

The Regional Municipality of Durham

MINUTES

HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES AND WORKS COMMITTEES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2011

A Joint meeting of the Health & Social Services and Works Committees was held on Thursday, November 10, 2011, in the Lower Level Boardroom (LL-C), Regional Headquarters Building, 605 Rossland Road East, Whitby, Ontario at 9:30 a.m.

Present: Councillor Coe, Chair, Health & Social Services Committee
Councillor Neal
Councillor Parish
Councillor Rodrigues
Councillor Woo attended the meeting at 9:37 a.m.

Councillor Pidwerbecki, Chair, Works Committee
Councillor Mercier, Vice-Chair, Works Committee
Councillor Ballinger
Councillor Jordan
Councillor Marimpietri
Councillor McLean
Councillor Perkins

Absent: Councillor Clayton
Councillor England
Regional Chair Anderson

Also

Present: Councillor Aker
Councillor Bath
Councillor Chapman attended the meeting at 9:40 a.m.
Councillor Collier
Councillor Diamond attended the meeting at 10:00 a.m.
Councillor Drew
Councillor Drumm
Councillor Foster
Councillor Henry
Councillor Mitchell
Councillor Novak
Councillor O'Connell attended the meeting at 9:35 a.m.
Councillor O'Connor
Councillor Ryan

Staff

Present: G. Cubitt, Chief Administrative Officer
C. Curtis, Commissioner of Works
R.J. Kyle, Commissioner & Medical Officer of Health
P. Abbey, Director, Oral Health, Health Department
G. Anello, Manager, Waste Services, Works Department
H. Ge, Public Health & Preventive Medicine Consultant, Health Department
K. Gorman, Director, Environmental Health, Health Department
M. Januszkiewicz, Director, Waste Management, Works Department
G. Kippen, Director, Support Services, Works Department
S. Munns, Director, Corporate Communications
D. Mutasingwa, Public Health & Preventive Medicine Resident, Health
Department
J. Paquette, Manager, Corporate Communications
J. Presta, Director, Environmental Services, Works Department
S. Siopis, Director, Transportation & Field Services, Works Department
attended for part of the meeting
C. Bandel, Committee Clerk
C. Tennisco, Committee Clerk
L. Fleury, Committee Clerk

Councillor Coe, Chair of the Health & Social Services Committee, assumed the
Chair.

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

2. PRESENTATIONS

a) PRESENTATION BY DR. PATRICIA ABBEY, DIRECTOR, ORAL HEALTH,
JOHN PRESTA, DIRECTOR, ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, AND DR. HONG
GE, PUBLIC HEALTH AND PREVENTIVE MEDICINE CONSULTANT
ENTITLED "COMMUNITY WATER FLUORIDATION"

Dr. Patricia Abbey, Director, Oral Health, John Presta, Director, Environmental
Services, and Dr. Hong Ge, Public Health and Preventive Medicine Consultant
provided a PowerPoint Presentation on Community Water Fluoridation. A copy
of the presentation along with supplementary material was provided as a
handout.

Dr. Abbey advised that Community Water Fluoridation (CWF) is effective,
equitable, economical, and safe.

She advised that fluoride is a naturally occurring mineral and listed various
sources of fluoride including CWF; fluoridated toothpaste; and fluoride topically
applied by dentists.

Dr. Abbey explained that fluoride increases resistance to decay and can remineralize the teeth to help heal decay which has already started.

Dr. Abbey outlined the history of CWF beginning in 1901 in Colorado Springs where it was discovered that there was an inverse relationship between higher fluoride levels in water and fewer cavities. It was also discovered that fluoride levels that are too high lead to fluorosis. She noted that during the 1930's and 1940's tests were conducted to determine the optimal level of fluoridation and to compare communities with CWF to communities without and those with naturally high levels of fluoride in the drinking water. She added that by 2007 45% of the Canadian population had access to fluoridated water.

Dr. Abbey advised that the debate on fluoridation has been ongoing for sixty years since CWF started. She added that there are over ninety national and international organizations that are proponents of CWF including Health Canada, the Canadian Public Health Association, the Canadian Dental Association, the Canadian Medical Association, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration and the World Health Organization. She added that opponents to CWF include the Fluoride Action Network.

Dr. Abbey outlined recent publications in support of CWF which she advised were also included in the handout package.

Dr. Abbey listed communities who have recently reaffirmed their decision to fluoridate water including Dorval, Quebec where fluoridation was reintroduced when an increase in the incidence of dental caries was noticed after fluoride was removed.

Dr. Abbey outlined Durham Region's interest in fluoridation in recent years including a 2008 memorandum from Dr. Kyle; three inquiries from members of the public; emails and phone calls from four individuals to enquire about the removal of fluoride from the water supply; a joint memorandum from Health and Works to the complainants; and a May 4th request for a presentation from a member of the Works Committee.

Dr. Abbey outlined the results of various studies which ranged over a fifty-year period showing the effectiveness of CWF for children.

Dr. Abbey advised that there is a 33% rate of decay in Durham Region children, and a 49% rate of dental caries in Durham Region seniors. She added that seniors have a lower rate of insurance coverage: 47% compared to 80% in 25 – 64 year-olds. She also added that 7.7% of Durham Region families are low income and fluoride reaches everyone.

J. Presta advised that CWF currently exists in the following Durham Region communities: Pickering, Ajax, Whitby, Oshawa, Brooklin, and Courtice.

J. Presta noted that CWF is economical with an annual cost of \$200,000 which is approximately equal to \$0.40 per person. He added that the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimate that every \$1.00 invested in CWF yields approximately \$38.00 in savings in dental treatment costs.

J. Presta advised that CWF is safe and noted the following regulations that govern CWF including the *Fluoridation Act* and the *Safe Drinking Water Act*. He noted that the recommended concentration for fluoridation is 0.5 – 0.8 mg/l with a maximum acceptable concentration of 1.5 mg/l. He added that water supply systems in Ontario are operated and maintained by licensed operators and each drinking water system has a Drinking Water Quality Management System. He advised that the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) provides licenses under the *Safe Drinking Water Act* and that MOE inspectors inspect drinking water systems annually. He further added that the Drinking Water Quality Management System is audited by the Canadian General Standards Board and that any health related issues fall within the purview of the Health Department.

J. Presta advised that hydrofluorosilicic acid is used for CWF and the Region obtains hydrofluorosilicic acid from Solvay Chemicals sourced in the United States. He added that all chemicals used in the drinking water supply process must meet the American Water Works Association Standard B703-06 and the American National Standards Institute/National Scientific Foundation Standards 60 and 61.

J. Presta advised that all water operators are trained to safely handle all chemicals used for water treatment. He also advised that National Science Foundation test results show that fluoridation products do not add measurable amounts of arsenic, lead, other heavy metals or radionuclide to drinking water. He added that drinking water is monitored for heavy metals and the 2010 Annual Water Quality Report is available on the Region's website.

Dr. Ge outlined two different methods for appraising scientific literature including a systematic review and a selective review. She provided details on various studies obtained during a systematic review which indicate that CWF is safe. She advised that the conclusions from the studies show that there is no link between exposure to fluoride in drinking water and any adverse health effects including cancer, immune system defects, reproductive defects, developmental defects (brain or nervous system), and IQ deficits.

Dr. Ge outlined a Rapid Risk Factor Surveillance System (RRFSS) survey that was conducted in 2009 that indicates that 66% of Durham Region residents support CWF, 17% oppose CWF, and 17% are not sure.

Dr. Ge concluded by stating that the drinking water in Durham Region is high quality and CWF is effective, equitable, economical and safe. She added that the staff recommendation is to continue water fluoridation.

Dr. Abbey provided further details on dental fluorosis in response to a request from a Committee member.

J. Presta responded to a question with respect to why CWF is not offered to all communities in Durham Region.

Dr. Abbey and Dr. Ge responded to questions with respect to the RRFSS survey and whether re-phrasing the questions could result in a different outcome; whether the studies on CWF as listed on Page 11 of the presentation take diet into account and the affect diet can have on cavity rates; once fluoride is in the water how is it possible to control how much individuals consume; and if the cavity rates vary in Durham communities with and without CWF.

Dr. Ge responded to questions from Councillor O'Connell with respect to a study published in 2004 in the journal of The American Neurological Association which concludes that fluoride enhances aluminum absorption from the gastro-intestinal mucosa and across the blood/brain barrier, the negative impacts of which can be neurological disorders and whether this study was considered in the literature review; and the costs to the healthcare system for neurological disorders because of fluoridation. Dr. Ge advised that the study referenced by Councillor O'Connell was not included in the systematic review and following the meeting she would read the article and discuss it with Councillor O'Connell. She added that the studies included in the systematic review did not indicate any impact on neurological development. She further added that she will obtain information on the healthcare costs of neurological disorders and provide Councillor O'Connell with the information directly.

Dr. Abbey, J. Presta and Dr. Ge responded to further questions with respect to whether any of the studies conducted on CWF were long-term and over what timeframe they were conducted; whether dental fluorosis is a health concern; if good dental hygiene without fluoride could also prevent decay; whether a comparison has been conducted to determine the effectiveness of adding fluoride to drinking water compared to using fluoridated toothpaste (i.e. if drinking fluoridated waters means that fluoridated toothpaste is not required); whether respondents to the RRFSS survey were asked why they would want fluoridated water; whether the addition of fluoride to drinking water acts to mitigate poor dental hygiene health rather than to address the root cause; if there are ways of removing fluoride from drinking water and whether it could be provided in another format for those who want it.

J. Presta responded to a question from Councillor Mercier with respect to whether there are plans to enhance those municipal drinking water systems that are not currently fluoridated. He advised that there is currently no plan in this regard. Councillor Mercier suggested that this be reviewed.

J. Presta also responded to a question from Councillor O'Connor with respect to what the process would entail should a community wish to fluoridate its

drinking water. Councillor O'Connor requested that a similar presentation be provided to the Township of Uxbridge.

Dr. Abbey responded to further questions with respect to what education is provided for individuals with wells and how big is the anti-fluoride movement.

Dr. Abbey responded to a question with respect to whether today's presentation and further information on fluoride are available on the Region's website. Dr. Abbey advised that there are multiple sources of information available on the Region's website and Dr. Kyle added that today's presentation will also be posted on the website.

Dr. Abbey, J. Presta and Dr. Ge responded to further questions with respect to whether there is any difference in the levels of tooth decay if fluoride levels are increased beyond the current concentration; how often the fluoride levels in the Region's drinking water supply systems are tested; how the hydrofluorosilicic acid is stored and added to the water supply; and what happens if there is a malfunction of the system.

Chair Coe added that there was a statement released by Dr. Arlene King, Chief Medical Officer of Health on April 4, 2011 that speaks to the benefits of CWF. He added that he will provide a copy to the Committee Clerk for distribution to all members of Council.

3. DELEGATIONS

a) MISTY OULTON RE: WATER FLUORIDATION

Ms. Misty Oulton appeared before the Committee with respect to Community Water Fluoridation.

Ms. Oulton advised that she is a resident of Durham Region who is concerned with CWF. She asked for a resolution to stop artificial fluoridation of drinking water with hydrofluorsilicic acid (HFSA). A copy of her delegation material was provided as a handout.

Ms. Oulton advised that HFSA is a highly reactive and corrosive chemical that is not of pharmaceutical quality and is known to cause fluorosis. She added that the Centres for Disease Control announced last year that 41% of teens between the ages of 12 – 15 have dental fluorosis. She questioned if the teeth are the mirror to the bone, then what is happening to the skeletal system.

Ms. Oulton stated that water fluoridation is used as a medication, yet does not allow for control of dosage. She added that she has huge safety concerns with this.

Ms. Oulton advised that the scientific and legal determination of safety is based on two types of research, animal studies (toxicology studies), and human

studies (clinical trials). She added that the HFSA used in CWF have neither the required animal nor human studies to determine safety. She stated that any claims that these products are “safe” are not based on well-established scientific protocol.

Ms. Oulton asked that councilors make a request that those presenting in favour of CWF provide the toxicological evidence that silicofluoride chemicals are safe and added that the burden of proof needs to be established by the presenters.

Ms. Oulton stated that The Centres for Disease Control and Prevention admits that they do not have in their possession toxicological evidence of fluoride safety; The Food and Drug Administration states they have never conducted such a test; The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency states they know of no such testing; and The American Dental Association claims no knowledge of toxicological testing of fluorides.

Ms. Oulton added that The National Sanitation Foundation International confirmed that they have no toxicological studies on file for either the fluoride compound or any contaminants contained in the certified fluoridation chemicals.

Ms. Oulton stated that fluoridating chemicals used in most public water supplies are an industrial waste by-product that can be described as “process water”. She added that the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act* classifies HFSA as persistent, bioaccumulative, and toxic. She further added that Health Canada has not regulated HFSA, tested it for toxicity, safety or purity, or approved it as a drug that prevents tooth decay.

Ms. Oulton advised that under the *Safe Drinking Water Act, Section 19* “Standard of Care” councilors must think independently on the merits of fluoridation and demonstrate that they are prudent defenders of drinking water quality and that they show no complacency in a false belief that all is well in other fluoridated communities. She added that municipal councilors can be held accountable for their decision to administer an unproven drug in the water supply as of January 2013.

Ms. Oulton added that only 33% of Canadians consume fluoridated water with many Ontario communities choosing to stop fluoridating recently. She asked that the Committee members end fluoridation in this community.

With the consensus of the Committee the Agenda was altered in order to allow Mr. Todd Baron to speak next.

d) TODD BARON RE: WATER FLUORIDATION

Mr. Todd Baron appeared before the Committee with respect to Community Water Fluoridation.

Mr. Baron advised that he is a resident of Durham Region and a doctor of chiropractic. He asked that the Committee members look at the positive and negative aspects of CWF and do their own research. He added that he sent an e-mail to members of Council providing information that he has gathered on CWF.

Mr. Baron questioned whether CWF is beneficial and noted that there are studies that indicate that it is and studies that indicated that it is not. He cited studies from British Columbia, North Carolina, Finland and Cuba. He added that locally there have been studies conducted in Quebec and Ontario and there are statistics available through Health Canada. He also added that the results from the York study cited during the presentation were found to be inconclusive. He explained that the head of the York review wrote a letter to the British Medical Journal indicating that the conclusions of the study were taken out of context.

Mr. Baron questioned whether CWF is safe and noted that some research shows that it can be dangerous to the brain and endocrine function. He added that perhaps more studies are required to prove that CWF is safe. He further added that the safety of CWF is indeterminate as there is no strong evidence supporting or saying it is safe.

Mr. Baron stated that topical applications of fluoride are more effective than ingested fluoride. He added that there is an ethical issue with CWF and further stated that until it is proven safe it may not be right to put it in the water. He added that he believes in the right to free choice.

Mr. Baron concluded by adding that he is a resident of Bowmanville where there is no CWF and there does not seem to be a difference in cavity rates.

b) LINDA GASSER RE: ENERGY-FROM-WASTE FACILITY

Ms. Linda Gasser appeared before the Committee with respect to the Energy-from-Waste Facility (EFW).

Ms. Gasser stated that recent spending excesses reported by various media outlets are but one example of why focused Council action and project oversight are required around the incinerator project.

Ms. Gasser advised that she submitted a Freedom of Information (FOI) request with respect to the groundbreaking ceremony for the EFW facility. She provided details with respect to the list of prospective attendees and noted that the actual attendance as estimated by a Toronto Star Reporter was 175.

Ms. Gasser stated that Council needs to focus on the issues of money, the decisions/action of the Chair and senior staff and the fact that some on Council claim they did not know about the costs for the groundbreaking ceremony.

Ms. Gasser added that one of the early estimates for an “upscale” groundbreaking event, dated April 12, 2009 for 230 guests was \$15,476.20. She added that the actual cost according to a September 1, 2011 document was \$72,187.11 for approximately 175 guests. She added that the costs almost quintupled from the estimates of two years ago.

Ms. Gasser stated that members of Council have an obligation to provide oversight and ensure proper cost controls are in place and ask for full disclosure of all costs related to the incinerator. She added that historic and future incinerator related costs would include things like consultant fees for various study costs, legal fees, development of the RFP, business case, staff and council travel, waste conferences, special council education sessions etcetera, irrespective of what particular budget or account these expenditures may be found in and regardless of when Council may or may not have approved any particular expenditure.

Ms. Gasser formally requested that the Committee direct staff to implement an incinerator project reporting protocol so that they are updated at regular intervals, in writing. She strongly suggested that this be done monthly. She also asked that an independent legal review be conducted of the project agreement with Covanta so that members of Council know what their options are and whether or not the legal opinions that have been obtained are accurate and defensible.

Ms. Gasser questioned whether it is correct that the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the EFW facility cost around \$20 million dollars. She also questioned why staff and Council may have attended conferences after the EA approval and submission of the Certificate of Approval (C of A) and whether it would be for the purposes of promoting the EFW project or to learn about industry messaging which she stated would benefit industry far more than the public. She further questioned how many of these events do Council and staff attend annually and what is the total cost of these since the incinerator project started – including pre EA commencement. She asked who is paying for these trips and, if it is Durham taxpayers, has Council authorized all the expenses and the purposes.

Ms. Gasser stated that Councilors should be able to explain if and when they will implement the “state of the art” monitoring that was committed to in January 2008. She questioned whether Council or staff have reviewed the monitoring plans and whether the plans meet Council’s commitments.

Ms. Gasser stated that according to EA Condition 7.5 staff must hold a pre-construction public consultation meeting. She advised that staff announced at the EFW Advisory Committee meeting that the public consultation would be held in combination with the first meeting of the EFW Waste Management Advisory Committee. She asked that Council direct staff to consult with the public in a proper meeting format.

Ms. Gasser responded to questions from the Committee members. She was asked to provide a copy of her presentation for members of Council.

c) WENDY BRACKEN RE: ENERGY-FROM-WASTE FACILITY

Ms. Wendy Bracken appeared before the Committee with respect to the Energy-from-Waste Facility (EFW).

Ms. Bracken stated that she will speak to the reports and events of the July 26th Special Council meeting. She advised that there were errors in the Health Risk Assessment report with respect to the emissions for Particulate Matter 2.5 (PM_{2.5}). She added that there were data quality issues with respect to the PM_{2.5} data measured at the Courtice monitoring station, as a result the monitoring report was amended in 2009. She stated that the amended values were not carried forward to the final amended EA Air Quality Assessment or Health Risk Assessment. She added that the baseline risk was assessed for less than half the actual level of PM_{2.5} emissions, and the methodology used to characterize health risk for PM_{2.5} was inappropriate and incapable of accurately accessing risk. She further added that PM_{2.5} was treated as a threshold pollutant by the consultants, which it is not.

Ms. Bracken stated that Dr. Copes' report provided professional confirmation stating "while for compliance purposes comparison of predicted PM_{2.5} concentrations with targets or standards may be helpful it doesn't give much insight into how large or small the potential health impacts may be". She questioned why members of the public are drawing attention to these issues. She added that Dr. Ollson admitted to the oversight of not amending the baseline values.

Ms. Bracken further stated that in Ontario the acceptable level of risk is one additional incidence of cancer per one million people. She explained that she believes Dr. Copes' assessment was missing the incremental lifetime risk of PM_{2.5} and the values should have been multiplied by 30 which is the estimated lifetime for the facility. She added that if this had been done, the risk would have exceeded the Ontario risk criterion by 3 to 18 times for additional deaths. She also added that this was brought to Council's attention during her July delegation and no action has been taken in this regard. She asked the Committee to ask Dr. Kyle whether he was aware that Dr. Copes' assessment did not account for the lifetime of the facility and if he is satisfied that risk only needs to be assessed for one year.

Ms. Bracken stated that state of the art monitoring is not in the emissions monitoring plan submitted to the MOE. She added that continuous sampling should be conducted for mercury and that monitoring commitments need to be met.

Ms. Bracken also stated that the EFW groundbreaking ceremony showed a disturbing attitude, out of touch with the public's concerns and added insult to

injury. She added that these are actions that require investigation and she asked Council to act on them.

Ms. Bracken advised that she wrote a letter to the Minister of the Environment and Minister of Health on behalf of Durham Environmental Watch, Durham Clear, and Zero Waste 4 Zero Burning which included the details she shared with the Committee today with respect to PM_{2.5}. She added that the letter points to the need for health based risk assessment of PM_{2.5}. She further added that she will provide a copy to the Committee Clerk for distribution to the members of Council.

Ms. Bracken responded to questions from the Committee members. She was asked to provide a copy of her presentation for members of Council.

4. CORRESPONDENCE

- a) MS. CAROLE CLINCH, WATERLOO RESIDENT, EMAILING THE CLERK'S DEPARTMENT, INFORMATION FOR COUNCIL REGARDING A FORMAL COMPLAINT SHE FILED ON NOVEMBER 25, 2010 WITH THE CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY (CFIA) AGAINST THE MANUFACTURER OF THE BOTTLED WATER PRODUCT CALLED "NURSERY WATER" WITH SODIUM FLUORIDE ADDED. MS. CLINCH STATES THAT THE CFIA CONFIRMED THAT THE HEALTH CLAIMS MADE BY THE MANUFACTURER OF THE PRODUCT CALLED "NURSERY WATER" ARE NOT COMPLIANT WITH THE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS OF THE FOOD AND DRUGS ACT AND ASSOCIATED REGULATIONS. SHE ADDS THAT AN ATIP REQUEST FOR INFORMATION RELATING TO THE CFIA INVESTIGATION HAS BEEN SUBMITTED. MS. CLINCH ALSO STATES THAT THE ACTUAL FLUORIDE PRODUCTS USED IN ARTIFICIAL WATER FLUORIDATION HAVE NEITHER THE REQUIRED ANIMAL STUDIES NOR THE REQUIRED HUMAN STUDIES TO DEMONSTRATE SAFETY. SHE ADDS THERE ARE NOW AVAILABLE TWO (2) RECENTLY PUBLISHED TOXICOLOGICAL STUDIES DEMONSTRATING HEALTH HARM FROM THE LONG-TERM USE OF THESE PRODUCTS. MS. CLINCH ALSO STATES THAT IN THE ABSENCE OF ANY STUDIES DEMONSTRATING SAFETY, BUT THE AVAILABILITY OF 2 RECENT TOXICOLOGICAL STUDIES SHOWING HEALTH HARM, ANY CLAIMS THAT THESE PRODUCTS ARE "SAFE" ARE NOT BASED ON WELL ESTABLISHED SCIENTIFIC PROTOCOLS OR THE AVAILABLE EVIDENCE. SHE FURTHER STATES THAT IN THE ABSENCE OF ANY GOVERNMENT REGULATION OR APPROVAL OF THESE PRODUCTS, ANY CLAIMS THAT THESE PRODUCTS ARE "SAFE" ARE NOT BASED ON FUNDAMENTAL REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS USED TO PROTECT PUBLIC SAFETY (OUR FILE: POO-39) SC #130
-

MOVED by Councillor Parish,
"THAT Correspondence Item a) be received for information."
CARRIED

5. OTHER BUSINESS

a) QUESTIONS FROM DELEGATES WITH RESPECT TO EFW FACILITY

Councillor Foster questioned whether Dr. Kyle and C. Curtis could address some of the questions raised today by the delegates with respect to the EFW facility. He also questioned whether they were aware of a recent study by the World Health Organization on air quality and added that he would provide them with the link.

C. Curtis advised that the methodology used for the Health Risk Assessment was peer reviewed and incorporated into the EA. He added that at the Special Council meeting in July, Dr. Copes advised that he found the additional risk acceptable and outlined more immediate concerns with respect to PM_{2.5} such as emissions from motor vehicles on highways.

Dr. Kyle advised that he does not recall being asked by Ms. Bracken for his opinion on Dr. Copes' risk assessment. He added that he is aware that the value was not multiplied by 30 and that when asked about this Dr. Copes advised that this calculation would not change his conclusion. Dr. Kyle added that a high level peer review of Dr. Copes' report was conducted by Ross Wilson.

Councillor O'Connell questioned whether the information that was provided to Ms. Gasser as a result of her FOI request could be shared with the members of Council prior to the November 23rd Council meeting. Chair Coe asked that the Regional Clerk respond to this request.

Councillor Neal asked that Ms. Bracken's concern with respect to the risk assessment for PM_{2.5} be addressed in writing.

6. ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by Councillor Parish,
"THAT the meeting be adjourned."
CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

L. Fleury, Committee Clerk

L. Coe, Chair
Health & Social Services Committee

N. Pidwerbecki, Chair
Works Committee