longer. Again, that is more of a policy question in terms of what goes on there. In terms of time frames, we run a very efficient shop.

MR. JOYCE: Subhead 3.1.01, Parks and Natural Areas.

MR. CRUMMELL: Go ahead.

MR. JOYCE: The fee increases, what is the projected income by fee increases?

MR. CRUMMELL: It is \$150,000.

MR. JOYCE: Was there any consultation before the fee increases went in, or it was just a decision made by the department?

MR. CRUMMELL: We did pre-Budget consultations, just like we do everywhere during Budget periods. We talked to the people of the Province; we asked them what they would like to see, knowing there is a revenue shortfall: fee increases, taxation, cutting costs. So people of the Province were aware that we were looking at these things.

In terms of the campers and the individuals themselves that I have been in contact with, that have contacted my office, the vast majority are pleased with a number of initiatives that we have incurred this year including the new information

systems that we have in place, the reservation systems. They are very pleased with that.

The people I am talking to, again, who have contacted my office were understanding that it has been a while since fees have increased, and again they are a very competitive level. The 30 per cent fee increase, the feedback that we are getting is certainly not onerous on the general population.

MR. JOYCE: I will just finish up one – what line item does that show up in, the \$150,000 increase?

MR. CRUMMELL: Excuse me?

MR. JOYCE: Where does that show up?

MR. CRUMMELL: General revenue.

It would show Revenue – Provincial –

OFFICIAL: (Inaudible).

MR. CRUMMELL: Sorry – oh, it is not (inaudible) here. That would go to our general revenue for the Province, so that is not captured here.

MR. JOYCE: Okay.

I am fine.

CHAIR: Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Under 3.1.01, under Professional Services there was \$72,000 spent in 2014-2015 and nothing into this year. Can you tell me what happened here?

MR. CRUMMELL: Actually, that was the funding for the World Heritage site nomination at Mistaken Point. That work was done. It provided for putting that document together and a management plan as well. That was a one-time cost.

MR. MURPHY: Who did the work on that?

MR. CRUMMELL: I know WaterWerks Communications did some work on that as well.

I think there might have been some other small contracts out there, but WaterWerks did –

OFFICIAL: WaterWerks.

MR. CRUMMELL: WaterWerks.

MR. MURPHY: Was that tendered?

MR. CRUMMELL: What is that?

MR. MURPHY: Was that one tendered?

MR. CRUMMELL: Absolutely.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

Under Purchased Services, \$604,100 was budgeted for and you came in on that one; Purchased Services this year is \$601,800. Can I get a breakdown as regards what is happening here in Purchased Services?

MR. CRUMMELL: In Purchased Services – Jamie, maybe you might want to jump in for detail.

MR. CHIPPETT: Last year we got a three-year funding allocation for the Mistaken Point World Heritage bid. That was just a variation in the cash flow based on the estimates for different products for the dossier submission.

Last year, we would have had the bulk of our expenditures in terms of layout of documents, printing of documents and so on. Obviously there is a little bit less for this year, but it is just an ebb and flow in the cash flow for that project.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. Was that done internally by the Environment and Conservation department, or was that tendered out? How was that service done?

MR. CHIPPETT: Normally, Purchased Services are done externally. I am not sure exactly what the individual pieces of work would be under that, but it would have been contractors most likely.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. Were they tendered out?

MR. CHIPPETT: In most cases, unless they are very small dollar figures, there would be an RFP or a tender.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. Thanks for that.

I am going to come back to the first section, 3.1.01. I will come over to 1.2.01 under Executive Support. There is about a \$103,000 difference in Salaries from year to year. I wonder if we can get an explanation on that. The actual budget was \$1,042,000 and \$939,000 was budgeted for this year.

MR. CRUMMELL: So we are looking at 1.2.01?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. CRUMMELL: So you are looking at – okay, yes I have it.

MR. MURPHY: The Salaries line.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, for sure. Basically what we are looking at there in the revised budget for 2014-2015 – there is a difference of \$18,000 there. Is that what you are referring to George? Are you referring to number one?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, Salaries.

MR. CRUMMELL: Okay. That decrease actually reflects the re-profiling of funds through Parks and Natural Areas for two interpreters at Mistaken Point. So, we have removed money from here, and re-profiled it over to Parks and Natural Areas again for Mistaken Point.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. So that is moved over.

Under Transportation and Communications, \$59,100 was budgeted and you only spent \$45,000. You have budgeted \$49,100 this year.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, the decrease reflects that the budget has been reduced to reflect expenditure in the requirement areas. We had a hard look at that, like we are always challenged to do. The difference between last year and this year just reflects less travel required.

MR. MURPHY: Line 02 under Revenue – Provincial is dropped by \$27,000-plus.

MR. CRUMMELL: You are looking at the decrease from \$164,000 to \$136,000 and back to \$169,000. The decrease of \$27,400 reflects reimbursement from the MMSB for the CEO for the final quarter of the fiscal year that was not paid to March 31. His invoice was not completed so it was a timing issue that we had to pay out. Jamie, you might want to –

MR. CHIPPETT: We pay the CEO of the MMSB and then the costs are ‘JV’ed’ back to us. It is normally a \$169,000 expenditure. The invoice being late in the year was not paid back to us in the previous fiscal year, so that is why there is \$136,600.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

MR. CRUMMELL: It is the CEO not the Chair.

MR. MURPHY: I was just going to say, because the Chair, I think, is gone on to Service NL. I was just going to get all over that one.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, I misspoke.

MR. MURPHY: You are off the hook. Thanks.

Heading 1.2.02, Salaries; you have one salary here for \$83,600 under Administrative Support, line 01.

MR. CRUMMELL: Right. We have an increase there to support summer co-op student employment. That money was re-profiled from Sustainable Development due to savings that we found. We think it is important to support summer and co-op students here in the Province. We needed some work to get done and we found the money to do it.

MR. MURPHY: How many students and where are the positions?

MR. CRUMMELL: A good question.

MR. CHIPPETT: It would be eight summer students and four co-op students. The co-op students are actually a new co-op program that MUN biology started, so eight and four out of that funding. In addition, we employ twenty-three students in our parks and seven students in the Salmonier Nature Park.

MR. MURPHY: So about thirty young adults will end up working?

MR. CHIPPETT: Forty-two in total.

MR. MURPHY: Forty-two, okay.

Under Transportation and Communications, as well, \$127,400 was budgeted. You still have the same budget for this year, but you only spent \$115,000 here. What happened here with Transportation and Communications?

MR. CRUMMELL: This last fiscal there was less cost for communications and postage costs. We think that the \$127,400 is more of a real number so we continued on with that going forward.

MR. MURPHY: Are you keeping that because of previous spending historically?

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, I would assume, again, and maybe Jamie – you look back and historically probably have some flows year to year. We did not want to catch ourselves short so we put that number back in for that line item.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. If I can come back to part of a semi-policy question; environmental liabilities are part of the Province's debt. In 2013, in a report of the Auditor General on the financial statements of the Province, the Auditor General noted that, "... current generally accepted accounting principles require that, if a reasonable estimate of environmental remediation costs can be determined, and it is likely that the Province will be liable for these costs, the amount should be recorded as a liability in the Province's financial statements."

What direction has the department been given as regards to including environmental liabilities as a budget line item?

MR. CRUMMELL: We have that program in place now. We are coming to the end of that assessment process. In terms of capturing it into a line item, generally accepted accounting principles – we need to identify what that is. Whether it is going to be a line item within Environment and Conservation or a line item within Finance, I would assume is yet to be

determined. I will let the deputy minister speak to that.

MR. CHIPPETT: As the minister said, we are fully compliant with the new accounting standard for liabilities. There are four or five different steps – and I am not an accountant so I will not go through them – that include things like is a reasonable estimate of remediation costs available? Is the Province responsible for the contamination? Has the Province committed to dealing with the remediation and will economic benefits be given up?

So that is the process that has been gone through for the 182 sites the minister talked about. All of that will be laid out in the Public Accounts when they are completed by the Office of the Comptroller General.

MR. MURPHY: Out of these 182 sites in the Province, Mr. Minister, so far I am wondering if there are any sites in the Stephenville area that have been assessed for risk. I have been asked.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, I mean a number of these sites across the Province Newfoundland and Labrador Housing and Transportation and Works have ownership of as well. So there are some properties in Stephenville that are owned by TW and that have been identified.

MR. MURPHY: That has been identified in Stephenville?

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: I am told there are about fourteen sites over there that have some sort of a risk associated with them having to do with the old base. Would that be factual?

MR. CRUMMELL: Again, I would not be able to give you details on that.

MR. GOEBEL: The assessment would include things like the base if the facility is owned by the Province, but there are still a lot of the bases owned by Transport Canada and they would continue to be responsible for it. They would not show up in our liabilities. There are also Newfoundland and Labrador Housing properties.

MR. MURPHY: I am wondering about some of the sites around Stephenville still. I can appreciate that Newfoundland and Labrador Housing might be dealing with a couple of them or Transportation and Works.

The government in the past, I am told, sometime around the 1990s, I would guess, have done some reports on the potential of some of these sites. The question whether they should be fully remediated or not – I have to note that under the federal government arrangement, and the arrangement with the US government, it is one of the reasons why the Hopedale site, the former radar site, was cleaned up.

I am wondering if there has been any discussion with outside entities from this Province to other outside entities about getting remediation funding put in place for potential cleanup of what has occurred in around the Stephenville area. Do you have those reports available?

MR. GOEBEL: Sorry, offhand I cannot say. I am just not sure if we have reports that you are referring to. I would have to go back to look up those kinds of reports.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

MR. CRUMMELL: If I could make a general statement and again we will go back to the Estimates here. When properties are turned over to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, when properties are turned over to other entities like the Stephenville Airport Authority, a lot of them, when they turn it over, you take responsibility or there is some cash that changes hands, there were some commitments that were made at that time.

In Hopedale, for instance, there was money that did change hands from the Americans. Argentia is another example of that. That is not unusual to have the Town of Stephenville perhaps, or Newfoundland and Labrador Housing that took over some of the barracks that are there and turn them into housing units, to have responsibility for any contamination on that site.

The assessment program that we are doing right now, we will get down to the brass tacks of that one. It should be public in short order.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, so there has not been –

CHAIR: I think now we need to move back to Mr. Joyce.

MR. MURPHY: Oh, sorry.

CHAIR: The time has expired for two or three minutes.

Mr. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: Okay.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just one more question on that. Is Grand Falls-Windsor included in this assessment, 123 assessments that are being done?

MR. CRUMMELL: The 182.

MR. JOYCE: The 182.

MR. CRUMMELL: I mean every part of the Province would be – you are talking about Abitibi in particular are you?

MR. JOYCE: Yes.

MR. CRUMMELL: That is a good question. Again I would assume that is the case and I see some nodding heads here.

MR. JOYCE: Okay, I can ask the assistant deputy minister: Is it one of the sites being –

MR. GOEBEL: Yes, it is. It is one of the sites that are being looked at.

MR. JOYCE: Okay, thank you.

I will go to 1.2.03, the Green Fund. Grants and Subsidies were dropped by about \$850,000. Is this the Green Fund itself?

MR. CRUMMELL: We are talking about 1.2.03?

MR. JOYCE: Subhead 1.2.03.

MR. CRUMMELL: You are talking about number 10, Grants and Subsidies.

MR. JOYCE: Yes.

MR. CRUMMELL: Basically that is ACASA, most of that monies is mostly – and Ecotrust is the other one –

OFFICIAL: Which is green.

MR. CRUMMELL: Which is the Green Fund, exactly. So there are two entities there that we see a change in. ACASA is the Atlantic Climate Adaption Solutions Association. Each Atlantic Province is a member of that association. There has been monies allocated to match federal dollars to do certain projects, and of course there is Ecotrust, which is the Green Fund that you are referring to. There was \$800,000 that is no longer – the Green Fund has come to the end of its lifespan, so that is the difference here.

MR. JOYCE: Okay.

MR. CRUMMELL: Good catch.

MR. JOYCE: In the revised dropped, in federal revenue there is \$70,000 and only \$8,900 was collected.

MR. CRUMMELL: The decrease of \$62,000 reflects that there was less expenditure again under the ACASA program. The way ACASA works is that we will work with the federal government out of the Maritime Provinces, the Atlantic Provinces, to identify green initiatives and if money is not being used, that we had budgeted, we would probably be able to be access them dollars. Well, the money is not transferred to us – it is application driven, a lot of these programs are –

OFFICIAL: The feds did an RFP (inaudible) –

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes. The federal government takes led in that. They do a Request for Proposals for interested businesses, entities, or organizations that want to partake in them dollars. Obviously, that shows the lack of uptake from interested parties.

MR. JOYCE: Okay.

Subhead 1.2.04, Sustainable Development, \$500,000 is being eliminated from the budget.

MR. CRUMMELL: Basically when we are looking at this one here, the bottom line here is that we have actually moved Sustainable Development into Environmental Assessment so that money has been re-profiled from Sustainable Development to EA. You will see it captured a little later on in your Estimates there. In 2.3.01, you will see some adjustments there.

That decrease reflects the reassignment actually of staff to – and some people had left and went to other positions within Environment and Conservation. There are two wildlife positions that staff went to, and there are three positions that went to Environmental Assessment as we created this new division of Environmental Assessment and Sustainable Development.

MR. JOYCE: Okay. Will the money be used for sustainable development or just moved to another part of the department?

MR. CRUMMELL: No, sustainable development is still a priority. Actually the Sustainable Development division works very closely with the Environmental Assessment Division. This is very compatible to work closely with them. There will still be lots of work going on in the –

MR. JOYCE: Do you do environmental assessments, say, sewer, water, or is that Government Services?

MR. CRUMMELL: Environmental assessments, how that occurs is a proponent or a developer who wants to do a project would register their project with us requesting, and we would do an environmental assessment of that. They would do some work. There is a document that they would provide to government.

So it is driven from proponents, not necessarily through us. We do assessments, but the assessments we do on occasion would not be an environmental assessment in a true sense of the word.

MR. JOYCE: How about Crown lands for example, a site with cabins on it? Does Environment do that or Government Services?

MR. CRUMMELL: When you are talking about cabins, Service NL plays a role,

Environment plays a role, Crown Lands are there as well, and sometimes Health has a role to play as well. It depends on what legislation is in there.

We would be there on a consulting basis. We would not be there – there are permits that you do have to go through us to get on occasion. It depends on the project that you are talking about or the cabin situation.

MR. JOYCE: Copper Mine Brook for example.

MR. CRUMMELL: Excuse me?

MR. JOYCE: Copper Mine Brook with (inaudible).

MR. CRUMMELL: The permits are done through Service NL. In terms of –

MR. JOYCE: Assessment.

MR. CRUMMELL: The permitting for us guys.

MR. CHIPPETT: There might be individual permits. I am not sure exactly what they would be.

Just to clarify, from an environmental assessment perspective to the minister's point, the guidance for whether or not a project would be registered with the department are the Environmental Assessment Regulations under the Environmental Protection Act. So for example, to your point about cabins, it would be based on the size. I think there is actually a hectare limit when it is above a certain size that you would have to register for environmental assessment.

MR. JOYCE: Okay.

MMSB, Solid Waste Management Strategy – that may be under your department or passed off; how are they performing now, and is there any audit done on it?

MR. CRUMMELL: When it comes to the MMSB, certainly it is not within our purview here with Environment and Conservation, it is an independent entity, but there is significant oversight with that body. There is an

independent board of directors; they operate arm's-length from government.

MR. JOYCE: Who do they answer to? What department?

MR. CRUMMELL: The CEO answers to me.

MR. JOYCE: To you?

MR. CRUMMELL: The board of directors, it would be a straight line to the board of directors, a dotted line then to me.

MR. JOYCE: I cannot ask you any questions.

MR. CRUMMELL: It is not a line item here in the Estimates today, so that is not something that we would get into for Estimates within Environment and Conservation.

MR. JOYCE: Are there any funds transferred from MMSB to your department or vice versa?

MR. CRUMMELL: Just that salary would be –

MR. JOYCE: Can you show us where – obviously, there are line items. That is why I am saying. You cannot say it is just not, because there are.

MR. CRUMMELL: It is just like the CEO of WHSCC – I am just trying to think now; I do not know if I misspoke on that one or not – but there are some salaries that are paid.

Occupational, Health and Safety, for instance, in Service NL is paid for by WHSCC, all of their salaries are paid for. So there are relationships between government departments and other outside entities, but they are still arm's-length. In particular, MMSB is arm's-length from –

MR. JOYCE: How can you be arm's-length and I cannot ask questions if there are salaries in the line items on it? Can you explain about where the salaries are in the line items?

MR. CHIPPETT: (Inaudible) explain the salary piece

MR. CRUMMELL: Go ahead, yes. I am going to let the deputy explain the salary piece and why that is the way it is.

MR. CHIPPETT: Just to be clear, the only salary that shows up in our line items is for the CEO who was a deputy minister for years in government. So that is why that relationship evolved whereby government pays MMSB for his salary and then we recoup it through revenue from MMSB. It is only because that individual is on the executive pay plan in the government.

MR. JOYCE: Okay. Besides that one person, is there any other money transferred from MMSB to your department or vice versa, any funds given to them to do any projects, any type of –

MR. CRUMMELL: No. The only example I can provide to you is the MMSB did a bit of work for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency; we referred to in the earlier session. There was a small fee there for consulting with MMSB. They did some audits on some of the government buildings for us because they are the experts in that.

MR. JOYCE: Can you show us where and how much?

MR. CRUMMELL: Excuse me?

MR. JOYCE: Show us how much you paid MMSB to do an audit, or how much and what line item?

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, I think if I can recall, I do not have it handy, but from CCEE it was a few thousand dollars, like \$10,000.

MR. JOYCE: Okay.

MR. CRUMMELL: If I recall correctly. I think you asked that question.

MR. JOYCE: Boil-water advisories, how many are there in the Province now? I am sure that is under Environment.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, that is certainly our shop. There are a little over 200. It is posted daily on our sites. It fluctuates sometimes on a daily basis. Right now there are 215. If you go online, you can see it right there. It tells you exactly how many boil-water advisories are there.

MR. JOYCE: Can you show me in the line items, which line item it is for safe and clean drinking water, the strategy for the department?

MR. CRUMMELL: Well, our Water Resources Management Division is responsible for this. That is in 2.2.01. So anything you see there incorporates into it the work we do.

MR. JOYCE: Okay.

CHAIR: Okay, I think we got a bit of the time back Mr. Murphy. I will go back to him now.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Eddie is a great fellow.

Minister, you mentioned under 1.2.04 that this whole department had gone over to Environmental Assessment and Sustainable Development. Is that right?

MR. CRUMMELL: That is correct.

MR. MURPHY: Did we lose any job positions in the shift here? The math does not seem to be working out right here.

MR. CRUMMELL: I think there is one less position with that changeover.

MR. MURPHY: What was that person's job? Do we know?

MR. CRUMMELL: It was a temporary environmental assessment scientist.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

Under the same line on 1.2.04, the Purchased Services line, \$237,000 was budgeted for and only \$98,700 was spent. However, if I look at the budgetary line item over here in Environmental Assessment we are only looking at \$10,100 that they were spending and still budgeted only for \$49,300. There is a huge discrepancy in the numbers here.

I am just wondering, what are Purchased Services, number one, that they are going after – what were the Purchased Services that they were getting beforehand, before Sustainable Development was moved?

MR. CRUMMELL: Again, just to be clear, you are at 1.2.04, Purchased Services, under 01.

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. CRUMMELL: That would reflect the end of our Caribou Strategy; we had a three year – sorry –

MR. MURPHY: Caribou study, was it?

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes.

We had a five-year, \$15 million program that we put in place to research the caribou on the Island portion of the Province. That has finished and has come to an end.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

I guess they are only putting – well, they are putting \$49,300 in this year. That is where we would find other studies I presume. What is that money being spent on this year, Purchased Services in 2.3.01?

MR. CRUMMELL: Subhead 2.3.01, okay, I got you. Let's have a little look here.

You are looking at Purchased Services. Again that line item there, with the creation of that new division we certainly needed extra funds and we are re-profiling funds to make sure that we cover historical expenditures, as well as to create the new division. As we make these changes and we move it over, we need to move money into different buckets to make sure we do the work that was being done before. That is what we think is the money we need to do that work under this new alignment.

MR. MURPHY: If that is the case, where there was \$237,000 that was spent or budgeted for, I should say, in 2014-2015 on caribou, it does not seem like there is a lot there for further study on any of the caribou. I am a little bit concerned about the Red Wine herd in particular in Labrador. Any comment on that – can you address that as regards to funding for further study on animals, or are we into enforcement now?

MR. CRUMMELL: For the Caribou Strategy moving forward for Labrador, I think it is \$1.7

million or \$1.8 million that we have over three years – is it?

OFFICIAL: It is \$1.9 million.

MR. CRUMMELL: It is \$1.9 million, I am sorry; so it is even more as we keep talking. It is \$1.9 million over three years to continue to monitor, to do the research and the science, and to identify their ranges for the caribou in Labrador. These will be captured in some of these line items as well. Salaries have increased in 2.3.01. They went up from \$825,000 to \$963,000. So you can see that the bodies have come with it as well.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, I was just curious as regards to the Salaries line, though, when you were talking. The merging of the two departments does not seem to add up is what I am saying. I know that there are salary details there.

How many people do we have working in Environmental Assessment and Sustainable Development now that we did not have before? Did we lose people? We lost one position that you just mentioned.

MR. CRUMMELL: It is three.

MR. MURPHY: There are only three people (inaudible)?

MR. CRUMMELL: There are three, but there are two other people moved over to Wildlife from Sustainable Development.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. So they are not all there?

MR. CRUMMELL: No, they are not all there.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

MR. CRUMMELL: Two went into Wildlife as well.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

MR. CRUMMELL: We do have a five-year moose management plan. We do have the caribou monitoring for Labrador. We have

people in the Wildlife Division who are doing that work as well.

MR. MURPHY: We lost a wildlife biologist over on the West Coast last year. Did we get him or her back?

MR. CRUMMELL: I am not sure what position that would be.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, we lost a biologist over there; a wildlife biologist last year. Was it last year? Yes.

MR. CRUMMELL: We know that within our division there might be a vacancy here or there. I do not think there is a position that was lost on the West Coast.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

MR. CRUMMELL: I do not have an answer for you because we do not have that information.

MR. MURPHY: I will ask you in the House.

MR. CRUMMELL: Okay. No sweat.

I do not know, Jamie, if you had something you wanted to add to one of my answers. It is important that we get the facts out, so, Jamie, if you could?

MR. CHIPPETT: Just on the question around Labrador, in particular, as the minister said, Sustainable Development worked exclusively on the Island. So a lot of those responsibilities, now that the piece of work has been done, will transfer over to the management people in the Wildlife Division.

There are actually separate activities that have the funding for the George River Caribou Initiative, and for some of the monitoring we are doing on the Red Wine herd that you mentioned.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

MR. CHIPPETT: So all our caribou resource work is not only done in that division. I guess the point of clarity is the Environmental Assessment and Sustainable Development Division now focusses on policy and environmental assessments of projects rather

than the activities around research with caribou on the Island, which were quite cost intensive, like helicopter time. The Purchased Services you asked about would be genetic work and so on.

MR. MURPHY: Your department, I guess, would still hold to the same principle, though, when it comes to helicopter leasing or rental? That would still go through Trans and Works?

MR. CHIPPETT: Yes, that contract is held through Transportation and Works.

MR. MURPHY: All right. I want to come back to some other line items here again in the last two-and-a-half minutes I have here of my time. Subhead 1.2.05 in Administrative Support, under Property, Furnishings and Equipment it showed \$175,000 budgeted for in 2014-21015. Nothing was spent, but there is still \$57,900 budgeted for this year. What did you anticipate that you were going to spend the money on, first off?

MR. CRUMMELL: That decrease of \$175,000 reflects funds that were reallocated to Professional and Purchased Services to cover costs associated with concluding the Salmonier Nature Park infrastructure project.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. Under Purchased Services as well, \$370,000 was anticipated and \$658,100 was spent. Is that the same project, Salmonier?

MR. CRUMMELL: Mr. Chair, \$370,000 was budgeted and \$658,000 was spent. Is that what you are referring to?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. CRUMMELL: That is to reflect the construction contracts. What ends up happening with these construction contracts – as well, actually, it was for Salmonier and it was also for Butter Pot and Seaward's. There were bridges put into those areas as well – Butter Pot Park. There are some capital monies that were spent there.

It has to do with the timing issues. When you have contracts that are let and the time that the work is done, you may go past your fiscal year.

That money that was allocated was carried forward. The money was spent on those infrastructure projects.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. The last figure in the last forty-five seconds, I guess. In Professional Services, \$30,000 was budgeted for and \$93,300 was actually spent here.

MR. CRUMMELL: Right. That reflects consulting contracts that we had for Salmonier Nature Park interpretation centre as well as the Butter Pot and Seaward's bridges.

MR. MURPHY: Who was the consultant there? Was that tendered?

MR. CRUMMELL: I would not be able to tell you. That is something I do not have handy.

MR. CHIPPETT: It did go to RFP for the consultants. Meridian Engineering was successful for the bridge projects.

MR. MURPHY: Meridian. Okay.

All right I see my time is up so I digress to –

CHAIR: Okay. We are going to pause now for the break that I said we would do at 7:30 o'clock. We will pause for ten minutes and then come back. We will let the gentleman down at the Broadcast Centre have a slight break because they are alone I think.

Recess

CHAIR: Okay, Mr. Joyce, you can continue with your line of questioning.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Subhead 3.1.01, Parks and Natural Areas; the natural areas system plan, are there funds in the budget for that?

MR. CRUMMELL: There is no specific funding in the budget for that. This is something that our employees are working on, on a regular basis within Parks and Natural Areas.

The two big projects that have been really time consuming – again, we are a small shop, and Parks and Natural Areas is a small shop as well.

Mistaken Point took a lot of resources over the last couple of years, a huge amount of resources in terms of manpower and other dollars. Mealy Mountains National Park; we are at the very final stages of making that a reality. That has been worked on for many years as well.

So in terms of a single line item, there are responsibilities there captured within these budgets for the natural areas system plan to keep moving forward. We are moving forward on that and work is being done on that on a regular basis.

MR. JOYCE: When do you expect it to be completed?

MR. CRUMMELL: Now that we are almost at the goal line now with Mistaken Point and with Mealy Mountains, this is definitely way up there on the priority list. I cannot give you a definitive time frame, but we are working on it very hard.

MR. JOYCE: When do you expect the Mealy Mountains work? That was supposed to be announced. Is there any decision made on that?

MR. CRUMMELL: Excuse me?

MR. JOYCE: Mealy Mountains.

MR. CRUMMELL: Right now we are going through one last round of consultations with groups in Labrador for the final, final.

MR. JOYCE: Okay. Pippy Park; I am sure that is under you guys also. Where in the budget does it show for the Rod Stewart concert? Were there any revenues?

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, so when we look at revenue, I do not know if we see – we do not have a revenue line item within Pippy Park, correct? Would that go into natural or that goes in general revenue?

The Pippy Park Commission actually does have their separate arm's length board of directors. You have the head of Pippy Park, the dotted line into me, but a straight line into the board. They have their own budgets and accounting procedures that are audited and work is done there – go ahead.

OFFICIAL: We give them a grant.

MR. CRUMMELL: We give them a grant as part of their operating costs. They generate revenue from the golf course, from other things as well, fees and services, rentals, and also from the Rod Stewart concert.

MR. JOYCE: Are they responsible for all the liabilities if any, insurance, et cetera?

MR. CRUMMELL: That is something they would cover themselves. The promoter would be required to have insurance for that as well. We would have our normal insurance that they would normally have with any of their properties that they manage and own, and also the promoter would have the first liability.

MR. JOYCE: What line item is the grant to Pippy Park and how much?

MR. CRUMMELL: Subhead 1.2.06 is where that is captured.

CHAIR: Page 11.5.

MR. CRUMMELL: You see 1.2.06 and the Grants and Subsidies. It is gone from \$539,000 to \$585,000, the main reason being are 3 per cent salary increases that capture that extra \$50,000.

MR. JOYCE: Okay. Just for example when you are saying – and I have no reason not to believe it. Like you said Mud Immortal last year, is there any line item if it cost a good – did it cost any funds to government last year for the Mud Immortal? I am sure there had to be damage done.

MR. CRUMMELL: Anything that was taken care of was done. It was taken care of. There is no cost captured this year and last year. That was two years ago now.

MR. JOYCE: So there is no cost to fix up that area?

MR. CRUMMELL: I think everything has been remediated. The site is back to its former state.

MR. JOYCE: Who paid for that?

MR. CRUMMELL: Who fixed that? Ross?

MR. CHIPPETT: Any site damage, as I understand it – I am not sure there was a lot of site damage – would have been covered off by in-house staff. More or less cleanup was the biggest thing in terms of things left behind and so on.

Then there was the area that the trail went over. So we have cordoned that off and we are investigating on a regular basis how the regeneration of vegetation is going. In some places it is still slow going, but there are signs of positive regrowth. There are no extra expenditures out of our department's budget for that.

MR. JOYCE: I would not know being your line item or Department of Justice, are there any lawsuits pending on this now?

MR. CRUMMELL: It is something that we are not aware of ourselves right now. There is one from an individual, but it is not something that we would be that familiar with. There is one outstanding I guess from what we are hearing.

MR. JOYCE: Okay. I am going to 3.2.01. I am going to the caribou numbers and the moose numbers. Do you have any idea the numbers of the caribou and the moose in the Province now?

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, absolutely. We have a moose population at 112,000 estimated, not including the national parks. Caribou on the Island portion, I think, is at 32,400, Ross? Yes, again that is the 32,000 range right now. So that is what we are talking about with the Island and moose.

With regard to Labrador, we have the George River herd at about 14,200; Mealy Mountains is around 1,500-1,800, I think; Lac Joseph there is a smaller number, but not far off that; and the Red Wine herd, obviously we are down to twenty-four or twenty-five animals.

OFFICIAL: Less than twenty.

MR. CRUMMELL: Less than twenty animals right now.

MR. JOYCE: Inspections for outfitters, is that under your department?

MR. CRUMMELL: Can you please repeat that?

MR. JOYCE: Inspections for outfitters.

MR. CRUMMELL: Inspections for outfitters, that would not be under our department.

MR. JOYCE: Okay.

The soil erosion study, what money is associated in the budget to ensure compliance this year?

MR. CRUMMELL: Monies associated in the budget for compliance for?

MR. JOYCE: Soil erosion, the study.

MR. CRUMMELL: Soil erosion?

MR. JOYCE: Yes.

OFFICIAL: I think that might be Natural Resources (inaudible)–

MR. CRUMMELL: We are just having a discussion here. In terms of that, certainly we monitor it through Climate Change and Energy Efficiency, but Natural Resources would be the lead on that.

MR. JOYCE: That same wetland policy, are there funds in here to ensure compliance for the wetlands?

MR. CRUMMELL: Funds to ensure compliance with wetlands?

MR. JOYCE: Ensure the wetland policy.

MR. CRUMMELL: Protection of wetlands – again in our general oversight that we provide, we have enforcement people who are within Natural Resources, who are within Justice, who would enforce any violations of regulations and protection of these types of areas. They would be doing the work around that.

MR. JOYCE: The last item for now is Species at Risk under the Species Status Advisory Committee, under Endangered Species,

commissioned in 2010-2011. How is that working now and how is that monitored in conjunction with the Species at Risk? Is the committee up and running now?

MR. CRUMMELL: You are talking about WERAC now, Sir?

OFFICIAL: The Species Status Advisory Committee.

MR. CRUMMELL: Oh, sorry – that committee is definitely very active. We have had significant correspondence. We have been out there and identified and listed this year a number of species that have been either threatened or at risk, so it is a very active committee.

MR. JOYCE: Are there any vacancies, and are they all filled if there are any vacancies?

MR. CRUMMELL: Any vacancies on that board?

MR. JOYCE: Yes.

MR. CHIPPETT: (Inaudible).

MR. CRUMMELL: Go ahead. Jamie is going to speak to that.

MR. CHIPPETT: There are some vacancies. One is very recent. The department did a news release last week or so. A long-standing member resigned because she is at university going on sabbatical, so that is one vacancy, and there are a couple of others. We have had suggestions forwarded from the committee in terms of people who would work in the disciplines that they need them in, whether it be insects, or Labrador, or what have you. We are moving forward to address those.

MR. JOYCE: WERAC, is that under Environment and Conservation? How is that going now? I know it was dormant for the longest while?

MR. CHIPPETT: That committee was fully populated last March – between March and April, I think, were the appointments and they had their first meeting in St. John's in February. The minister and I actually attended with that group. There was some news activity around

that, including the committee appointing a Labrador sub-committee for the first time in their history. I think, Minister, there are some events planned in the not too distant future to announcement the progress.

MR. JOYCE: Okay.

I see my fifteen minutes are up, Mr. Chair – ten minutes is up.

CHAIR: Perfect.

Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I wanted to come back over to some line items again, under 3.2.01, Administration, Licensing and Operations. There is a difference in Salaries line here that I would like to get an explanation on; but, at the same time as that, Minister, while you are at it, the line for Transportation and Communications as well has gone from \$311,000 to \$166,900.

MR. CRUMMELL: That is pretty simple, actually. It is a decrease reflecting savings from – we are going to rely more on the online version of the Hunting and Trapping Guide going forward, so there will be some savings realized there.

MR. MURPHY: For the Hunting and Trapping Guide in Transportation and Communications? I am just wondering about the uptake, the Hunting and Trapping Guide itself, this is usually mailed out to hunters and trappers, of course. They are utilizing that more online, are they?

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, absolutely. We see, even like moose licences, most people apply online and we are moving forward into this new age. People are starting to prefer online versions of what we provide to the people of the Province and it is reflecting that.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

Under Purchased Services, would this be affected by the same thing? You had a \$927,500 budget call in 2014-2015; this year it is only \$792,600.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, you are right. There is a decrease of \$134,900. Again, it is the increased reliance on the online version of the Hunting and Trapping Guide, and also we saved some money on leased accommodations, but the big part is the Hunting and Trapping Guide.

MR. MURPHY: Just another question, if I can, on Transportation and Communications. The Hunting and Trapping Guide; is that done in-house here, is that tendered out, or an outside contractor does that?

MR. CRUMMELL: That is tendered out.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. Thank you for that.

Under 3.2.02, Endangered Species and Biodiversity, there is a difference in the Salaries line that is a little bit noticeable. It looks like the 3 per cent. I will get you to explain that one.

MR. CRUMMELL: No, you are right.

MR. MURPHY: The 3 per cent salary?

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

How many people are working right now in Endangered Species and Biodiversity?

MR. CRUMMELL: We have four people within that division.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

I am just wondering when they get a call – I can ask you this, I guess, and it might be a general policy question. I am just wondering how something – and it may go through the Wilderness and Ecological Reserves Advisory Council too. When it comes to endangered species, you would take your advice from them and have your people at Endangered Species and Biodiversity look at that? Would I be right on that?

MR. CRUMMELL: Absolutely, WERAC provides us with invaluable advice. The federal government also has a committee that we take advice from. Jamie, can you –

MR. CHIPPETT: That is the species advisory committee (inaudible).

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, the species advisory committee which is a federal government committee that provides advice to provinces as well. We listen to what they have to say and we act on it.

MR. MURPHY: You mentioned at the same time on the WERAC you had a resignation? Was I right on that?

MR. CRUMMELL: I think we are fully teamed up there, yes.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. I was just a bit concerned that one had resigned. Yes, they are doing good work and I was glad to see that finally it was enacted again.

Under 3.2.03, Stewardship and Education, there is a difference here on the Salaries line. It looks like you gained an employee here or a salary increased or something. I will get you to explain that, 3.2.03.

MR. CRUMMELL: So you look from the decrease from the budget and then the actual?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, there were two vacancies for a portion of the fiscal year that had to be filled. We realized some savings while those positions were vacant.

MR. MURPHY: Have they been made full time or are they contractual?

MR. CRUMMELL: Within that division we do have eleven permanent, four temporary, and three seasonal for a total of eighteen employees.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

Under Purchased Services, \$75,000, that was the revised figure this year, but you only had \$59,200 in the budget. I was wondering what the extra \$26,000 overall was for? I am sorry, not \$26,000.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes. So we spent an extra \$15,000, \$16,000 last year, and it was actually

for the utilization of vehicle maintenance and vehicle rentals. It was part of our contribution to the Stewardship Association of Municipalities. They have had a number of projects that were funded in part by Environment Canada's Environmental Damages Fund. We worked in partnership with those two organizations and it required more time on the ground with our people.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. On to 3.2.04, Habitat, Game and Fur Management; there is a difference in the Salaries line in 2014-2015, but an increase overall to \$955,000 in this year's budget. Can we get a breakdown of what is happening here?

MR. CRUMMELL: Right, so you are looking at the difference between this year and next year?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. CRUMMELL: Basically, there is an increase of \$61,800. That is re-profiling one position from Parks and Natural Areas to Labrador. We have seen a need in Labrador to have somebody up there. There are a lot of developments happening up there, so we made the decision to move somebody into that area.

MR. MURPHY: How many positions are in Labrador altogether, just one?

MR. CRUMMELL: That is a good question – three.

MR. MURPHY: Three positions. What is the job of this other person? I know it is under Habitat, Game and Fur Management. Would this have to do with the monitoring of the herd and the actions that to be taken, obviously; government evidence gathering, possibly?

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, you basically answered the question. You are right.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, so that is what it is for. We are going to hear probably some action against whoever has been doing the illegal hunting of caribou and such?

MR. CRUMMELL: The enforcement piece, again I reiterate, comes down to Justice.

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. CRUMMELL: They have Fish and Wildlife Enforcement officers.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

MR. CRUMMELL: Our people are biologists and scientists. So the enforcement people are with the arm of government which is Justice.

MR. MURPHY: They would obviously be aiding Justice.

MR. CRUMMELL: They would certainly be part of the consultations in talking about what is happening with the herds, in particular, in Labrador. They have been doing the field surveys, helping us establish the hunting seasons, the zones, the quotas, and helping identifying the critical wildlife areas for these species.

MR. MURPHY: All right. Under Transportation and Communications in the same line, \$698,300 was budgeted for, and the actual spent was \$898,300. It is an extra \$200,000 more. I am wondering what that \$200,000 was.

MR. CRUMMELL: Actually, that increase of \$200,000 reflects transportation costs. You are talking about your helicopters now for your surveys for moose and caribou. It also includes the two newly created Moose Reduction Zones on the Avalon and in Central Newfoundland. So a survey is being done there.

MR. MURPHY: I am just curious; do you have a breakdown on how much went, for example, to helicopters versus the Avalon region that you just set up? It is a bit curious. It is a pretty even number there and I am just wondering if I can get another little breakdown.

MR. CRUMMELL: Maybe Ross might be able to speak to that. We would have to get that. The majority of the money would be for helicopter time for sure. In terms of the breakdown from the Island and Labrador, I do not have that here in front of us, but we could get that for you.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, if I could get a breakdown on the spending that happened here

in 2014-2015 for that \$898,300, it would be great. On to Purchased Services, then, just below; \$115,000 was actually spent against \$151,800, but you also have budgeted that same figure for this year.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, that decrease of \$36,800 is just less vehicle maintenance that happened this year. The miscellaneous purchases were down in this fiscal. They fluctuate year to year so we do not look at one year versus the next; we look at a three, four, or five-year period to see where it usually lands.

MR. MURPHY: So you keep the same number for historical purposes.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, exactly right. Plus, with the two new Moose Reduction Zones on the Avalon and Central we wanted to make sure that we had the resources that were adequate.

MR. MURPHY: All right. I see my time is up.

MR. JOYCE: You can go ahead.

MR. MURPHY: Are you sure?

MR. JOYCE: (Inaudible) talk about yours.

MR. MURPHY: May the Lord be with you, Eddie.

Thank you.

CHAIR: Everybody is so agreeable here tonight.

MR. MURPHY: Aren't they? Boy, I tell you.

I am just waiting for the little red light. Hello?

CHAIR: It is over on Ivan's – the light is on at Ivan's desk.

MR. MURPHY: Oh, the wrong light is on. Okay. There you go. Now you have it.

Under Wildlife, 3.2.05, Research, there is a difference in the Salaries lines. I wonder if you can give me a breakdown here.

MR. CRUMMELL: Okay. The increase there is certainly the 3 per cent. Also, the funding for

the Moose Management Plan that we just announced, the \$1.5 million over the next five years; there is funding there for one wildlife research biologist at \$74,600 a year. That is a new hire.

MR. MURPHY: Great. Where are they going to be based? Are they going to be portable pretty much all over the Island? They are not going to be centered in one particular area, but wherever the moose are?

MR. CRUMMELL: Corner Brook.

MR. MURPHY: That is where we lost a position last year. Curiosity dictates, I suppose, did we get the same biologist back?

MR. CRUMMELL: I would not know. I do not know if we have done the hiring yet or if somebody has been transferred or whatnot.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, so we have a West Coast biology position that has opened up again. As long as that person gets their job back, fine.

Under Transportation and Communications, Minister, \$400,000 was spent and \$158,900 was the initial ask. I am just wondering if I can get a breakdown here. At the same time, \$263,900 is the actual ask for this year.

MR. CRUMMELL: Right. The increase of \$241,000 reflects transportation for the moose and caribou surveys and classifications. We did six moose management areas last year, and also again the two newly created Moose Reduction Zones on the Avalon. That is what it captures.

Go ahead, Jamie.

MR. CHIPPETT: Just to highlight, years when we have appropriate weather conditions we – not regularly, but when we do – frequently transfer the money to allow us to do more surveys when the weather allows. There are some years when you just cannot do it because of weather, whether it be fog, or wind, or what have you.

MR. MURPHY: We are not flying tomorrow.

MR. CHIPPETT: What is that?

MR. MURPHY: We are not flying tomorrow.

MR. CHIPPETT: No. Six Moose Management Areas were done. There were classifications done on all the caribou herds on the Island and the two zones that the minister talked about.

MR. MURPHY: Just a general policy question when it comes to the moose surveys. I would presume that the most recent survey – are you at liberty to comment on the results? Some people would argue that we have been having issues with moose, but the person who meets one on a highway obviously is having a different kind of an issue with moose.

I am told on one end of the spectrum that there is a lack of moose in areas and in other areas, there are too many. I am wondering if you can comment on that.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, certainly we hear similar things out there of course. The reason why we brought in this five-year moose management plan was to make sure that we brought in the social considerations into our decision making, and the moose reduction zones along the highways was an important piece of that. We do hear from interested people on both ends of the spectrum, like you do, who say there are too many moose and it is not enough.

We do have areas of the Province that we have identified where moose are declining. We have areas where we know they are increasing. The South Coast, generally they are increasing. The Northern Peninsula, they are generally decreasing from the high densities they seen in the past. The West Coast is stable from our surveys, from our information. The Central is declining to stable.

So yes, we do have some evidence to show what is happening out there in different areas of the Province. Again, the more information we have, the better off we are. The increased funding for the surveys which was including our five-year moose management plan would give us better certainty about the numbers that are out there and we will be able to make decisions based on that.

MR. MURPHY: All right, thanks for that.

Under Cooperative Wildlife Projects, 3.2.06, there is a little bit of a difference between the

Salaries line here. In 2014-2015, \$16,600 was the actual revised.

MR. CRUMMELL: That basically there would be just a decrease in revenue from partners. We do partner with different levels of government, other businesses and organizations out there. So, that would just reflect some of the things that we are working together on, just a decrease in funding from one of our partners.

MR. MURPHY: So you would not necessarily say that you lost anybody, but an appropriation of funding gone to another department?

MR. CRUMMELL: That would be correct. Basically what we are talking – we have a number of initiatives that we deal with, with different people: the Firearm Safety/Hunter Education group; there is a bat project that would receive some monies from us as well and (inaudible). There is a whole inventory of different projects that ebbs and flows in the course of time. We see a reduction in some of this funding that is coming through from other entities.

MR. MURPHY: Your department may be the one to ask about the brown bat study. There was a cautionary note that was put out I think by Environment and Conservation some time ago. Has any of your staff noticed any issues with brown bats? Have they had any reports on it?

MR. CRUMMELL: I know that there has been a general callout for the people of the Province to keep an eye to see if there have been any changes. Ross, maybe you might want to speak to that.

MR. FIRTH: I think maybe you are referring to the White-nose Syndrome.

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. FIRTH: We are very fortunate at this point in time that we have no recorded cases of White-nose Syndrome for bats in the Province, but we are monitoring things very, very closely.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, it is a bit late now I guess. The snow is almost gone. Usually it was a winter problem, but nobody has found anything like that?

MR. FIRTH: Not up to this point, no.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, that is great. Thanks.

Coming back to 3.2.06 then, under Transportation and Communications the \$200,000 line item there for this year, but there was only \$24,000 that was spent. I am just wondering what is happening there?

MR. CRUMMELL: Last year that decrease of \$130,000 reflects less air services that were required in that fiscal year. When you look at the increase of \$50,000 – sorry, the increase for the following year is going to be for the monitoring of the caribou in Labrador.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, monitoring of the caribou in Labrador.

Purchased Services too, the same line is \$200,000 as well.

MR. CRUMMELL: Purchased Services, the increase – well in Purchased Services there is a decreased based on historical expenditures offset by funds for monitoring caribou. Then we look at just less contracts in that fiscal year, the prior year.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, and the line down below under federal revenue (inaudible) revenue.

MR. CRUMMELL: That is the one you called out earlier, I believe was it, in terms of our partnerships, just less money from our partners.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. That is the one that you were explaining there.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

I guess just far over now to the Institute for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Science, a change in the line item – I am guessing here some of these are pretty much jumping out there. Mr. Chair, 3 per cent on the \$190,000 for this year?

MR. CRUMMELL: Correct.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

Further down here the Professional Services, \$6,300 was spent and \$20,000 allocated for this year.

MR. CRUMMELL: When we look at what was spent – so that \$6,300 that was spent last year was a contract in support of the population and health of Newfoundland moose from 1966 to 2012. This was a contract that was a research project, I am assuming.

In terms of what we are looking forward to for the next year, we re-profiled some money from Grants and Subsidies to support short-term research projects with timelines measured in months as opposed to years required for graduate student project completion. We saw a need to have some resources there to help students continue on with their projects, students who are grad students –

MR. MURPHY: Under Grants and Subsidies, though, from the actual budget of \$200,000 down to \$80,000 this year.

MR. CRUMMELL: That basically reflects that there was actually less applications in 2014-2015 than in the past. Again, the \$80,000 that we have budgeted for 2015-2016 just reflects more closely what the actual expenditure has been over the last few years. We did re-profile some money to go towards Professional Services, which we just referred to a few minutes ago, which is going to give us the ability to let grad students and doctor and thesis students to do their work and get paid to do that.

CHAIR: Can we check back with Mr. Joyce now and see if he is –

MR. JOYCE: No, I am fine.

CHAIR: Okay. Mr. Murphy can keep going.

MR. MURPHY: On that line, though, on Grants and Subsidies it was \$200,000 and it went down to \$80,000. The line under Professional Services is \$20,000, so we are still net down \$100,000 for studies?

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, I mean that is exactly what that says. I might let Jamie jump in; he would know more about the history of the applications. It is application driven, these

Grants and Subsidies obviously. People are aware they are out there. They have used them in the past and continue to use them – Jamie.

MR. CHIPPETT: Just to clarify, the Professional Services line and the \$20,000 is to do shorter term research projects. Often when you get tied into a graduate student whether it be masters or Ph.D., you are into three or five year timelines. Those allow us to deal with students or professors or companies to do a short-term piece of work.

In terms of the other line, obviously it is less \$20,000 based on that re-profiling, and the Grants and Subsidies were reduced somewhat closely to the levels that were expended last year. We spent \$140,000 rather than the full \$200,000 the year before.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, but we are only going to see \$80,000, so a difference of \$68,000.

MR. CHIPPETT: Yes. I would just note that we are doing the extra work with the co-op students and so on we referenced earlier.

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. CHIPPETT: There is additional research money that could indeed involve academia in the moose management plan budget.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, all right.

Just a final summation I guess – I do have some questions around the water items, 2.2.01. I guess we will come over there now. Again 2.2.01.01, Salaries, I am taking it that this is a 3 per cent increase in Salaries that is being allotted for in the numbers?

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: It looks like it might be a position there too; I am not quite sure.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, the \$66,700 reflects the 3 per cent salary increase. There is also some re-profiling of Atlantic Climate Adaption Solutions Association funds from the policy division. So, there has been a re-profiling of monies as well.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, so it has been transferred over to you in this particular case.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: Under Transportation and Communications, \$306,700 versus \$215,000.

MR. CRUMMELL: Last year we saw a decrease of almost \$68,000, and reduced travel in helicopter rentals. Also, we did have a freeze on later on in the year, a discretionary travel freeze. We did take that to heart and we found some savings there.

In terms of next year, or this year I should say coming up and the increase of \$24,000, we have re-profiled some of the ACASA funds from the policy division. We offset that by re-profiling employee's benefits to cover historical expenditures.

MR. MURPHY: When it comes to helicopter travel, Minister, the Auditor General – I am not sure if it was last year's report or the report before that – talked about the allocation of helicopter time between departments. He was talking about air ambulance crossing over to Fire and Emergency Services crossing over to Environment.

There were issues in actually determining which department would have how much money spent. Not only that, but as regards to the logging issue as regards to what time the helicopter flights and everything took place, has the department overcome that issue of the time tracking just for fleet management purposes?

MR. CRUMMELL: I will defer to my deputy on that one.

MR. CHIPPETT: Transportation and Works of course are managing that contract and did the response to the Auditor General. They revised the manual for administrative purposes for all those things, whether it be timekeeping, or the people on a flight or whatever. So that has been passed out to all departments that utilize helicopter time. We have made sure staff all have that and we are adhering to those guidelines.

MR. MURPHY: Yes. So I just want to make sure now about this because the Auditor General said that it was an issue. What is the process right now? The pilot would actually have to log name and everything now? Has your staff been given instructions as regards to be passing on their name before they take the flight? A flight requires some names when you have a certain number of people aboard and other times it does not.

MR. CHIPPETT: I cannot speak to those details. I do not know if Colleen Johnson, our Manager of Finance, might be able to add something to that.

MS JOHNSON: The manual was provided to us last year after that audit came out. That manual was provided with direction as to how the logs are to be completed and it is to be passed on. We did monitor those invoices at the first quarter to ensure that we were following, and we were. So as of now, we are sure that we have been following the manual, what has been advised.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, great. Thanks for that.

MS JOHNSON: You are welcome.

MR. MURPHY: We had to ask you one question anyway for the night; we cannot have you here for no reason.

Under Grants and Subsidies, \$61,400, Minister, under 2.2.01.10.

MR. CRUMMELL: What we did here, again we had money for ACASA – we still had some monies in that budget, but we re-profiled some of that money. We thought there might be a need here and I think the basis behind that, deputy –

MR. CHIPPETT: Is it line 10 we are talking about.

MR. CRUMMELL: We are talking about line 10.

MR. MURPHY: Line 10, Grants and Subsidies.

MR. CHIPPETT: That is the hurricane alert system.

MR. CRUMMELL: The hurricane alert system, right. The hurricane alert system that government initiated a little while ago, we want to continue to support that. We had to re-profile some money to do that, so that is what the money is for.

MR. MURPHY: Under the hurricane alert system –

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: Well, I guess there is another climate change issue that we are talking about. You see monies like that and there is a bit of a realization that we are getting into severe weather and your department is going to be meeting some challenges in the future. I will not go on any further with that I guess.

Under Revenue – Federal, line 01, there was \$330,000 in the budget. There is only \$30,000 here when it comes to federal revenue, a difference of \$300,000. Is this part of the federal Green Fund contribution?

MR. CRUMMELL: No, the \$300,000 reflects removal of revenue from the federal government as a C-CORE project was not approved and as a result, the funding did not come from the federal government. We anticipated that project to be approved, it was not, and that is what that \$330,000 reflects.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, so further over on federal revenue they are looking at \$30,000 now.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, that \$30,000 – I guess there is \$300,000 in the difference is what we are talking about here in that funding.

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. CRUMMELL: Exactly.

MR. MURPHY: What was that C-CORE project, are you at liberty to say?

MR. GOEBEL: It was a project that we had proposed in collaboration with C-CORE to do satellite imagery of ice and snow and help us to better predict flooding and quantification of water in watersheds, but unfortunately the federal government did not come through, so the

project never came to fruition. We had the amount in the budget in case it did come through at the time.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. It is too bad they did not; I guess their attitude might have been well, there is not going to be any ice in a few years, so why worry about it.

MR. GOEBEL: There were some other reasons other than that.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, all right. Thanks, Martin, for that.

Mr. Minister, under 2.2.02, under the Water Quality Agreement, a difference again in the Salaries line here.

MR. CRUMMELL: Okay, yes, the \$31,600 is the 3 per cent.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

Under Transportation and Communications it is the same dollar amount right across the board here.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, we do not see any changes there, and our historic spend has been consistent.

MR. MURPHY: What was this money spent on for the \$167,500? Because well, for the last two years anyway it has been the same.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, and I will let my deputy – he is into the weeds on this one a little bit more than I am.

MR. CHIPPETT: Is it Transportation and Communications?

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, Water Resources Management.

MR. MURPHY: Subhead 2.2.02.

MR. CHIPPETT: Subhead 2.2.02, right?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. CHIPPETT: So, freight, postage, and the biggest one there actually would be air services

costs associated with water quality testing, particularly in remote areas and so on.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

Under Purchased Services too at the same time while we are there on that section, I just have two questions around water, I guess – \$100,000 –

MR. CRUMMELL: The decrease from \$156,700 to \$60,000 – that is \$96,700 – reflects savings due to in-house servicing of instrumentation. So what I am assuming here, and I will certainly have my people back me up on this one, there are obviously costs associated with maintain the equipment, and we found ways to do it ourselves and save some dollars.

The following year – next year, this year coming up – we have \$100,000 allocated. That is to reflect what we expect the requirements to be this year.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. Just two general questions around, I think it is an ongoing water study. Dorothea – oh my God, I cannot remember her last name now. Can you give us a status update on where that is right now? What is her last name again?

MR. CRUMMELL: Hanchar? Yes, Dorothea Hanchar.

MR. MURPHY: Hanchar. Yes, there you go. Is there any update on what is happening with the water study now?

MR. CRUMMELL: With the water study now? So that is not the university –

OFFICIAL: That is the groundwater.

MR. CRUMMELL: The groundwater with the arsenic and whatnot. Is that what we are talking about here now?

OFFICIAL: Torbay (inaudible).

MR. CRUMMELL: Torbay groundwater. Did you want to answer that one again perhaps?

MR. MURPHY: No, the Torbay groundwater, I think, was a different one.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: I think Dorothea was doing something Province-wide.

MR. CRUMMELL: Go ahead Martin.

MR. GOEBEL: Yes, Dorothea was not doing the study, she was just technical advisor.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

MR. GOEBEL: The town is doing this. The Town of Torbay is carrying out the groundwater assessment study.

MR. MURPHY: That is what I getting at. The second question then was about the Torbay study that is ongoing. That is still ongoing, but have you had any preliminary results?

MR. GOEBEL: We do not have any results yet from that particular study. It is a study to help quantify the available water resources for the purpose of planning, and deciding if there are sustainable groundwater resources available for servicing the subdivisions.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, okay.

When it comes to the actual study of the waste that is centered around Torbay airport how far did your inquiries go, as regards to getting water testing done, to find out how many people might have been affected down there? I understand there is testing on the go down there now.

MR. GOEBEL: Yes, there was testing done. Through the Town of Torbay and the Department of Natural Resources, there was a program set up whereby the homeowners could take a water quality sample and have it tested for water quality. That sampling was a basic metal scan to determine if there were, basically, contaminants potentially getting into their water.

Those results have not been released yet. They have not been completed. I do not know of anybody who has gotten any results back yet. A couple of hundred samples that were taken were analyzed. In due course, people will be advised if their well shows any sign of any kind of contamination. Then the results of course will be provided to the town. We are going to be

there to help analyze and put an interpretation on those results when they become available.

MR. MURPHY: Thanks for that. I know that this is a big issue, not only with the people of Torbay, but I think anybody else who is basically centred around the airport who are not on municipal services right now.

Mr. Minister, I am just wondering if your department might have had some consultations with the federal Environment Minister around this issue of liability. There are a lot of people down there. Basically they cannot build down there because they think that they do not have good water. There might be good reason to be of concern down there.

Are there any talks as regards to getting these people proper municipal services as a result of that and has the federal government pick up the cost? I throw that out there simply because if it is a federal responsibility for the airport, the spills, they should also pick up the liability when it comes to that.

MR. CRUMMELL: First of all, we are certainly talking to the people nearby who are most affected. We are talking with the municipal leaders in the area as well and discussing issues.

You are right; there are some federal responsibilities around that. Martin and his team have been doing some work in educating people as to what has happened in the past and what to expect going forward into the future.

With regard to compensation or any talks with the federal government in terms of liabilities or remediation, there is nothing at this point that I can point to, that I can say that there is work in that area. Certainly, Transport Canada is aware and taking responsibility of what they – basically, the polluters, the ones that deal with these situations. They have laws and legislation in place to assure that occurs and so do we.

We are working through it and trying to identify the extent of the issues in the Province. Martin might be able to speak a bit more to it as well.

MR. GOEBEL: Yes, Minister, you are quite right, Transport Canada does still manage the

site. They are the owners of it and they have groundwater observation wells that are tested annually. There has not been any significant change in the level of a particular contaminant that arose from the firefighting exercises that were carried out there.

The concern of course was that there would be a change if there was an overuse of groundwater in the area. That is why development has been put on hold in that area for now.

Also, at the same time, of course, there is only a limited amount of groundwater available for a certain number of homes. That has to be quantified, how much groundwater really is available.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

The only other question that I would have around that issue – well, there are a couple of small rivers that flow from the back of the airport down towards Logy Bay-Middle Cove-Outer Cove, and I would have a concern there.

Has the Town of Logy Bay-Middle Cove-Outer Cove and residents down there been consulted too and made part of the study? I do not know again – I can remember as a kid that there was some firefighting practices that were going on, on the back of the airport up there on that end of it (inaudible) –

MR. GOEBEL: Yes, you are quite correct. The firefighting practices stopped in the late 1990s, but at that point in time there had already been some damage done to those streams and to South Pond. South Pond is the receiving water from those particular streams.

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. GOEBEL: There were certain chemicals found. The town is fully aware of that fact. We have advised them as a very public process, in terms of we have had meetings with the town and we made recommendations and so on and so forth. There are reports on that available, and the town is fully aware of the condition of those ponds and that stream.

MR. MURPHY: So the federal government is acknowledging that they have some big

responsibilities here obviously, and I presume that we are going to be stepping up and probably getting some coverage for these people if there is in fact toxicity, for the lack of a better word, in the water down there that is going to render the water unusable in some cases.

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, everything that is happening now is precautionary in nature. There is no evidence to say that there is any contamination near the residents in the area. It is all very precautionary, what we are doing in here, in taking a measured approach. The work is being done, we are assessing it, and we will find out what needs to happen going forward. At this stage, where this occurred a number of years ago, over many years, we can only be hopeful that there is no long-lasting impact or any damage to the (inaudible).

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

Mr. Minister, just one or two final questions now and that will conclude it. I am just wondering about the disposal of fracking fluids. Has the government itself consulted with Environment and Conservation on the development of regulations when it comes, for example, to the disposal of wastewater and holding ponds – that might be a Service NL thing when it comes to direct disposal of wastewater from potential fracking that may occur in the Province?

MR. CRUMMELL: Yes, there is legislation and regulations around any mining or any wastewater that is produced from industrial sites. That legislation is very strong. We monitor any sites in the Province, as do the federal government.

Right now we have not specifically been tasked – my people – to look into something like that. It is obviously, George, a good question in the House of Assembly. We are in Estimates, at the end of it, so I am not going to knock you down on that one. The reality is there is a fracking review going on. We are keeping an eye on what is happening there. There are conversations happening, but nobody has tasked us to go out and put new regulations and legislation in place to deal with what you are talking about. There are regulations and

legislation in place that will protect the environment from these types of things.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, I think we are all done. I would just like to say thanks to your staff again. It was nice seeing all the guys and girls again this year. Thanks for the work that you are doing. Keep it up. We will keep an eye on you though.

CHAIR: Mr. Joyce, do you have any final questions?

MR. JOYCE: No, I am fine. Thank you very much.

CHAIR: Okay, Mr. Murphy has concluded so do you want to call –

CLERK: Subhead 1.1.01 through 3.3.01 inclusive.

CHAIR: Shall the clauses as identified carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: Contrary?

Carried.

On motion, subheads 1.1.01 through 3.3.01 carried.

CLERK: The total.

CHAIR: Shall the total carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: Contrary?

On motion, Department of Environment and Conservation, total heads, carried.

CHAIR: Shall I report the Estimates of the Department of Environment and Conservation and Climate Change carried without amendment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: Carried.

On motion, Estimates of the Department of Environment and Conservation and the Office of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency carried without amendment.

CHAIR: Thank you, Minister and staff, and thank you members of the Committee. It sure has been a fruitful night. We all sleep better knowing that we have the answers we got tonight.

CLERK: A motion to adjourn.

CHAIR: I need a motion to adjourn.

Motion by Mr. Pollard; I do not think that needs seconding.

The Committee is adjourned.

On motion, the Committee adjourned.